



Genetic variation in serotonin transporter function affects human fear expression indexed by fear-potentiated startle

Floris Klumpers^{a,*}, Ivo Heitland^a, Ronald S. Oosting^b, J. Leon Kenemans^a, Johanna M.P. Baas^a

^a Department of Experimental Psychology & Psychopharmacology, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 2, 3508 TC, Utrecht, The Netherlands

^b Department of Pharmacology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 23 May 2011

Accepted 24 October 2011

Available online 7 November 2011

Keywords:

5-HTTLPR

Startle

Fear

Anxiety

COMT

HTR1A

DAT

ABSTRACT

The serotonin transporter (SERT) plays a crucial role in anxiety. Accordingly, variance in SERT functioning appears to constitute an important pathway to individual differences in anxiety. The current study tested the hypothesis that genetic variation in SERT function is associated with variability in the basic reflex physiology of defense. Healthy subjects ($N=82$) were presented with clearly instructed cues of shock threat and safety to induce robust anxiety reactions. Subjects carrying at least one short allele for the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism showed stronger fear-potentiated startle compared to long allele homozygotes. However, short allele carriers showed no deficit in the downregulation of fear after the offset of threat. These results suggest that natural variation in SERT function affects the magnitude of defensive reactions while not affecting the capacity for fear regulation.

© 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The serotonin transporter plays a crucial role in anxiety. Accordingly, pharmacological adjustment of serotonin transporter (SERT) functioning by selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) is among the most established clinical pharmacological strategies to control human anxiety disorders (Baldwin et al., 2005; Bandelow et al., 2002). It is therefore to be expected that genetic variation in SERT function underlies innate differences in individuals' fear reactivity. In the current study we investigated how genetic variance in the SERT gene affects the up and down regulation of basic fear responses.

To this end we studied the impact of a well-known polymorphism in the promoter region of the SERT gene (also called 5-HTTLPR), which influences anxiety-related personality (Lesch et al., 1996). This common 5-HTTLPR polymorphism consists of an insertion/deletion of 43 bp in the 5' regulatory region of the gene, resulting in either a long or short allele. The short allele is associated with reduced SERT transcriptional activity in vitro (Heils et al., 1996). Meta-analyses have more recently confirmed that carriers of the 5-HTTLPR short allele (S-carriers) report more anxiety related personality traits (Schinka et al., 2004; Sen et al., 2004). However effect sizes are small (Munafò et al., 2009) and the relation between

this polymorphism and anxiety- and stress related psychopathology remains a matter of debate (Karg et al., 2011; Lonsdorf et al., 2009a; Wankerl et al., 2010).

A potentially fruitful approach to further investigate sequelae of genetic variability in serotonin transporter function is by establishing intermediate phenotypes associated with the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism (Canli, 2008; Domschke and Dannlowski, 2010). For example, imaging studies showed exacerbated amygdala activation towards fear cues in S-carriers (Hariri et al., 2002; Munafò et al., 2008). Another approach has been to compare 5-HTTLPR genotypes on peripheral psychophysiological measures such as skin conductance and startle during fear conditioning. In a classical conditioning study, S-carriers were more likely to show strong conditioned SCR responses than LL homozygotes who were found more often in a group of subjects that showed weak conditioning (Garpenstrand et al., 2001). More recently, evidence was presented for stronger SCRs in S-carriers during vicarious conditioning (Crisan et al., 2009). Finally, Lonsdorf et al. (2009b) reported that across the acquisition phase of a fear conditioning session, S-carriers showed stronger potentiation of the startle response. Potentiation of the startle reflex is a reliable index of the activation of the defensive system (Bradley et al., 2005) and is widely used as an objective and rather specific measure of fearful responding (Grillon and Baas, 2003; Hamm and Weike, 2005). Taken together these results suggest that increased neural threat processing in S-carriers as witnessed by stronger amygdala activations, may be reflected in autonomic measures of fear and defensive reflexes. Moreover,

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 030 253 45 82; fax: +31 030 253 45 11.
E-mail address: F.Klumpers@uu.nl (F. Klumpers).

S-carriers may show altered amygdala regulation by the prefrontal cortex (PFC) (Heinz et al., 2005; Pacheco et al., 2009; Pezawas et al., 2005). Since the interaction between these regions mediates fear regulation (Hartley and Phelps, 2010; Quirk and Beer, 2006), this implies that increased anxiety in S-carriers could stem from a genetic deficit in the capacity to suppress fear.

Here we investigated further how the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism affects fear reactions and the downregulation of fear responses. An instructed fear paradigm was employed, in which fear reactions were elicited in healthy volunteers by presenting cues that are identified before the experiment as signaling threat of electric shock (Bocker et al., 2004; Grillon et al., 1991, 1993). Moreover, startle was also measured after the termination of threat cues, during the transition from threat to a period of relative safety. In this way we could index how well subjects of each genotype were able to reduce fear when direct danger subsided. Previous work indicated that the capacity to return to a resting state after threat offset depends on prefrontal-limbic interactions (Klumpers et al., 2010a). Based on the evidence that S-carriers display increased fear reactivity which perhaps relates to altered prefrontal control, we hypothesized that S-carriers would (a) demonstrate greater reactivity to threat cues by showing stronger startle potentiation and (b) would show a reduced capacity for fear regulation as reflected in a slower decline of startle potentiation after the offset of threat cues.

2. Methods and materials

This study was approved by the medical ethical committee at the Utrecht University Medical Centre.

2.1. Subjects

Subjects were recruited through advertisements posted around the faculty and on the faculty website. A total of 95 subjects (aged 18–30) passed inclusion criteria and gave written informed consent. All subjects reported to be free of hearing problems, neurological conditions, cardiovascular disease and psychiatric diagnoses relevant to the current study, including mood and anxiety disorders. Moreover, included subjects reported no regular illicit drug use or use of psychoactive prescription drugs. Of these subjects, 94 completed the instructed fear paradigm. We excluded 11 subjects with missing data, corrupted data and/or minimal startle reactivity based on the criterion that each subject should have at least one artifact free, non-zero response for each condition in each task block (see task description below). In the remaining 83 subjects, we could accurately determine 5-HTTLPR genotype for 82 subjects (60 female; see Table 1). Of subjects these subjects, 76 were Caucasians of European descent. As an analysis excluding other ethnicities did not change the results, we decided to report on the full sample here.

2.2. Genotyping

DNA was collected with buccal swabs and isolated using a standardized kit (QiAmp DNA Mini Kit; Qiagen, Germany). 5-HTTLPR genotyping was performed using polymerase chain reaction (PCR) followed by gel electrophoresis as described by Lonsdorf et al. (2009a; see erratum). This procedure visualized for each subject either 2 short 486 bp DNA fragments (S/S), one short and one long (529 bp) fragment (S/L) or 2 copies of the long fragment (L/L). Out of the 83 subjects, we determined genotype successfully in duplicate for 82 subjects. Genotype percentages were: SS (17%), SL (57%), and LL (26%) and in accordance with the Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium ($p > .5$). Of note, three additional candidate polymorphisms (HTR1A C-1019G, COMT val158met, and DAT1 3' UTR VNTR) were assessed more exploratorily and did not affect fear-potentiated startle, the reduction in startle after threat offset and the anxiety ratings. Gene–gene interactions were not investigated given that for each interaction, smallest cells contained less than 5 subjects.

2.3. Stimuli and apparatus

Physiological recording and amplification was carried out using the BioSemi Active Two system with matching FLAT active Ag/AgCl electrodes (BioSemi, Amsterdam, The Netherlands). Startle probes were 50-ms white noise bursts with instantaneous rise time presented at 106 dBa through foam in-ear earplugs (Earlink, Aero Company auditory systems, IN, USA). Eye blink startle to these probes was measured by electromyographic (EMG) recordings from the orbicularis oculi. For EMG measurement, electrodes were placed under the right eye; one centralized under the pupil and the other 15 mm lateral towards the outer canthus of the eye. Shocks were administered through a constant current simulator (Digitimer DS7A, Digitimer Ltd., Letchworth Garden City, United Kingdom) with tin cup

electrodes located over the upper, inner wrist of the left arm. Two photos of male faces with neutral emotional expression from the NIMSTIM database (Tottenham et al., 2009; models 21 and 23) were used as cues to signal threat and safety in the instructed fear task. One of the photos was presented with blue background and the other with orange background to increase salience and distinctiveness of the cues.

2.4. Procedure

Subjects first completed a medical screening questionnaire and a Dutch translation of the trait portion of the Spielberger State/Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Defares et al., 1980). Electrodes for startle recording and shock administration were applied and the subjects underwent a standardized shock workup procedure consisting of 5 sample shocks to set the shock intensity individually for each subject at a level considered “quite annoying” (see Klumpers et al., 2010a, 2010b). This goal of this procedure was not revealed to subjects to assure an unbiased response. The final intensity of the electrical stimulation varied between subjects from 0.5 to 5.8 mA. After the workup, subjects received instructions about the task (see below). When the instructions were clear to subjects the earplugs were inserted. Twelve startle probes were presented for startle habituation. This initial series of probes was also used as a baseline startle measurement. Immediately after the last habituation probe the instructed fear task commenced.

2.5. Instructed fear task

The task was explained by showing the cue that signaled shock threat for that subject, with the instruction that “at any time during presentation of this cue shocks could be administered”. Next subjects were presented with the second cue, and were instructed that they “would never receive shocks” when this cue was presented (Fig. 1). Whether the orange or blue cue signaled shock threat was evenly distributed across subjects. During the task, cues were presented with a variable duration to make the offset of the conditions unpredictable (4–8 s, $M = 5.6$ s). The word “RUST” (‘rest’ in Dutch) was presented on the screen during the intervals between cues. Subjects were instructed to relax during these periods. Rest periods lasted between 6 and 20.5 s ($M = 11.1$ s). Startle probes could be presented at three latencies: (a) during the cues, 3 s after cue onset (“cue probes”), (b) in the rest period following the cue, 1.5 s after cue offset (“offset – early probes”) or (c) 5 s after cue offset (“offset – late probes”). Subjects were instructed to ignore the probes as much as possible. The startle probe timing is illustrated in Fig. 1.

The full experiment consisted of 5 experimental blocks with brief breaks after blocks 2 and 4. During these breaks and at the end of the experiment, subjects retrospectively rated their state anxiety during each cue and immediately following the offset of each cue on a computerized scale from 0 (*not anxious/nervous*) to 10 (*very anxious/nervous*). After the breaks, instructions regarding the threat and safe cue were repeated and 4 startle probes were administered for startle habituation before continuation of the experiment.

Each experimental block contained 10 presentations of each cue. For each condition (threat/safe), 4 cue probes and 4 offset probes (2 × offset – early, 2 × offset – late) were presented per block. The mean interval with a previous startle probe was kept at 20 s for each of the 6 probe types (2 conditions × 3 probe latencies), with a minimum interval of 16 s after a previous probe or shock reinforcement. A semi-random order was created, with no more than three consecutive repetitions of the same cue. To exclude order effects, half of the subjects received this event order while for the other half of the subjects threat and safe conditions were presented in the reversed order. This was distributed evenly across genotypes (χ^2 p -value $> .6$). A total of 9 shocks were administered at varying, semi-random time points to reduce predictability to reinforce the instruction that shocks could be administered at any time during the threat condition.

2.6. Data processing and statistical analysis

Startle data were pre-processed and checked for artifacts according to previously published guidelines (Blumenthal et al., 2005) and procedures (Bocker et al., 2004; Klumpers et al., 2010a, 2010b). To determine baseline startle, startle magnitudes from the habituation trials were log-transformed to correct deviations from normality. For the analysis of the instructed fear task, startle magnitudes for all experimental conditions were transformed to z scores per subject to simultaneously control for impact of baseline startle on fear-potentiated startle. As recommended (Grillon and Baas, 2002), raw data are also reported. Finally, data were averaged according to condition (threat, safe) and probe latency (cue, offset – early and offset – late). Similarly, the state anxiety ratings were averaged according to condition (threat, safe) and latency which only had 2 levels for the rating data (cue, offset).

All the subsequent statistical analyses were carried out in SPSS 17 (SPSS, Chicago, Illinois). Gender was not explicitly matched between genotypes and added as covariate for all genotype comparisons. Consistent with previous research (Brocke et al., 2006; Lesch et al., 1996; Lonsdorf et al., 2009b), we grouped genotypes into S-allele carriers vs. L/L homozygotes to ascertain a minimum sample size of 20 subjects for each group (see Table 1). Genotype groups were compared on trait anxiety, final shock intensity, and baseline startle amplitude in univariate ANOVAs.

Table 1

Descriptives. Sample size and gender distribution as a function of 5-HTTLPR genotype as well as means (SD) for trait anxiety scores, shock intensity and baseline startle amplitude. Statistics are reported for the comparison between S-carriers and LL homozygotes.

| | S/S | S/L | L/L | S-carriers vs. LL |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| N | 14 | 47 | 21 | |
| % Females ^a | 79 | 77 | 62 | $\chi^2 = 1.2, p = .18$ |
| Trait anxiety ^b (STAI-t score) | 35.4 (8.2) | 37.6 (7.6) | 32.9 (7.2) | $F_{(1,79)} = 3.6, p = .06$ |
| Final shock intensity (μA) ^b | 1.6 (0.8) | 2.2 (1.0) | 2.3 (1.2) | $F_{(1,79)} = 1.6, p = .21$ |
| Baseline startle amplitude (μV) | 70.4 (43.0) | 90.3 (55.1) | 78.0 (55.5) | $F_{(1,79)} < 1$ |

^a Gender was used as a covariate in all analyses comparing genotypes.

^b Adding trait anxiety score and/or shock intensity as a covariate in the startle data did not change the results.

To test effects of our task on fear potentiation of startle, we performed a 2×3 repeated measures ANOVA with within factors Condition (Threat, Safe) and Probe Latency (cue, offset – early, offset – late). Fear potentiated startle (FPS) was defined as the difference between startle amplitude in threat and safe conditions and assessed through the Condition main effect. Regulation of defensive state after threat offset was assessed by the Condition \times Probe Latency interaction. To evaluate the effect of the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism on our startle data, a between subjects factor 5-HTTLPR (S-carriers vs. LL) was added. Differences in FPS between genotypes were assessed by the 5-HTTLPR \times Condition interaction and difference in regulation of defensive states by the 5-HTTLPR \times Condition \times Probe Latency interaction. To explore genotype effects on FPS further, we assessed the 5-HTTLPR \times Condition interactions for each Probe Latency separately.

A similar strategy was used to analyze the rating data. State anxiety ratings from one subject were missing due to technical error. In the remaining subjects, we verified that our task produced the intended effects by performing a 2×2 repeated measures ANOVA with within factors Condition (Threat vs. Safe) and Latency (cue, offset). Increases in state anxiety in Threat vs. Safe conditions were assessed through the Condition main effect. Fear regulation after threat offset was assessed through the Condition \times Latency interaction. To evaluate whether the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism had an effect on anxiety induced by our task, a between subjects factor 5-HTTLPR (S-carriers vs. LL) was added. Differences between genotypes in task-related anxiety were assessed through the interaction between 5-HTTLPR and Condition and differences in the regulation of anxiety by the 5-HTTLPR \times Condition \times Latency interaction. Moreover, genotypes were compared on anxiety in each condition at each latency (Threat cue, Threat offset, Safe cue, Safe offset) in univariate ANOVAs.

3. Results

3.1. Sample descriptives

Gender distribution, mean shock intensity, baseline startle amplitude and trait anxiety score for the 5-HTTLPR genotype groups are displayed in Table 1. 5-HTTLPR short allele carriers tended to report higher trait anxiety compared to L/L homozygotes, there were no other differences (see Table 1 for descriptives and statistics).

3.2. Instructed fear results

3.2.1. State anxiety

Across genotypes, subjects consistently reported higher state anxiety following threat vs. safe cues (Condition main effect: $F_{(1,81)} = 170.8, p < .001, \eta^2 = .69$). In the rest period following the offset of the cues, the difference in anxiety between Conditions was reduced as witnessed by a Condition \times Latency interaction ($F_{(1,81)} = 123.7, p < .001, \eta^2 = .60$). The paradigm thus induced the expected effects on reported state anxiety with an increase during the threat cues that was regulated towards baseline after threat offset (Table 2). 5-HTTLPR genotypes did not differ in state anxiety (5-HTTLPR \times Condition: $F_{(1,78)} < 1$; 5-HTTLPR \times Condition \times Latency: $F_{(1,78)} = 2.8, p = .10, \eta^2 = .04$; see Table 2).

3.2.2. Startle data

Mean startle data are presented in Fig. 2 (top panel). Tested across probe latencies, threat cues induced strong increases in startle amplitude relative to the safe cues (Condition main effect: $F_{(1,82)} = 143.6, p < .001, \eta^2 = .64$). Fear potentiated startle (FPS), the difference between startle amplitude during threat and safe, diminished over probe latencies (Condition \times Probe Latency: $F_{(2,164)} = 133.3, p < .001, \eta^2 = .62$). FPS was strong during the cues (Condition effect – cue probes only: $F_{(1,82)} = 250.0, p < .001, \eta^2 = .75$), weak 1.5 s after offset of the threat cue (Condition effect for offset – early probes: $F_{(1,82)} = 3.5, p = .08, \eta^2 = .04$) and absent 5 s past the offset of the threat cue (Condition effect for offset – late probes: $F_{(1,82)} < 1$). Subjects thus successfully regulated their defensive states after threat offset.

Mean FPS as a function of 5-HTTLPR genotype can be found in Fig. 2 (bottom panel). Short allele carriers showed




Fig. 1. Conditions of shock threat and safety were cued through presentation of pictures of neutral faces. The bottom line illustrates how startle probes were presented at three latencies in an excerpt from an experimental block. Startle probes were presented during the cue ('cue probe'), in the rest period at 1.5 s after cue offset ('offset – early') or 5 s after cue offset ('offset – late'). Cues and rest periods varied in duration, details can be found in the text under "instructed fear task".

Table 2
Mean (SD) state anxiety ratings as a function of 5-HTTLPR genotype. State anxiety was rated on a scale from 0 (not at all anxious) to 10 (very anxious). Statistics are reported for the comparison between S-carriers and LL homozygotes.

| | S/S | S/L | L/L | S-carriers vs LL |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| State anxiety Threat – cue | 5.8 (2.5) | 5.2 (2.3) | 4.8 (2.7) | $F_{(1,78)} < 1$ |
| State anxiety Threat – offset | 4.1 (2.1) | 2.7 (1.9) | 3.1 (2.4) | $F_{(1,78)} < 1$ |
| State anxiety Safe – cue | 1.4 (1.2) | 1.0 (0.8) | 1.0 (1.1) | $F_{(1,78)} < 1$ |
| State anxiety Safe – offset | 2.6 (2.1) | 2.3 (1.8) | 1.7 (1.7) | $F_{(1,78)} = 1.6, p = .21$ |

stronger FPS averaged across probe latencies than L/L subjects (5-HTTLPR \times Condition: $F_{(1,79)} = 4.0, p = .048; \eta^2 = .05$). Further exploration revealed that S-carriers showed stronger FPS for cue probes (5-HTTLPR \times Condition – cue probes only: $F_{(1,79)} = 4.24, p = .043; \eta^2 = .05$) but not for the probe latencies following cue offset (F 's < 1). After threat cue presentation, S-carriers were equally efficient in reducing fear as L/L subjects (Fig. 2, lower panel) which was also apparent from the non-significant 5-HTTLPR \times Condition \times Probe Latency interaction ($F_{(2,158)} = 1.3, p = .28; \eta^2 = .03$).

For completeness raw data for each condition and probe latency are reported in Fig. 3.

Finally, as a data quality check supplementary analyses were undertaken to confirm that FPS during the cue, where differences between genotypes occurred, provided a valid and reliable measure of individuals level of fear expression. Stronger FPS during cues correlated with greater increases in state anxiety during the threat condition (Spearman's $\rho = .39, p < .001$; Fig. 4, top panel), indicating that basic defensive fear responses and subjective state anxiety were interlinked. Further, FPS during the first and second halves of the experiment showed a strong positive association (Spearman's $\rho = .58, p < .001$ for cue probes; see Fig. 4, bottom panel). This confirmed that average FPS to the cues provided a reliable measure of subjects' tendency to express fear.




Fig. 2. Mean startle amplitudes as a function of probe latency. The top panel depicts startle data averaged across all genotypes as a function of condition and probe latency. The bottom panel depicts fear-potentiated startle (Threat startle amplitude – Safe startle amplitude) for each 5-HTTLPR genotype as a function of probe latency, revealing stronger FPS in S-carriers during cue probes. Error bars represent standard error of the mean *** $p < .001, *p < .05, #p < .1$.




Fig. 3. Mean raw startle EMG data in microvolt (μV) for the 5-HTTLPR groups as a function of probe latency and condition. SS and SL genotypes are combined into S-carriers for illustrative purposes. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

4. Discussion

Our study tested the hypothesis that naturally occurring genetic variation in SERT function modulates human fear reactions. We elicited robust fear responses, measured by fear-potentiated startle (FPS), in a group of healthy subjects genotyped for the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism. Our data indicated that 5-HTTLPR short allele carriers show stronger physiological fear responses under threat




Fig. 4. scatter plots visualizing (top panel) the correlation across subjects between FPS and anxiety ratings during the cue and (bottom panel) FPS for the first 50% and last 50% of cue probes.

compared to subjects carrying two long alleles. However, subjects of all genotypes were equally efficient in the down regulation of their defensive state following threat termination.

Together with previous work (Lonsdorf et al., 2009b), these results illustrate how the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism is associated with changes in basic defensive responding as indexed by potentiation of the startle reflex (Bradley et al., 2005; Grillon and Baas, 2003; Hamm and Vaitl, 1996). As the amygdala plays an important role in startle potentiation (Anders et al., 2004; see Davis, 2006 for review), our results fit nicely with the evidence for 5-HTTLPR mediated amygdala hyperactivity (Dannlowski et al., 2010; Munafò et al., 2008). These changes in basic defensive reactivity may contribute to increases in (pathological) anxiety observed in S-carriers (e.g. see Lonsdorf et al., 2009a; Schinka et al., 2004). While 5-HTTLPR genotypes did not differ significantly in retrospectively rated state anxiety in our study, reports of higher subjective fear were associated with greater FPS. In line with previous work, we also demonstrated that our measurement of FPS was reliable (Klumpers et al., 2010b) which is an important prerequisite for assessing trait-like individual differences (Larson et al., 2000).

Previous studies suggested that 5-HTTLPR genotype may gate fear learning as S-carriers show enhanced responding in fear conditioning paradigms (Crisan et al., 2009; Garpenstrand et al., 2001; Lonsdorf et al., 2009b). Here, we demonstrate that also when subjects are explicitly made aware beforehand which cue signals danger, S-carriers respond more strongly to threat cues. Our results therefore suggest that the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism more generally affects fear reactivity, and not specifically the acquisition of fear responses through classical conditioning. This is also consistent with the observation of enhanced amygdala responding to intrinsically affective fear stimuli, such as fearful and angry faces, in S-carriers (see Domschke and Dannlowski, 2010; Munafò et al., 2008, for an overview).

It is noteworthy that several previous studies found no difference between 5-HTTLPR genotypes in potentiation of startle (Armbruster et al., 2009; Brocke et al., 2006; Larson et al., 2010; Pauli et al., 2010). In all these studies startle potentiation was induced through aversive picture presentation. Comparing the affective picture paradigm directly with a shock threat paradigm similar to ours, Lissek et al. (2007) reported that the physical threat of electric shock provoked considerably higher anxiety states than presentation of aversive pictures. In line with this, several studies that assessed 5-HTTLPR effects (Armbruster et al., 2009; Brocke et al., 2006) did not find significant startle potentiation across all subjects. Perhaps also relevant is that while acute treatment with the SSRI citalopram exacerbates fear potentiated startle in the instructed fear paradigm in humans (Grillon et al., 2007) there is no effect on picture-induced emotion modulated startle responses (Browning et al., 2007). Therefore it is possible that SERT mediated effects on FPS come into play most clearly in the context of direct and relatively strong threats. Similarly, in a recent study genotype effects on amygdala responses emerged only under a heightened stress state (Cousijn et al., 2010) illustrating that genetic effects on defensive systems may arise most clearly when sufficient levels of anxiety are reached.

In line with previous work (Klumpers et al., 2010a), we again observed that healthy subjects regulated their defensive state quickly, but without significant differences between genotypes. Our data thus suggest that 5-HTTLPR genotype affects the generation of the fear response, but not its subsequent downregulation following threat offset. The 5-HTTLPR polymorphism also does not affect the amount of fear extinction (Lonsdorf et al., 2009b) or the recovery from defensive states induced by aversive pictures (Larson et al., 2010). Moreover, in a recent neuroimaging study S-carriers were able to down regulate their excessive amygdala reactivity to fear pictures through volitional reappraisal (Schardt

et al., 2010). These findings match our results and suggest that 5-HTTLPR genotype primarily influences fear reactivity and not the basic capacity to reduce fear after danger subsides. Importantly however, both in the current study and in previously mentioned work (Lonsdorf et al., 2009b; Schardt et al., 2010) primarily healthy volunteers were tested. Across healthy populations S-carriers may be able to overcome their innate tendency to react more strongly to threats when required, perhaps by recruiting additional prefrontal resources (Schardt et al., 2010). However a different picture may emerge in those suffering from excessive anxiety or those exposed to severe stress (Caspi et al., 2010; Karg et al., 2011).

In conclusion, we report evidence that innate variability in SERT function modulates basic defensive reactivity indexed by FPS but does not affect the basic capacity for fear downregulation. These results yield further insight in the relation between genetically determined variability in serotonin transporter function and individual differences in anxiety.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Sophie Akkermans & Veerle van Son for invaluable assistance in data collection and Erik Hendriksen for technical support.

References

- Anders, S., Lotze, M., Erb, M., Grodd, W., Birbaumer, N., 2004. Brain activity underlying emotional valence and arousal: a response-related fMRI study. *Human Brain Mapping* 23, 200–209.
- Armbruster, D., Moser, D.A., Strobel, A., Hensch, T., Kirschbaum, C., Lesch, K.P., Brocke, B., 2009. Serotonin transporter gene variation and stressful life events impact processing of fear and anxiety. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology* 12, 393–401.
- Baldwin, D.S., Anderson, I.M., Nutt, D.J., Bandelow, B., Bond, A., Davidson, J.R., den Boer, J.A., Fineberg, N.A., Knapp, M., Scott, J., Wittchen, H.U., 2005. Evidence-based guidelines for the pharmacological treatment of anxiety disorders: recommendations from the British Association for Psychopharmacology. *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 19, 567–596.
- Bandelow, B., Zohar, J., Hollander, E., Kasper, S., Moller, H.J., 2002. World Federation of Societies of Biological Psychiatry (WFSBP) guidelines for the pharmacological treatment of anxiety, obsessive-compulsive and posttraumatic stress disorders. *World Journal of Biological Psychiatry* 3, 171–199.
- Blumenthal, T.D., Cuthbert, B.N., Filion, D.L., Hackley, S., Lipp, O.V., van Boxtel, A., 2005. Committee report: guidelines for human startle eyeblink electromyographic studies. *Psychophysiology* 42, 1–15.
- Bocker, K.B., Baas, J.M., Kenemans, J.L., Verbaten, M.N., 2004. Differences in startle modulation during instructed threat and selective attention. *Biological Psychology* 67, 343–358.
- Bradley, M.M., Moulder, B., Lang, P.J., 2005. When good things go bad: the reflex physiology of defense. *Psychological Sciences* 16, 468–473.
- Brocke, B., Armbruster, D., Muller, J., Hensch, T., Jacob, C.P., Lesch, K.P., Kirschbaum, C., Strobel, A., 2006. Serotonin transporter gene variation impacts innate fear processing: acoustic startle response and emotional startle. *Molecular Psychiatry* 11, 1106–1112.
- Browning, M., Reid, C., Cowen, P.J., Goodwin, G.M., Harmer, C.J., 2007. A single dose of citalopram increases fear recognition in healthy subjects. *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 21, 684–690.
- Canli, T., 2008. Toward a neurogenetic theory of neuroticism. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1129, 153–174.
- Caspi, A., Hariri, A.R., Holmes, A., Uher, R., Moffitt, T.E., 2010. Genetic sensitivity to the environment: the case of the serotonin transporter gene and its implications for studying complex diseases and traits. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 167, 509–527.
- Cousijn, H., Rijpkema, M., Qin, S., van Marle, H.J., Franke, B., Hermans, E.J., van Wingen, G., Fernandez, G., 2010. Acute stress modulates genotype effects on amygdala processing in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 107, 9867–9872.
- Crisan, L.G., Pana, S., Vultur, R., Heilman, R.M., Szekeley, R., Druga, B., Dragos, N., Miu, A.C., 2009. Genetic contributions of the serotonin transporter to social learning of fear and economic decision making. *Social Cognition and Affective Neuroscience* 4, 399–408.
- Dannlowski, U., Konrad, C., Kugel, H., Zwitserlood, P., Domschke, K., Schoning, S., Ohrmann, P., Bauer, J., Pyka, M., Hohoff, C., Zhang, W., Baune, B.T., Heindel, W.,

- Arolt, V., Suslow, T., 2010. Emotion specific modulation of automatic amygdala responses by 5-HTTLPR genotype. *Neuroimage* 53, 893–898.
- Davis, M., 2006. Neural systems involved in fear and anxiety measured with fear-potentiated startle. *American Psychologist* 61, 741–756.
- Defares, P.B., Ploeg, H.M.v.d., Spielberger, C.D., 1980. Een nederlandstalige bewerking van de Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory: de Zelf-Beoordelings Vragenlijst.
- Domschke, K., Dannowski, U., 2010. Imaging genetics of anxiety disorders. *Neuroimage* 53, 822–831.
- Garpenstrand, H., Annas, P., Ekblom, J., Orelund, L., Fredrikson, M., 2001. Human fear conditioning is related to dopaminergic and serotonergic biological markers. *Behavioral Neuroscience* 115, 358–364.
- Grillon, C., Ameli, R., Merikangas, K., Woods, S.W., Davis, M., 1993. Measuring the time course of anticipatory anxiety using the fear-potentiated startle reflex. *Psychophysiology* 30, 340–346.
- Grillon, C., Ameli, R., Woods, S.W., Merikangas, K., Davis, M., 1991. Fear-potentiated startle in humans: effects of anticipatory anxiety on the acoustic blink reflex. *Psychophysiology* 28, 588–595.
- Grillon, C., Baas, J., 2003. A review of the modulation of the startle reflex by affective states and its application in psychiatry. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 114, 1557–1579.
- Grillon, C., Baas, J.M., 2002. Comments on the use of the startle reflex in psychopharmacological challenges: impact of baseline startle on measurement of fear-potentiated startle. *Psychopharmacology* 164, 236–238.
- Grillon, C., Levenson, J., Pine, D.S., 2007. A single dose of the selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor citalopram exacerbates anxiety in humans: a fear-potentiated startle study. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 32, 225–231.
- Hamm, A.O., Vaitl, D., 1996. Affective learning: awareness and aversion. *Psychophysiology* 33, 698–710.
- Hamm, A.O., Weike, A.I., 2005. The neuropsychology of fear learning and fear regulation. *International Journal of Psychophysiology* 57, 5–14.
- Hariri, A.R., Mattay, V.S., Tessitore, A., Kolachana, B., Fera, F., Goldman, D., Egan, M.F., Weinberger, D.R., 2002. Serotonin transporter genetic variation and the response of the human amygdala. *Science* 297, 400–403.
- Hartley, C.A., Phelps, E.A., 2010. Changing fear: the neurocircuitry of emotion regulation. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 35, 136–146.
- Heils, A., Teufel, A., Petri, S., Stober, G., Riederer, P., Bengel, D., Lesch, K.P., 1996. Allelic variation of human serotonin transporter gene expression. *Journal of Neurochemistry* 66, 2621–2624.
- Heinz, A., Braus, D.F., Smolka, M.N., Wrase, J., Puls, I., Hermann, D., Klein, S., Grusser, S.M., Flor, H., Schumann, G., Mann, K., Buchel, C., 2005. Amygdala-prefrontal coupling depends on a genetic variation of the serotonin transporter. *Nature Neuroscience* 8, 20–21.
- Karg, K., Burmeister, M., Shedden, K., Sen, S., 2011. The serotonin transporter promoter variant (5-HTTLPR), stress, and depression meta-analysis revisited: evidence of genetic moderation. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 68, 444–454.
- Klumpers, F., Raemaekers, M.A., Ruigrok, A.N., Hermans, E.J., Kenemans, J.L., Baas, J.M., 2010a. Prefrontal mechanisms of fear reduction after threat offset. *Biological Psychiatry* 68, 1031–1038.
- Klumpers, F., van Gerven, J.M., Prinssen, E.P., Niklson, I., Roesch, F., Riedel, W.J., Kenemans, J.L., Baas, J.M., 2010b. Method development studies for repeatedly measuring anxiolytic drug effects in healthy humans. *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 24, 657–666.
- Larson, C.L., Ruffalo, D., Nietert, J.Y., Davidson, R.J., 2000. Temporal stability of the emotion-modulated startle response. *Psychophysiology* 37, 92–101.
- Larson, C.L., Taubitz, L.E., Robinson, J.S., 2010. MAOA T941G polymorphism and the time course of emotional recovery following unpleasant pictures. *Psychophysiology* 47, 857–862.
- Lesch, K.P., Bengel, D., Heils, A., Sabol, S.Z., Greenberg, B.D., Petri, S., Benjamin, J., Muller, C.R., Hamer, D.H., Murphy, D.L., 1996. Association of anxiety-related traits with a polymorphism in the serotonin transporter gene regulatory region. *Science* 274, 1527–1531.
- Lissek, S., Orme, K., McDowell, D.J., Johnson, L.L., Luckenbaugh, D.A., Baas, J.M., Cornwell, B.R., Grillon, C., 2007. Emotion regulation and potentiated startle across affective picture and threat-of-shock paradigms. *Biological Psychology* 76, 124–133.
- Lonsdorf, T.B., Ruck, C., Bergstrom, J., Andersson, G., Ohman, A., Schalling, M., Lindfors, N., 2009a. The symptomatic profile of panic disorder is shaped by the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* 33, 1479–1483.
- Lonsdorf, T.B., Weike, A.I., Nikamo, P., Schalling, M., Hamm, A.O., Ohman, A., 2009b. Genetic gating of human fear learning and extinction: possible implications for gene–environment interaction in anxiety disorder. *Psychological Sciences* 20, 198–206.
- Munafò, M.R., Brown, S.M., Hariri, A.R., 2008. Serotonin transporter (5-HTTLPR) genotype and amygdala activation: a meta-analysis. *Biological Psychiatry* 63, 852–857.
- Munafò, M.R., Freimer, N.B., Ng, W., Ophoff, R., Veijola, J., Miettinen, J., Jarvelin, M.R., Taanila, A., Flint, J., 2009. 5-HTTLPR genotype and anxiety-related personality traits: a meta-analysis and new data. *American Journal of Medical Genetics B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics* 150B, 271–281.
- Pacheco, J., Beavers, C.G., Benavides, C., McGeary, J., Stice, E., Schnyer, D.M., 2009. Frontal-limbic white matter pathway associations with the serotonin transporter gene promoter region (5-HTTLPR) polymorphism. *Journal of Neuroscience* 29, 6229–6233.
- Pauli, P., Conzelmann, A., Mucha, R.F., Weyers, P., Baehne, C.G., Fallgatter, A.J., Jacob, C.P., Lesch, K.P., 2010. Affect-modulated startle reflex and dopamine D4 receptor gene variation. *Psychophysiology* 47, 25–33.
- Pezawas, L., Meyer-Lindenberg, A., Drabant, E.M., Verchinski, B.A., Munoz, K.E., Kolachana, B.S., Egan, M.F., Mattay, V.S., Hariri, A.R., Weinberger, D.R., 2005. 5-HTTLPR polymorphism impacts human cingulate–amygdala interactions: a genetic susceptibility mechanism for depression. *Nature Neuroscience* 8, 828–834.
- Quirk, G.J., Beer, J.S., 2006. Prefrontal involvement in the regulation of emotion: convergence of rat and human studies. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 16, 723–727.
- Schardt, D.M., Erk, S., Nusser, C., Nothen, M.M., Cichon, S., Rietschel, M., Treutlein, J., Goschke, T., Walter, H., 2010. Volition diminishes genetically mediated amygdala hyperreactivity. *Neuroimage* 53, 943–951.
- Schinka, J.A., Busch, R.M., Robichaux-Keene, N., 2004. A meta-analysis of the association between the serotonin transporter gene polymorphism (5-HTTLPR) and trait anxiety. *Molecular Psychiatry* 9, 197–202.
- Sen, S., Burmeister, M., Ghosh, D., 2004. Meta-analysis of the association between a serotonin transporter promoter polymorphism (5-HTTLPR) and anxiety-related personality traits. *American Journal of Medical Genetics B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics* 127B, 85–89.
- Tottenham, N., Tanaka, J.W., Leon, A.C., McCarry, T., Nurse, M., Hare, T.A., Marcus, D.J., Westerlund, A., Casey, B.J., Nelson, C., 2009. The NimStim set of facial expressions: judgments from untrained research participants. *Psychiatry Research* 168, 242–249.
- Wankerl, M., Wust, S., Otte, C., 2010. Current developments and controversies: does the serotonin transporter gene-linked polymorphic region (5-HTTLPR) modulate the association between stress and depression? *Current Opinion in Psychiatry* 23, 582–587.