Supplementary Appendix for

Causes of variation in epigenetic aging across the lifespan

Table of Contents

Study sample
Data pre-processing7
Epigenetic age acceleration calculation7
Modelling the familial correlations across the lifespan as a function of cohabitation status
Modelling the causes of variation across the lifespan
Figure S1 Correlation between chronological age and DNAm age within each study10
Figure S2 Variance in age-adjusted DNAm age by chronological age11
Table S1 Within-study familial correlation estimates in DNAm age additionally adjusting for blood cell
composition
Table S2 Results from modelling the familial correlations in DNAm age across the lifespan as a function
of cohabitation history
Table S3 Results from modelling the causes of variation in DNAm age across the lifespan15
References

Study sample

1. Peri/postnatal Epigenetic Twins Study (PETS)

The PETS is an Australian twin birth cohort study of the plasticity of epigenetic marks during the intrauterine period and early childhood¹. A total of 250 newborn twin pairs were recruited between 2007 and 2009, and data on maternal factors during pregnancy, infant anthropometric measurements, and biological specimens from different cell lineages were collected at several time points. The study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committees of the Royal Women's Hospital, Mercy Hospital for Women, and Monash Medical Centre, Melbourne. The PETS included three datasets measured using the HumanMethylation27 array (27K), the HumanMethylation450 array (450K), and the HumanMethylationEPIC array (EPIC).

The 27K dataset was accessed from the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) with the accession number GSE36642 for 22 newborn monozygotic twin (MZ) pairs and 11 dizygotic twin (DZ) pairs. DNA was extracted from cord blood mononuclear cells (18 MZ, 9 DZ pairs), human umbilical vascular endothelial cells (14 MZ, 10 DZ pairs) and placenta (8 MZ, 7 DZ pairs). Data were background corrected, normalized and minimized for batch effects using *lumi* package; see Gordon *et al.* for more details².

The 450K dataset was accessed from the GEO with the accession number GSE42700. This dataset included longitudinal measures for 10 MZ pairs and 5 DZ pairs: DNA was extracted from buccal cells collected at birth and age 18 months, respectively. Data were background corrected, pre-processed using the Illumina method within the Bioconductor *minfi* package³ and normalized using the subset-quantile within-array normalization (SWAN) method⁴; see Martino *et al.* for more details⁵.

The EPIC dataset included 23 newborn MZ pairs and 22 DZ pairs. DNA was extracted from cord blood. Data were background corrected, pre-processed using the *minfi* package³ and normalized using the quantile normalization method.

2. Brisbane Systems Genetic Study (BSGS)

The BSGS is an Australian twin family study of pigmented nevi and cognition comprising adolescent twins, their siblings and parents⁶. This analysis included 614 participants of European descent. The study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Queensland Institute for Medical Research.

The DNA methylation dataset was accessed from the GEO with the accession number GSE56105. DNA was extracted from peripheral blood and methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip. Individual probes were normalized across all samples using a generalized linear model with a logistic link function; see McRae *et al.* for more details⁷.

3. E-Risk Longitudinal Twin Study (E-Risk)

The E-Risk tracks the development of a 1994–1995 birth cohort of 2,232 British children. It comprises 56% MZ and 44% DZ pairs. This analysis included 426 MZ pairs and 306 DZ pairs aged 18 years. The study was approved by the NRES Committee London — Camberwell St Giles Ethics Committee, and the Joint South London and Maudsley and the Institute of Psychiatry Research Ethics Committee approved each phase of the E-Risk study.

The DNA methylation dataset was accessed from the GEO with the accession number GSE105018. DNA was extracted from blood samples and methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip. Data were normalized with the *dasen* function from the *wateRmelon* package; see Hannon *et al.* for more details⁸.

4. Danish Twin Registry (DTR)

MZ pairs discordant for birth weight were sampled based on information from the Danish Twin Registry. This analysis included 150 MZ pairs in two age groups, younger adults (mean age 33 years) and older adults (mean age 63 years). The study was approved by The Regional Scientific Ethical Committees for Southern Denmark.

The DNA methylation dataset was accessed from the GEO with the accession number GSE61496. DNA was extracted from blood samples and methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip. Data were normalized using the SWAN method⁴ within the *minfi* package³; see Tan *et al.* for more details⁹.

5. Australian Mammographic Density Twins and Sisters Study (AMDTSS)

The AMDTSS is an Australian twin family study principally of mammographic density¹⁰. Participants completed questionnaire surveys through telephone-administered interviews and donated blood samples. This analysis included 479 middle-aged women selected for DNA methylation research. The study was approved by the Australian Twin Registry and the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Melbourne.

The DNA methylation dataset was available on the GEO under the accession number of GSE100227. DNA was extracted from dried blood spots stored on Guthrie cards and DNA methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip. Data was processed by Bioconductor *minfi* package³, which included normalization of data using Illumina's reference factor-based normalization methods (*preprocessIllumina*) and the SWAN method⁴ for type I and II probe bias correction. An empirical Bayes batch-effects removal method *ComBat*¹¹ was applied to minimize the technical variation across batches. See Li *et al.* for more details¹².

6. TwinsUK cohort

The TwinsUK cohort comprises unselected volunteers ascertained from the general population. Means and ranges of quantitative phenotypes in Twins UK were similar to age-matched samples from the general

population in the UK. This analysis included 33 middle-aged female MZ pairs and 43 middle-aged female DZ pairs.

The DNA methylation dataset was accessed from the GEO under the accession number GSE58045. DNA was extracted from blood samples and methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation27 BeadChip; see Bell *et al.* for more details ¹³.

7. Multiple Tissue Human Expression Resource (MuTHER) Study

The MuTHER is a study of middle-aged females, including 386 twin pairs and 84 singletons of European descent recruited through the TwinsUK Adult Twin Registry¹⁴. This analysis included 246 twin pairs. The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of St. Thomas' Hospital, London. All participants provided written informed consent.

The DNA methylation dataset was accessed from the ArrayExpress with the accession number E-MTAB-1866. DNA was extracted from adipose tissue samples and methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip. Data were quantile normalized; see Grundberg *et al.* for more details¹⁴.

8. Older Australian Twins Study (OATS)

The OATS is an Australian longitudinal, multi-center study of twins aged 65 years and older that commenced in 2007 investigating healthy brain aging¹⁵. This analysis included 108 MZ pairs. The study was approved by the Australian Twin Registry and the ethics committees of the University of New South Wales, University of Melbourne, Queensland Institute of Medical Research and the South Eastern Sydney and Illawarra Area Health Service. All participants provided written informed consent.

DNA was extracted from blood samples and methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip. Raw intensity data were background corrected and methylation beta-values were generated using the R *minfi* package³. The SWAN method⁴ was performed for type I and II

probe bias correction. Probes not detected in all samples were removed, as were probes containing SNPs and probes on the sex chromosomes.

9. Longitudinal Study of Aging Danish Twins (LSDAT)

The LSDAT collected same-sex twin pairs born in Denmark for longitudinal assessment for aging-related phenotypes. This analysis included 43 elderly twin pairs.

The DNA methylation dataset was assessed from the GEO under the accession number GSE73115. The dataset included longitudinal measurements: DNA was extracted from blood samples collected at years 1997 and 2007, respectively. Methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip. Data were normalized using the SWAN method⁴ within the *minfi* package³; see Tan *et al.* for more details¹⁶.

10. Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study (MCCS)

The MCCS is an Australian prospective cohort study of 41,514 healthy adult volunteers (24,469 women, 17,045 men) aged between 27 and 76 years (99.3% aged 40–69 years) recruited between 1990 and 1994¹⁷. Peripheral blood samples were obtained from participants at baseline and 5,629 participants from six nested cancer case-control studies were measured for DNA methylation. This analysis included 62 spouse pairs from controls. The study was approved by the Cancer Council Victoria's Human Research Ethics Committee and performed in accordance with the institution's ethical guidelines. All participants provided written informed consent.

Samples in each case-control sub-study were processed separately during non-overlapping periods of time over a two-year period in the same laboratory with the same protocol. DNA was extracted from peripheral blood samples collected at baseline, prior to any diagnosis of cancer. Methylation was measured using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip. The same data pre-processing procedure was applied to each case-control sub-study, respectively. Raw intensity data was processed by Bioconductor *minfi* package³,

which included normalization of data using Illumina's reference factor-based normalization methods (*preprocessIllumina*) and the SWAN method⁴ for type I and II probe bias correction. *ComBat*¹¹ was applied to the data from all samples across sub-studies to minimize the influence of chip effects; see Severi *et al.*¹⁸ and Wong *et al.*¹⁹ for more details.

Data pre-processing

As several datasets on public repositories contained quality controlled and pre-processed data only, we were unable to apply the same pre-processing methods across datasets. We used the study-specific data preprocessing methods; thus each study could address dataset-specific technical variations. This design allows us to investigate true biological signals independent of any bias introduced from a unifying data preprocessing approach.

Epigenetic age acceleration calculation

To adjust for the effects of chronological age on DNAm age, we studied epigenetic age acceleration, calculated as the residuals from a linear regression of DNAm age on chronological age. This calculation was done for each longitudinal measurement of the PETS 450K dataset and of the LSDAT, for each generation of the BSGS, and for each age group of the DTR. For the PETS 27K dataset, DNAm age was standardized to have zero mean and unit variance for each type of biological sample, and the average standardized DNAm age across biological samples was used to calculate epigenetic age acceleration.

Sensitivity analyses were performed using only those studies in which DNA methylation was measured in blood. Naive CD8+ T cells, exhausted CD8+ T cells, plasmablasts, CD4+ T cells, natural killer cells, monocytes, and granulocytes estimated from the DNA methylation data^{12,16} were additionally adjusted for in calculating epigenetic age acceleration.

Modelling the familial correlations across the lifespan as a function of cohabitation status

The modelling was performed using the pooled data across all studies. Study-specific variance in the residuals were used in analysis. For individuals *i* and *j* from the same family, their correlation was modelled as

$$\rho_{ij} = \begin{cases} \theta - e^{-\lambda t} & \text{if } t \le t_0 \\ (\theta - e^{-\lambda t_0}) e^{-\nu(t-t_0)}, & \text{if } t > t_0 \end{cases}$$

where $0 \le \theta \le 2$, and λ , $\nu \ge 0$.

Under this model, the correlation when the pairs start to live together is θ minus 1, and λ and ν reflect the increasing and decreasing rates at which the familial correlation increases with length of cohabitation and decreases with length of separation, respectively. The definitions of *t* and *t*₀ depend on the relationship between *i* and *j*: 1) for twin pairs, *t* = chronological age and *t*₀ = 18 years; 2) for sibling pairs, *t* = chronological age of the younger sibling and *t*₀ = chronological age of the younger sibling when the older sibling was 18 years old; 3) for parent-offspring pairs, *t* = chronological age of the offspring and *t*₀ = 18 years; and 4) for spouse pairs, *t* = time in years since the pair married (assumed to be the average chronological age of the pair minus 24 years) and *t*₀ = time in years when the pair became separated (if known).

Modelling the causes of variation across the lifespan

For individuals *i* and *j* from the same family, there covariance was modelled as

$$COV_{ij} = \begin{cases} \alpha \sigma_A^2 + \beta_A (1 - e^{-\lambda_A t}) + \beta_C (1 - e^{-\lambda_C t}) & \text{if } t \le t_0 \\ \alpha \sigma_A^2 + \beta_A (1 - e^{-\lambda_A t}) e^{-\nu_A (t - t_0)} + \beta_C (1 - e^{-\lambda_C t}) e^{-\nu_C (t - t_0)}, & \text{if } t > t_0 \end{cases}$$

where α , β_A , β_C , λ_A , λ_C , ν_A , $\nu_C \ge 0$, and the definitions of *t* and t_0 are the same as above.

We assumed that variation can be caused by combinations of additive genetic factors (A), shared environmental factors (C), and individual-specific environmental factors (E). We fitted the following models under different assumptions:

- 1. AE model: variation is caused by only A and E; the effects of A are constant across the lifespan; $\alpha = 2$ × kinship coefficient, β_A , β_C , λ_A , λ_C , ν_A , $\nu_C = 0$, and σ_A^2 are free to be estimated.
- 2. Cohabitation-dependent AE model: variation is caused only by A and E; the effects of A depend on cohabitation; α , σ_A^2 , β_C , λ_C , $\nu_C = 0$, $\beta_A = 2 \times$ the kinship coefficient, λ_A , $\nu_A = 0$ for spouse pairs, and the same and free to be estimated for the other pairs.
- 3. Cohabitation-dependent ACE model: variation is caused by A, C and E; the effects of A and C both depend on cohabitation; α, σ_A² = 0, β_A = 2 × kinship coefficient, λ_A, v_A = 0 for spouse pairs, but is the same and free to be estimated for the other pairs, β_C = 1 for all pairs, λ_C and v_C are the same for MZ, DZ, sibling and parent-offspring pairs and free to be estimated.
- 4. Cohabitation-dependent CE model: variation is caused by only C and E; the effects of C depend on cohabitation; α , σ_A^2 , β_A , λ_A , $\nu_A = 0$, $\beta_C = 1$ for DZ, sibling pairs and spouse pairs, and free to be estimated for the other pairs, λ_C and ν_C are the same for MZ, DZ, sibling and parent-offspring pairs and free to be estimated.

Under the above cohabitation-dependent CE model, we further allowed for the role of additive genetic factors whose effects were assumed to be constant across the lifespan. This was made possible by letting $\alpha = 2 \times \text{kinship coefficient and } \sigma_A^2 \neq 0$. σ_A^2 was estimated.



Figure S1 Correlation between chronological age and DNAm age within each study



Figure S2 Variance in age-adjusted DNAm age by chronological age

Study*	Type of pairs	Number of pairs	Correlation (95% CI)	Р	P for MZ vs DZ
PETS EPIC	MZ	23	0.22 (-0.14 to 0.53)	0.23	0.39
	DZ	22	-0.04 (-0.46 to 0.10)	0.87	
	MZ and DZ	45	0.11 (-0.14 to 0.38)	0.44	
BSGS	MZ	67	0.68 (0.61 to 0.73)	< 0.001	<0.001
	DZ	111	0.31 (0.15 to 0.45)	<0.001	
	Siblings	260	0.29 (0.17 to 0.40)	<0.001	
	Parent-offspring	363	0.12 (0.00 to 0.25)	0.06	
	Spouses	59	-0.06 (-0.29 to 0.18)	0.63	
E-Risk	MZ	426	0.45 (0.39 to 0.51)	<0.001	0.23
	DZ	306	0.38 (0.30 to 0.45)	<0.001	
	MZ and DZ	732	0.42 (0.37 to 0.47)	<0.001	
DTR younger adults	MZ	73	0.54 (0.42 to 0.65)	<0.001	_
AMDTSS	MZ	66	0.43 (0.26 to 0.58)	<0.001	0.05
	DZ	66	0.12 (-0.10 to 0.34)	0.28	
	MZ and DZ	132	0.26 (0.10 to 0.40)	0.002	
	Siblings	552	0.09 (0.00 to 0.18)	0.06	
DTR older adults	MZ	77	0.40 (0.23 to 0.54)	<0.001	_

Table S1 Within-study familial correlation estimates in DNAm age additionally adjusting for blood cell composition

OATS	MZ	108	0.36 (0.21 to 0.49)	<0.001	_
LSADT 1997	MZ	18	0.00 (-0.55 to 0.55)	1.00	0.36
	DZ	25	0.31 (0.01 to 0.56)	0.05	
	MZ and DZ	43	0.24 (-0.04 to 0.48)	0.10	
LSADT 2007	MZ	18	0.38 (-0.01 to 0.67)	0.07	0.72
	DZ	25	0.28 (-0.05 to 0.55)	0.10	
	MZ and DZ	43	0.32 (0.06 to 0.54)	0.02	
MCCS	Spouses	62	0.10 (-0.14 to 0.33)	0.42	_

Abbreviations – MZ: monozygotic twin; DZ: dizygotic twin; CI: confidence interval

*Studies – PETS: Peri/postnatal Epigenetic Twins Study EPIC array dataset; BSGS: Brisbane System Genetics Study; E-Risk: Environmental Risk Longitudinal Twin Study; DTR: Danish Twin Registry, in two groups: younger and older adults; AMDTSS: Australian Mammographic Density Twins and Sisters Study; OATS: Older Australian Twins Study; LSDAT: Longitudinal Study of Aging Danish Twins, with samples collected at years 1997 and 2007, respectively; MCCS: Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study

Pairs	Parameter	All parameters freely estimated		All θ=1		DZ=Sibling, v is the same for all pairs	
i uno		Estimate (SE)	Р	Estimate (SE)	Р	Estimate (SE)	Р
MZ	θ	1.20 (0.13)	0.11*	1		1	
	λ	0.021 (0.011)	0.05	0.040 (0.003)	< 0.001	0.041 (0.003)	< 0.001
	ν	0.003 (0.002)	0.11	0.003 (0.002)	0.10	0.004 (0.002)	0.02
DZ	θ	1.03 (0.15)	0.87*	1		1	
	λ	0.026 (0.014)	0.07	0.028 (0.004)	< 0.001	0.026 (0.003)	< 0.001
	ν	0.004 (0.004)	0.28	0.004 (0.004)	0.28	0.004 (0.002)	0.02
Sibling	θ	1.09 (0.34)	0.80*	1		1	
	λ	0.018 (0.032)	0.58	0.026 (0.006)	< 0.001	0.026 (0.003)	< 0.001
	ν	0.019 (0.011)	0.08	0.018 (0.010)	0.08	0.004 (0.002)	0.02
Parent-offspring	θ	0.69 (0.54)	0.56*	1		1	
	λ	0.043 (0.069)	0.54	0.012 (0.005)	0.02	0.011 (0.005)	0.02
Spouse	θ	0.76 (0.44)	0.58*	1		1	
	λ	0.012 (0.022)	0.58	0.003 (0.003)	0.44	0.003 (0.003)	0.44
Log-likelihood		-1907.195		-1908.715		-1911.432	

Table S2 Results from modelling the familial correlations in DNAm age across the lifespan as a function of cohabitation history

Abbreviations - MZ: monozygotic twin; DZ: dizygotic twin; SE: standard error

*P-value from comparing the estimate with 1

Parameter	Pairs	AE model	Cohabitation-dependent	Cohabitation-dependent	Cohabitation-dependent
			AE model	ACE model	CE model
α	MZ	1	0	0	0
	DZ and sibling	0.5	0	0	0
	Parent-offspring	0.5	0	0	0
	Spouse	0	0	0	0
$\sigma_{A}{}^{2}$ (SE)	All pairs	0.52 (0.02)	0	0	0
β _A	MZ	0	1	1	0
	DZ and sibling	0	0.5	0.5	0
	Parent-offspring	0	0.5	0.5	0
	Spouse	0	0	0	0
λ_A (SE)	MZ	0	0.041 (0.003)	0.025 (0.007)	0
	DZ and sibling	0	0.041 (0.003)	0.025 (0.007)	0
	Parent-offspring	0	0.041 (0.003)	0.025 (0.007)	0
	Spouse	0	0	0	0
$v_A(SE)$	All pairs	0	0.003 (0.002)	0.003 (0.006)	0
β_{C} (SE)	MZ	0	0	1	1.41 (0.13)
	DZ and sibling	0	0	1	1

Table S3 Results from modelling the causes of variation in DNAm age across the lifespan

Parent-offspring	0	0	1	0.49 (0.20)
Spouse	0	0	1	1
MZ	0	0	0.009 (0.004)	0.026 (0.003)
DZ and sibling	0	0	0.009 (0.004)	0.026 (0.003)
Parent-offspring	0	0	0.009 (0.004)	0.026 (0.003)
Spouse	0	0	0.006 (0.014)	0.003 (0.003)
All pairs	0	0	0.005 (0.003)	0.004 (0.002)
	-1943.141	-1918.798	-1915.739	-1911.773
	3892.282	3845.596	3845.478	3837.546
	Parent-offspring Spouse MZ DZ and sibling Parent-offspring Spouse All pairs	Parent-offspring0Spouse0MZ0DZ and sibling0Parent-offspring0Spouse0All pairs0-1943.1413892.282	Parent-offspring 0 0 Spouse 0 0 MZ 0 0 DZ and sibling 0 0 Parent-offspring 0 0 Spouse 0 0 Spouse 0 0 All pairs 0 0 3892.282 3845.596	Parent-offspring 0 1 Spouse 0 0 1 MZ 0 0 0.009 (0.004) DZ and sibling 0 0 0.009 (0.004) Parent-offspring 0 0 0.009 (0.004) Spouse 0 0 0.009 (0.004) Spouse 0 0 0.009 (0.004) All pairs 0 0 0.005 (0.003) -1943.141 -1918.798 -1915.739 3892.282 3845.596 3845.478

Abbreviations - MZ: monozygotic twin; DZ: dizygotic twin; SE: standard error; AIC: Akaike Information Criterion

Model details - AE model: variation was assumed to be caused by only additive genetic factors (A) and individual-specific environmental factors (E), and the effects of A are constant across the lifespan; Cohabitation-dependent AE model: variation was assumed to be caused by only A and E, and the effects of A depend on cohabitation; Cohabitation-dependent ACE model: variation was assumed to be caused by A, shared environmental factors (C) and E, and the effects of A and C both depend on cohabitation; Cohabitation; Cohabitation; Cohabitation-dependent CE model: variation is caused by only C and E, and the effects of C depend on cohabitation

References

1. Saffery R, Morley R, Carlin JB, Joo JH, Ollikainen M, Novakovic B, et al. Cohort profile: The peri/post-natal epigenetic twins study. Int J Epidemiol 2012;41:55-61.

2. Gordon L, Joo JE, Powell JE, Ollikainen M, Novakovic B, Li X, et al. Neonatal DNA methylation profile in human twins is specified by a complex interplay between intrauterine environmental and genetic factors, subject to tissue-specific influence. Genome Res 2012;22:1395-406.

3. Aryee MJ, Jaffe AE, Corrada-Bravo H, Ladd-Acosta C, Feinberg AP, Hansen KD, et al. Minfi: a flexible and comprehensive Bioconductor package for the analysis of Infinium DNA methylation microarrays. Bioinformatics 2014;30:1363-9.

4. Maksimovic J, Gordon L, Oshlack A. SWAN: Subset-quantile within array normalization for illumina infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChips. Genome Biol 2012;13:R44.

5. Martino D, Loke YJ, Gordon L, Ollikainen M, Cruickshank MN, Saffery R, et al. Longitudinal, genome-scale analysis of DNA methylation in twins from birth to 18 months of age reveals rapid epigenetic change in early life and pair-specific effects of discordance. Genome Biol 2013;14:R42.

6. Powell JE, Henders AK, McRae AF, Caracella A, Smith S, Wright MJ, et al. The Brisbane Systems Genetics Study: genetical genomics meets complex trait genetics. PLoS ONE 2012;7:e35430.

7. McRae AF, Powell JE, Henders AK, Bowdler L, Hemani G, Shah S, et al. Contribution of genetic variation to transgenerational inheritance of DNA methylation. Genome Biol 2014;15:R73.

8. Hannon E, Knox O, Sugden K, Burrage J, Wong CCY, Belsky DW, et al. Characterizing genetic and environmental influences on variable DNA methylation using monozygotic and dizygotic twins. PLoS Genet 2018;14:e1007544.

9. Tan Q, Frost M, Heijmans BT, von Bornemann Hjelmborg J, Tobi EW, Christensen K, et al. Epigenetic signature of birth weight discordance in adult twins. BMC Genomics 2014;15:1062.

17

10. Odefrey F, Stone J, Gurrin LC, Byrnes GB, Apicella C, Dite GS, et al. Common genetic variants associated with breast cancer and mammographic density measures that predict disease. Cancer Res 2010;70:1449-58.

11. Johnson WE, Li C, Rabinovic A. Adjusting batch effects in microarray expression data using empirical Bayes methods. Biostatistics 2007;8:118-27.

12. Li S, Wong EM, Joo JE, Jung CH, Chung J, Apicella C, et al. Genetic and Environmental Causes of Variation in the Difference Between Biological Age Based on DNA Methylation and Chronological Age for Middle-Aged Women. Twin Res Hum Genet 2015;18:720-6.

13. Bell JT, Tsai PC, Yang TP, Pidsley R, Nisbet J, Glass D, et al. Epigenome-wide scans identify differentially methylated regions for age and age-related phenotypes in a healthy ageing population. PLoS Genet 2012;8:e1002629.

14. Grundberg E, Meduri E, Sandling JK, Hedman AK, Keildson S, Buil A, et al. Global analysis of DNA methylation variation in adipose tissue from twins reveals links to disease-associated variants in distal regulatory elements. Am J Hum Genet 2013;93:876-90.

15. Sachdev PS, Lammel A, Trollor JN, Lee T, Wright MJ, Ames D, et al. A comprehensive neuropsychiatric study of elderly twins: the Older Australian Twins Study. Twin Res Hum Genet 2009;12:573-82.

16. Tan Q, Heijmans BT, Hjelmborg JV, Soerensen M, Christensen K, Christiansen L. Epigenetic drift in the aging genome: a ten-year follow-up in an elderly twin cohort. Int J Epidemiol 2016.

Giles GG, English DR. The Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study. IARC Sci Publ 2002;156:69 70.

18. Severi G, Southey MC, English DR, Jung CH, Lonie A, McLean C, et al. Epigenome-wide methylation in DNA from peripheral blood as a marker of risk for breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2014;148:665-73.

18

19. Wong Doo N, Makalic E, Joo JE, Vajdic CM, Schmidt DF, Wong EM, et al. Global measures of peripheral blood-derived DNA methylation as a risk factor in the development of mature B-cell neoplasms. Epigenomics 2016;8:55-66.