12-16-2019

Genetic Variations in the Dopamine Reward System Influence Exercise Reinforcement and Tolerance for Exercise Intensity

Kyle D. Flack

University of Kentucky, kyle.flack@uky.edu

Christopher Pankey

USDA, Agricultural Research Service

Kelsey Elise Ufholz

USDA Agricultural Research Service

LuAnn Johnson

USDA, Agricultural Research Service

James N. Roemmich

USDA Agricultural Research Service

Follow this and additional works at: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/foodsci_facpub

Part of the [Behavioral Medicine Commons](#), and the [Dietetics and Clinical Nutrition Commons](#)

Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.

Repository Citation

Flack, Kyle D.; Pankey, Christopher; Ufholz, Kelsey Elise; Johnson, LuAnn; and Roemmich, James N., "Genetic Variations in the Dopamine Reward System Influence Exercise Reinforcement and Tolerance for Exercise Intensity" (2019). *Dietetics and Human Nutrition Faculty Publications*. 28.
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/foodsci_facpub/28

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Dietetics and Human Nutrition at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dietetics and Human Nutrition Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

Genetic Variations in the Dopamine Reward System Influence Exercise Reinforcement and Tolerance for Exercise Intensity

Digital Object Identifier (DOI)

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2019.112148>

Notes/Citation Information

Published in *Behavioural Brain Research*, v. 375, 112148.

© 2020 Published by Elsevier B.V.

© 2020. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

The document available for download is the authors' post-peer-review final draft of the article.

Highlights:

- Exercise reinforcement, similar to other reinforcing behaviors, can be predicted by genetic variations in the central dopamine reward system.
- Having at least one copy of the G allele for the DRD2/ANKK1 polymorphism (rs1800497) predicts greater exercise reinforcement
- Tolerance for exercise intensity, which is related to exercise reinforcement, is influenced by SNP's related to pain neurotransmission.
- Greater moderate-to-vigorous physical activity was observed among those homozygous for the T allele for the CNR1 polymorphism at rs6454672.

Abstract

Background: Exercise is a reinforcing behavior and finding exercise highly reinforcing is characteristic of habitual exercisers. Genotypes related to dopamine metabolism moderate the reinforcing value of behaviors, but genetic moderators of exercise reinforcement have not been established. **Purpose:** Determine whether singular nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) that moderate central reward pathways and pain neurotransmission are associated with exercise reinforcement, tolerance for exercise intensity, and usual physical activity. **Methods:** Adults (n=178) were measured for the reinforcing value of exercise relative to sedentary activities (RRV_{exercise}), minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) and completed the Preference for and Tolerance of the Intensity of Exercise Questionnaire. Genotyping of 23 SNPs known to influence central dopamine tone, pain, or physical activity was performed. ANOVA tested differences in RRV_{exercise} , tolerance, and MVPA among genotype groups. Linear regression controlling for BMI, sex, and liking of exercise was used to further predict the association of genotype on RRV_{exercise} , tolerance, and MVPA. **Results:** Having at least one copy of the G allele for the DRD2/ANKK1 polymorphism (rs1800497) conferred greater RRV_{exercise} . Greater tolerance for exercise intensity was observed among those homozygous for the T allele for the CNR1 polymorphism (rs6454672), had at least one copy of the G allele for the GABRG3 polymorphism (rs8036270), or had at least one copy of the T allele for the LPR polymorphism (rs12405556). Homozygous individuals for the T allele at rs6454672 exhibited greater MVPA. **Conclusion:** Similar to other reinforcing behaviors, there is a genetic contribution to exercise reinforcement, tolerance for exercise intensity, and MVPA.

Key words: Dopamine, Exercise, SNPs, Physical Activity, Tolerance for Exercise Intensity

1 Genetic Variations in the Dopamine Reward System Influence Exercise Reinforcement and
2 Tolerance for Exercise Intensity

3 Kyle Flack, PhD, RD.^{1,2*} Christopher Pankey, PhD^{2,3}, Kelsey Ufholz, PhD²; LuAnn Johnson²
4 James N. Roemmich, PhD²

5 ¹Department of Dietetics and Human Nutrition, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.

6 ²USDA, Agricultural Research Service, Grand Forks Human Nutrition Research Center, 2420 2nd
7 Ave N., Grand Forks, ND

8 ³Department of Biomedical Sciences, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine,
9 Lewisburg, WV

10

11 *Corresponding author:

12 Kyle Flack, PhD, RD.
13 University of Kentucky
14 206E Funkhouser Building
15 Lexington, KY 40506-0054
16 Phone: 859-257-4351
17 Fax: 859-257-3707
18 email: Kyle.Flack@uky.edu

1. Introduction

Physical activity (PA) and the exercise subcomponent of PA are well-established as effective strategies to improve the health of nearly every organ system in the body, increase energy expenditure, and promote maintenance of a healthy body weight (1). Despite the long-term public health emphasis by the US government regarding the importance of PA for the health of Americans, more than 90% of US adults fail to meet PA recommendations when objectively assessed by accelerometry, and just 1 in 4 Americans report engaging in any leisure time physical activity (2, 3). Producing sustained increases in exercise and PA is an intractable problem; interventions designed to increase long-term PA have not yet demonstrated adherence in efficacy trials, let alone effectiveness trials (4).

Understanding individual-level factors associated with exercise participation may help to solve the problem of low adherence to the physical activity guidelines. One such factor is the reinforcing value of exercise relative to a competing alternative behavior (relative reinforcing value of exercise, RRV_{exercise}). The alternative behavior is often a desired sedentary activity such as screen time or reading that is often chosen in favor of physical activity/exercise. Exercise reinforcement is a measure of how much an individual is willing to work to gain access to (i.e., consume) exercise. Individuals who find a behavior highly reinforcing will perform more work to obtain access relative to a less reinforcing behavior (5). Indeed, the RRV_{exercise} is associated with engaging in physical activity at a frequency, duration, and intensity sufficient to meet physical activity guidelines (6), the choice to be physically active among children (7), and predictive of habitual vigorous PA among adults (8).

The dopamine hypothesis of reward explains that behavioral reinforcement and the appetitive drive to consume a reward are predominately a function of the meso-accumbal dopamine system (9, 10). At the core of this system, specific genotypes explain some of the individual variability in the reinforcing nature of, and participation in behaviors such as drug abuse, alcohol consumption, nicotine use, gambling, and eating (5, 11-13). For example, SNP's influencing protein expression for the DRD2 or DRD3 dopamine receptors are associated with opioid addiction, alcoholism, cocaine abuse, and smoking (14-16). Also, SNPs affecting central dopamine tone such as the dopamine transporter gene (SLC6A3), DRD2 receptor, monoamine oxidase A (MAOA-LPR), and serotonin receptor genes are associated with food reinforcement and energy intake (17), while SNPs of the fat mass and obesity associated (FTO) gene moderate the relationship between food reinforcement and energy intake (18).

Exercise can be realized as a reinforcing behavior as exercise dependency has been demonstrated in both humans (19, 20) and rodents (21-23). The wide individual differences in successful adherence to regular PA and exercise (2) suggest that genetic variability in central mechanisms of reinforcement may be associated with individual differences in RRV_{exercise} , although this has not yet been studied. Identifying such variations in the central dopaminergic reward system would provide initial evidence that some SNPs may moderate exercise reinforcement, thus influencing individual differences in physical activity behaviors (9, 24) and adherence to physical activity guidelines (6). Prior work suggests that SNPs involved in control of the central dopaminergic reward system may associate with PA behavior (25, 26). SNPs associated with pain neurotransmission could additionally impact exercise reinforcement (27, 28) because exercise reinforcement is positively associated with the ability to tolerate the discomfort of increasing exercise intensity (6). Thus, the current study was performed to test the hypothesis

that SNPs associated with central dopamine physiology that moderate the reinforcing value of other behaviors (17, 29, 30), activity of central nervous system reward pathways (9, 14, 16, 31, 32), or those associated with pain neurotransmission (27, 28) would be associated with exercise reinforcement, tolerance for exercise intensity discomfort, and usual (habitual) physical activity.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Participants and Study Design

The study sample was a combined data set from two studies on exercise reinforcement. One study was a cross-sectional study to determine predictors and correlates of exercise reinforcement (clinical trials.gov identifier: NCT02416882) while the other was a longitudinal study on changes in exercise reinforcement (clinical trials.gov identifier: NCT02444247). The baseline assessment of exercise reinforcement from the longitudinal study was used for the present analysis. A total of 178 participants (127 female) age 18 to 49 years were included. Baseline participant characteristics are presented in Table 1. Participants were a sample who responded to recruitment media including printed brochures, fliers, and online advertisements placed on the Grand Forks Human Nutrition Research Center website. Entry criteria were very similar for both studies. All participants were non-smokers and healthy enough to participate in an exercise program assessed by a physical activity readiness questionnaire, not taking any drugs that affect energy expenditure (e.g., thyroid, glucose-lowering drugs), could not have gained or lost more than 5% of body weight over the past 6 months or 10 pounds over the past 3 months, could not use tobacco, and could not be pregnant or lactating or plan to become pregnant in the next 6 months. Both studies were approved by the University of North Dakota Institutional

Review Board and registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, numbers NCT02444247 and NCT02416882.

For both studies, after having the study explained and providing written informed consent, participants provided a blood sample for genetic assessment and were given an ActiGraph accelerometer (Pensacola, FL) to measure usual PA. Participants wore the accelerometer for seven days before performing additional assessments. During subsequent visits, participants completed assessments of anthropometrics (height and weight), exercise reinforcement, and tolerance for discomfort during intense exercise.

2.2 Assessments

2.2.1 Height and weight: Height was measured in triplicate to the nearest 0.1 cm using a stadiometer (Seca; Chino, CA). Body weight was measured using a calibrated digital scale (Fairbanks Scales- Model SCB-R9000-HS; MO) to the nearest 0.1 kg. Measures were completed with participants wearing either provided lab scrubs or light casual clothes (t-shirt, shorts) and not wearing shoes.

2.2.2 Physical activity: Habitual, free-living PA was measured using an ActiGraph accelerometer (GT3X+ model; Pensacola, Florida). Each participant wore the device for seven days prior to performing other assessments. Participants were instructed to wear the monitor at the right hip using the provided belt during all hours awake except when bathing or swimming. Data were cleaned of non-wear time, defined as consecutive strings of zeros greater than 20 minutes. An epoch of 10 seconds was used for data collection as a shorter epoch is more suitable

to reflect bout duration under free-living conditions where many bouts of sporadic PA last 30 seconds or less (33, 34). These data were used to determine participants' usual PA, defined as weekly minutes of MVPA using the Crouter et al. algorithm (35) and Freedson cut-points (36).

2.2.3 Liking: Participants' liking (hedonic value) of the exercise options (treadmill, elliptical, stationary bike) and sedentary alternatives (TV, video games, reading magazines, puzzles/Sudoku) was assessed using a 10-point scale (1 = "do not like at all" and 10 = "like very much"). The most liked sedentary activity and exercise option was used as the sedentary and exercise alternative for the $RRV_{exercise}$ testing session, respectively.

2.2.4 $RRV_{exercise}$: Participants' $RRV_{exercise}$ (specifically, aerobic-type exercise) was assessed against a sedentary alternative chosen based upon hedonic liking scores (see "Liking" above). $RRV_{exercise}$ was assessed by evaluating the amount of operant responding (mouse button presses) a participant was willing to complete to gain access to exercise or a sedentary alternative (11, 37). The testing space included two adjacent computer workstations. The participant could earn points towards their most liked exercise activity at one station, while the other station was an identical setup that could be used to earn points toward their most liked sedentary alternative. Participants could switch between stations as much as they chose. The program presented a game similar to a slot machine with a row of three shapes of various colors; a point was earned each time the shapes and colors matched. For every 5 points a schedule was completed and the participant received 5 min of access to the reinforcer that was earned (either exercise or sedentary activity). The game was performed until the participant no longer wished to work for access to either the exercise or sedentary activities, with no minimum or maximum time limit. At

first, points were delivered after every 4 presses (schedule of reinforcement was 4), but then the schedule of reinforcement doubled (4, 8, 16, 32, [...] 1024) each time 5 points were earned. For instance, the participant initially had to click the mouse button 4 times to earn one point for schedule 1. After the first 5 points were earned, schedule 1 was complete and the participant had earned 5 minutes for the corresponding activity. Then, 8 clicks were required to earn each of the next 5 points for schedule 2 before another 5 minutes was earned. Schedule 3 required 16 clicks to earn one point, schedule 4 required 32 clicks to earn one point, and so on (11, 37). Participants engaged in the activity for the time earned after they complete the reinforcement task, which ended when participants no longer wished to earn points (time) for exercise or the sedentary alternative. Similar button pressing tasks have been used as valid predictors of the RRV of physical versus sedentary activity (7). Participants self-selected the intensity level when performing any earned exercise time, which was typically a low to moderate steady-state intensity. These assessments took place in private laboratory space within a large exercise facility. Participants completed their earned exercise time using the exercise facilities' equipment. The last schedule completed for exercise and the sedentary alternative were assessed separately and termed Pmax of sedentary ($P_{\text{max}_{\text{sed}}}$) and Pmax of exercise ($P_{\text{max}_{\text{exercise}}}$). RRV_{exercise} was calculated as $(P_{\text{max}_{\text{exercise}}}/(P_{\text{max}_{\text{exercise}}} + P_{\text{max}_{\text{sed}}}))$ (18, 37).

2.2.5 Preference and tolerance for exercise intensity: Participants completed the Preference for and Tolerance of the Intensity of Exercise Questionnaire (PRETIE-Q) (38). The tolerance subscale measured ability to tolerate the discomfort associated with intense exercise and was included in the current analysis as only tolerance scores have been linked to RRV_{exercise} (6).

2.2.6 *Genetic assessment*: Table 2 details the SNPs assessed. SNP genotyping was performed on 3-5 ml samples of whole blood collected in EDTA-containing tubes that were immediately processed for DNA extraction and frozen for future batch analysis. Platinum® qPCR SuperMix for SNP Genotyping (Applied Biosystems' TaqMan®-based SNP genotyping products, Life Technologies) specifically formulated for discrimination of alleles by real-time qPCR followed by allelic-discrimination analysis was used for the amplification and identification of each SNP. Predesigned SNP genotyping assays for individual SNPs that included two allele-specific TaqMan® MGB probes containing distinct fluorescent dyes and a PCR primer pair to detect specific SNP targets were used. These probe and primer assays align with the genome to provide specificity for the allele of interest.

2.3 *Analytic Plan*: Sex differences in demographics, RRV_{exercise} , MVPA, liking, and tolerance for exercise discomfort were determined by unpaired T-tests. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tested whether participants homozygous for minor alleles differed for RRV_{exercise} , tolerance of exercise intensity, MVPA, and liking of exercise and sedentary activities from participants carrying one or two major alleles. RRV_{exercise} was modeled using the beta distribution due to it being a ratio score. When used as a dependent variable, MVPA was transformed by natural logarithmic transformation due to the highly skewed distribution, and back-transformed to report means and standard errors in models predicting MVPA. All other dependent variables were modeled using the normal distribution. For SNPs that showed significant differences by ANOVA, after correcting for the false discovery rate, multiple regressions were performed to test whether SNP genotype was predictive of RRV_{exercise} , tolerance for exercise intensity, or MVPA after controlling for possible covariates. The

RRV_{exercise} model included BMI, MVPA, tolerance for exercise intensity, liking of aerobic exercise, and sex as covariates. Tolerance of exercise intensity models included BMI, MVPA, RRV_{exercise}, liking of exercise, and sex. The MVPA model included BMI, RRV_{exercise}, liking of aerobic exercise, tolerance for exercise intensity, sex, and the interaction of tolerance and genotype.

3. Results

Men had greater ($p<0.05$) BMI, MVPA, and tolerance for exercise intensity than women. No sex differences were found for age or RRV_{exercise} (Table 1). Genotype prevalence was consistent with NIH databases (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/snp/>) as shown in Table 3.

Participants that were homozygous (A:A) for rs1800497 had a lower RRV_{exercise} than participants carrying one or two G alleles when tested by ANOVA ($p<0.01$) and by regression ($p<0.01$) that modeled potential covariate effects on RRV_{exercise} (Table 4). From ANOVA, tolerance for exercise intensity was greater ($p<0.05$) for participants that were homozygous for rs6454672 (T:T), and lower for homozygous rs8036270 (A:A) and rs12405556 (G:G) ($p<0.01$, $p<0.05$, respectfully). Results from the regression models demonstrated that SNP's rs6454672, rs8036270, and rs12405556 were significant ($p<0.03$) predictors of tolerance for exercise intensity. MVPA and RRV_{exercise} were also significant ($p<0.01$) predictors of tolerance for exercise intensity in each model (Table 5). SNP rs6454672 was a significant predictor ($p<0.001$) of MVPA, as homozygous carriers of the T allele exhibited lower ($p<0.01$) MVPA (Table 6.). The interaction of tolerance and genotype was tested to further examine the synergy between genotype and the ability to tolerate exercise intensity but was not significant ($p=0.41$). There were no SNP genotypes that influenced in liking of the exercise or sedentary alternatives.

200 4. Discussion

201 This is the first investigation of the association of SNPs that moderate central dopamine
202 physiology and pain neurotransmission with exercise reinforcement, tolerance for exercise
203 intensity, and usual physical activity. The results support the hypothesis that a genetic
204 contribution to RRV_{exercise} exists. Specifically, individuals carrying the polymorphism of a G
205 allele at rs1800497 had greater RRV_{exercise} . The rs1800497 polymorphism, also known as Taq1A,
206 affects the ankyrin repeat and kinase domain containing 1 gene (ANKK1), and is a G > A
207 polymorphism, causing a Glutamine > Lysine missense variant. Although there is some debate
208 (39), Taq1A is associated with decreased ligand binding at, or decreased expression of the
209 dopamine D2 receptor (DRD2) (40-43), and is associated with other reinforcing behaviors (30)
210 and greater risk of alcohol and drug abuse (44). Further, central dopamine signaling is necessary
211 for development and maintenance of exercise behavior (24), supporting a role for Taq1A in
212 exercise reinforcement. Indeed, genotype variants affecting dopamine signaling via DRD2 or
213 ANKK1 expression are associated with differences in usual physical activity in both rodents and
214 humans (45, 46).

215 In the current study, homozygous Taq1A carriers (A1/A1) had lower ($p < 0.01$) RRV_{exercise}
216 than heterozygous A1:A2 or homozygous A2/A2 carriers (Table 4.). Adults with the Taq1A
217 allele experience a decreased response to reinforcing stimuli (30). Notably, dopamine signaling
218 has been investigated for its role in motivation (47, 48), motor movement (49-51) and
219 reinforcement (52). Moreover, the dopamine system is a key player in determining voluntary
220 physical activity (see review (24)). Antagonists of DRD₂ receptors (53) or similar DRD₂

polymorphisms (46) also reduce motor activity in humans. Together these data support a mechanism by which Taq1A inhibits central dopamine signaling, therefore attenuating RRV_{exercise} .

This study is also the first to demonstrate a genotypic association with tolerance for exercise intensity. The SNP's rs6454672, rs8036270, and rs12405556 independently predicted tolerance for exercise intensity, which is defined as an individual's ability to tolerate the discomfort associated with intense exercise such as fatigue, pain, and sweatiness (38). This is in contrast to the need to increase dosage to maintain a response, as is common with pharmacologic agents. Greater tolerance for exercise intensity is associated with participating in enough exercise to meet physical activity guidelines (6) and with self-selected exercise intensity (54), suggesting that greater tolerance for exercise intensity may lead to more frequent engagement in intense physical activity.

Most of what is known regarding rs6454672 is in respect to cannabinoid signaling and schizophrenia, as rs6454672 is located near the cannabinoid receptor 1 gene and is noted for its contribution to genetic coding variability for the cannabinoid receptor type 1 (CB1) gene (55). Stimulation of CB1 receptors negatively regulates pain and inflammation through its inhibitory action as a Gai-coupled receptor, decreasing neurotransmission of pain (56). Carrying even a single minor (C) allele is associated with a decreased likelihood of meeting physical activity recommendations (57), which is supported by the current finding that homozygous T carriers have greater tolerance for exercise intensity, supporting previous work demonstrating individuals with greater tolerance for exercise intensity are more likely to meet PA recommendations (6). The relationship between tolerance for exercise intensity and increased likelihood of meeting PA recommendations is also supported by the current finding that participants homozygous (T:T) at

244 rs6454672 also exhibited greater MVPA. However, no other SNP's tested in this study were
245 associated with MVPA.

246 The gamma-aminobutyric acid type A receptor gamma 3 subunit (GABRG3) encodes a
247 gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) receptor and rs8036270 is an intron variant within this gene
248 locus. GABA, as the primary inhibitory neurotransmitter in the human brain, can bind to
249 ionotropic receptors (K⁺ channels - hyperpolarizing) or metabotropic receptors (G_{ai}) to inhibit
250 neurotransmission of painful stimuli (58). Consistent with the present finding that carrying at
251 least one G allele at rs8036270 predicts increased tolerance for exercise intensity, prior studies
252 have determined that this SNP is also associated with leisure time exercise behavior and physical
253 activity related energy expenditure (26, 59). Although further research is necessary for
254 verification, these findings suggest that rs8036270 positively regulates inhibitory
255 neurotransmission through GABA signaling, thus decreasing "pain" signaling pathways,
256 increasing exercise intensity tolerance, and therefore, physical activity.

257 SNP rs12405556 is an intron variant that affects the leptin receptor and predicts physical
258 activity (59, 60). In agreement with the current study, prior studies have also demonstrated that
259 glutamine to arginine substitution in codon 223 of the leptin receptor predicts levels of physical
260 activity and adiposity in humans (60). The current work revealed that having at least one copy of
261 the minor (T) allele predicted greater tolerance for exercise intensity. Central leptin receptors,
262 and therefore central leptin signaling, play key roles in feeding behavior [80], energy
263 homeostasis (61), and physical activity behavior (60, 62). Therefore, these data suggest that
264 carrying at least one copy of the minor allele for rs12405556 may be a genetic factor driving
265 greater tolerance for exercise intensity, and physical activity.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, we found that SNP rs1800497 predicted RRV_{exercise} . Additional SNP's rs6454672, rs8036270 and rs12405556 predicted greater tolerance for exercise intensity, while rs6454672 also predicted MVPA. Having greater RRV_{exercise} is an important factor in one's choice to be more physically active (6, 8, 63). Maintaining an exercise routine likely depends on an individual's ability to experience aversive aspects of exercise yet be able to tolerate those unpleasant aspects and persist engaging in exercise behavior. Therefore, having greater RRV_{exercise} and tolerance for the discomfort associated with intense exercise may lead to more frequent and sustained exercise behavior. These results demonstrate that functional changes at the protein level provide pathways by which SNPs may be driving changes in physical activity-related behavior, and these SNPs may be underlying causes for differences in habitual physical activity between individuals. Further research to determine personalized exercise prescriptions based on genotype, along with strategies to increase exercise reinforcement among certain individuals is needed to potentially increase the number of Americans being physically active.

Contributions

Kyle D. Flack, PhD., RD: Lead author. Contributed to study design and development, led all aspects of recruitment, intervention management, and data collection. Composed an original manuscript draft.

Christopher Pankey: Second author. Revised all manuscript drafts and completed writing of the manuscript.

Kelsey Elise Ufholz, PhD.: Third author. Assisted in data collection and composition of manuscript.

LuAnn Johnson, MS: Fourth author. Statistician in charge of all statistical analysis.

James N. Roemmich, PhD.: Senior author. Led study idea development, study design, and responsible for funding. Revised all manuscript drafts and made final decisions on manuscript and data analysis.

All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Doreen Rolshoven, Jackie Nelson and student interns for their assistance with implementation of the protocol, data collection and data entry.

300

Funding

301

This study was funded by the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural

302

Research Service, and Project 3062-51000-051-00D. Mention of trade names, commercial

303

products, or organizations does not imply endorsement from the U.S. government. USDA is an

304

equal opportunity provider and employer

305

Data Statement

306

Raw data available upon request to the Grand Forks Human Nutrition Research Center

307

Data Sharing Committee: phone: 701-795-8272, fax: 701-795-8230

- 308 1. Pedersen BK, Saltin B. Evidence for prescribing exercise as therapy in chronic disease.
309 Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2006;16 Suppl 1:3-63. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2006.00520.x.
310 PubMed PMID: 16451303.
- 311 2. Tucker JM, Welk GJ, Beyler NK. Physical activity in US adults: compliance with the
312 physical activity guidelines for Americans. Am J. Prev. Med. 2011;40(4):454-61.
- 313 3. U.S. Department of Health and human Services. Physical Activity Guidelines for
314 Americans. Okla Nurse. 2008;53(4):25.
- 315 4. Perri MG, Anton SD, Durning PE, Ketterson TU, Sydemann SJ, Berlant NE, et al.
316 Adherence to exercise prescriptions: Effects of prescribing moderate versus higher levels of
317 intensity and frequency. Health Psychol. 2002;21(5):452-8. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.21.5.452.
- 318 5. Berridge KC. 'Liking' and 'wanting' food rewards: brain substrates and roles in eating
319 disorders. Physiol Behav. 2009;97(5):537-50. Epub 2009/04/02. doi:
320 10.1016/j.physbeh.2009.02.044. PubMed PMID: 19336238; PubMed Central PMCID:
321 PMC2717031.
- 322 6. Flack KD, Johnson L, Roemmich JN. Aerobic and resistance exercise reinforcement and
323 discomfort tolerance predict meeting activity guidelines. Physiol Behav. 2017;170:32-6. Epub
324 2016/11/29. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2016.11.032. PubMed PMID: 27890588.
- 325 7. Epstein LH, Kilanowski CK, Consalvi AR, Paluch RA. Reinforcing value of physical
326 activity as a determinant of child activity level. Health Psychol. 1999;18(6):599-603. PubMed
327 PMID: 10619533.
- 328 8. Flack KD, Johnson L, Roemmich JN. The reinforcing value and liking of resistance
329 training and aerobic exercise as predictors of adult's physical activity. Physiol Behav.
330 2017;179:284-9. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2017.06.016. PubMed PMID: 28663109.

- 331 9. Huppertz C, Bartels M, Groen-Blokhuis MM, Dolan CV, de Moor MH, Abdellaoui A, et
332 al. The dopaminergic reward system and leisure time exercise behavior: a candidate allele study.
333 BioMed Res. Int. 2014;2014:591717. doi: 10.1155/2014/591717. PubMed PMID: 24734235;
334 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3964758.
- 335 10. Spanagel R, Weiss F. The dopamine hypothesis of reward: past and current status. Trends
336 Neurosci. 1999;22(11):521-7. PubMed PMID: 10529820.
- 337 11. Epstein LH, Carr KA, Lin H, Fletcher KD. Food reinforcement, energy intake, and
338 macronutrient choice. Am J Clin Nutr. 2011;94(1):12-8. doi: DOI 10.3945/ajcn.110.010314.
339 PubMed PMID: WOS:000291794800005.
- 340 12. Robinson MJ, Fischer AM, Ahuja A, Lesser EN, Maniates H. Roles of "Wanting" and
341 "Liking" in Motivating Behavior: Gambling, Food, and Drug Addictions. Curr Top Behav
342 Neurosci. 2016;27:105-36. doi: 10.1007/7854_2015_387. PubMed PMID: 26407959.
- 343 13. Robinson TE, Berridge KC. The neural basis of drug craving: an incentive-sensitization
344 theory of addiction. Brain Res Brain Res Rev. 1993;18(3):247-91. PubMed PMID: 8401595.
- 345 14. Clarke T-K, Weiss ARD, Ferarro TN, Kampman KM, Dackis CA, Pettinati HM, et al.
346 The Dopamine Receptor D2 (DRD2) SNP rs1076560 is Associated with Opioid Addiction.
347 Annals of Human Genetics. 2014;78(1):33-9. doi: 10.1111/ahg.12046.
- 348 15. Novak G, LeBlanc M, Zai C, Shaikh S, Renou J, DeLuca V, et al. Association of
349 polymorphisms in the BDNF, DRD1 and DRD3 genes with tobacco smoking in schizophrenia.
350 Ann Hum Genet. 2010;74(4):291-8. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-1809.2010.00578.x.
- 351 16. Sasabe T, Furukawa A, Matsusita S, Higuchi S, Ishiura S. Association analysis of the
352 dopamine receptor D2 (DRD2) SNP rs1076560 in alcoholic patients. Neurosci. Lett.
353 2007;412(2):139-42. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2006.10.064>.

- 354 17. Epstein LH, Wright SM, Paluch RA, Leddy JJ, Hawk LW, Jr., Jaroni JL, et al. Relation
355 between food reinforcement and dopamine genotypes and its effect on food intake in smokers.
356 Am J Clin Nutr. 2004;80(1):82-8. PubMed PMID: 15213032.
- 357 18. Scheid JL, Carr KA, Lin H, Fletcher KD, Sucheston L, Singh PK, et al. FTO
358 polymorphisms moderate the association of food reinforcement with energy intake. Physiol
359 Behav. 2014;132:51-6. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.04.029. PubMed PMID: 24768648.
- 360 19. Chan CS, Grossman HY. Psychological effects of running loss on consistent runners.
361 Precept Mot Skills. 1988;66(3):875-83. doi: 10.2466/pms.1988.66.3.875. PubMed PMID:
362 3405713.
- 363 20. Chapman CL, De Castro JM. Running addiction: measurement and associated
364 psychological characteristics. J Sports Med Phys Fitness. 1990;30(3):283-90. PubMed PMID:
365 2266760.
- 366 21. Belke TW. Running and responding reinforced by the opportunity to run: effect of
367 reinforcer duration. J Exp Anal Behav. 1997;67(3):337-51. doi: 10.1901/jeab.1997.67-337.
368 PubMed PMID: 9163938; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1284610.
- 369 22. Belke TW. Studies of wheel-running reinforcement: parameters of Herrnstein's (1970)
370 response-strength equation vary with schedule order. J Exp Anal Behav. 2000;73(3):319-31. doi:
371 10.1901/jeab.2000.73-319. PubMed PMID: 10866355; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1284780.
- 372 23. Iversen IH. Techniques for Establishing Schedules with Wheel Running as
373 Reinforcement in Rats. J Exp Anal Behav. 1993;60(1):219-38. doi: DOI 10.1901/jeab.1993.60-
374 219. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1993LN11200016.
- 375 24. Kanb AM, Lightfood, JT. Does the difference between physically active and couch
376 potato lie in the dopamine system? Int J Biol Sci. 2010;6(2):133-50.

- 377 25. Hooper AEC, Bryan AD, Hagger MS. What keeps a body moving? The brain-derived
378 neurotrophic factor val66met polymorphism and intrinsic motivation to exercise in humans. J
379 Behav Med. 2014;37(6):1180-92.
- 380 26. Rankinen T, Roth SM, Bray MS, Loos R, Pérusse L, Wolfarth B, et al. Advances in
381 exercise, fitness, and performance genomics. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2010;42(5):835-46.
- 382 27. Diatchenko L, Slade GD, Nackley AG, Bhalang K, Sigurdsson A, Belfer I, et al. Genetic
383 basis for individual variations in pain perception and the development of a chronic pain
384 condition. Hum Mol Gen. 2004;14(1):135-43.
- 385 28. Lee PJ, Delaney P, Keogh J, Sleeman D, Shorten GD. Catecholamine-o-
386 methyltransferase polymorphisms are associated with postoperative pain intensity. Clin J Pain.
387 2011;27(2):93-101.
- 388 29. Carr KA, Lin H, Fletcher KD, Sucheston L, Singh PK, Salis RJ, et al. Two functional
389 serotonin polymorphisms moderate the effect of food reinforcement on BMI. Behav Neurosci.
390 2013;127(3):387.
- 391 30. Epstein LH, Temple JL, Neaderhiser BJ, Salis RJ, Erbe RW, Leddy JJ. Food
392 reinforcement, the dopamine D2 receptor genotype, and energy intake in obese and nonobese
393 humans. Behav Neurosci. 2007;121(5):877-86. doi: 10.1037/0735-7044.121.5.877. PubMed
394 PMID: 17907820; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2213752.
- 395 31. Caldú X, Vendrell P, Bartrés-Faz D, Clemente I, Bargalló N, Jurado MÁ, et al. Impact of
396 the COMT Val108/158 Met and DAT genotypes on prefrontal function in healthy subjects.
397 Neuroimage. 2007;37(4):1437-44.

- 398 32. Savitz J, Hodgkinson CA, Martin-Soelch C, Shen P-H, Szczepanik J, Nugent A, et al.
399 The functional DRD3 Ser9Gly polymorphism (rs6280) is pleiotropic, affecting reward as well as
400 movement. *PloS one*. 2013;8(1):e54108.
- 401 33. Ayabe M, Kumahara H, Morimura K, Tanaka H. Epoch length and the physical activity
402 bout analysis: an accelerometry research issue. *BMC Res Notes*. 2013;6:20. doi: 10.1186/1756-
403 0500-6-20. PubMed PMID: 23331772; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3558345.
- 404 34. Gabriel KP, McClain JJ, Schmid KK, Storti KL, High RR, Underwood DA, et al. Issues
405 in accelerometer methodology: the role of epoch length on estimates of physical activity and
406 relationships with health outcomes in overweight, post-menopausal women. *Int J Behav Nutr*
407 *Phys Act*. 2010;7:53. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-7-53. PubMed PMID: 20550691; PubMed Central
408 PMCID: PMC2900223.
- 409 35. Crouter SE, Kuffel E, Haas JD, Frongillo EA, Bassett DR, Jr. Refined two-regression
410 model for the ActiGraph accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2010;42(5):1029-37. doi:
411 10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181c37458. PubMed PMID: 20400882; PubMed Central PMCID:
412 PMC2891855.
- 413 36. Freedson PS, Melanson E, Sirard J. Calibration of the Computer Science and
414 Applications, Inc. accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 1998;30(5):777-81. PubMed PMID:
415 9588623.
- 416 37. Bickel WK, Marsch LA, Carroll ME. Deconstructing relative reinforcing efficacy and
417 situating the measures of pharmacological reinforcement with behavioral economics: a
418 theoretical proposal. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2000;153(1):44-56. PubMed PMID:
419 11255928.

- 420 38. Ekkekakis P, Thome J, Petruzzello SJ, Hall EE. The Preference for and Tolerance of the
421 Intensity of Exercise Questionnaire: a psychometric evaluation among college women. *J Sports*
422 *Sci.* 2008;26(5):499-510.
- 423 39. Lucht M, Roskopf D. Comment on "Genetically determined differences in learning from
424 errors". *Science.* 2008;321(5886):200; doi: 10.1126/science.1155372. PubMed PMID:
425 18621654.
- 426 40. Jönsson E, Nöthen M, Grünhage F, Farde L, Nakashima Y, Propping P, et al.
427 Polymorphisms in the dopamine D2 receptor gene and their relationships to striatal dopamine
428 receptor density of healthy volunteers. *Mol. Psychiatry.* 1999;4(3):290.
- 429 41. Noble EP, Blum K, Ritchie T, Montgomery A, Sheridan PJ. Allelic association of the D2
430 dopamine receptor gene with receptor-binding characteristics in alcoholism or gene ism. *Arch*
431 *Gen. Psychiatry.* 1991;48(7):648-54.
- 432 42. Pohjalainen T, Rinne J, Någren K, Lehtikainen P, Anttila K, Syvälahti E, et al. The A1
433 allele of the human D 2 dopamine receptor gene predicts low D 2 receptor availability in healthy
434 volunteers. *Mol. Psychiatry.* 1998;3(3):256.
- 435 43. Thompson J, Thomas N, Singleton A, Piggott M, Lloyd S, Perry EK, et al. D2 dopamine
436 receptor gene (DRD2) Taq1 A polymorphism: reduced dopamine D2 receptor binding in the
437 human striatum associated with the A1 allele. *Pharmacogenetics.* 1997;7(6):479-84. PubMed
438 PMID: 9429233.
- 439 44. Doehring A, Hentig N, Graff J, Salamat S, Schmidt M, Geisslinger G, et al. Genetic
440 variants altering dopamine D2 receptor expression or function modulate the risk of opiate
441 addiction and the dosage requirements of methadone substitution. *Pharmacogenet Genomics.*
442 2009;19(6):407-14. doi: 10.1097/FPC.0b013e328320a3fd. PubMed PMID: 19373123.

443 45. Knab AM, Bowen RS, Hamilton AT, Gullledge AA, Lightfoot JT. Altered dopaminergic
444 profiles: implications for the regulation of voluntary physical activity. *Behav Brain Res.*
445 2009;204(1):147-52.

446 46. Simonen RL, Rankinen T, Pérusse L, Leon AS, Skinner JS, Wilmore JH, et al. A
447 dopamine D2 receptor gene polymorphism and physical activity in two family studies. *Physiol*
448 *Behav.* 2003;78(4-5):751-7.

449 47. Berridge KC. Motivation concepts in behavioral neuroscience. *Physiol Behav.*
450 2004;81(2):179-209. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2004.02.004.

451 48. Berridge KC, Robinson TE. What is the role of dopamine in reward: hedonic impact,
452 reward learning, or incentive salience? *Brain Res Rev.* 1998;28(3):309-69.

453 49. Kelly MA, Rubinstein M, Phillips TJ, Lessov CN, Burkhart-Kasch S, Zhang G, et al.
454 Locomotor activity in D2 dopamine receptor-deficient mice is determined by gene dosage,
455 genetic background, and developmental adaptations. *J Neurosci.* 1998;18(9):3470-9.

456 50. Pitts SM, Horvitz JC. Similar effects of D1/D2 receptor blockade on feeding and
457 locomotor behavior. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav.* 2000;65(3):433-8.

458 51. Baik J-H, Picetti R, Saiardi A, Thiriet G, Dierich A, Depaulis A, et al. Parkinsonian-like
459 locomotor impairment in mice lacking dopamine D2 receptors. *Nature.* 1995;377(6548):424.

460 52. Salamone JD, Correa M. Motivational views of reinforcement: implications for
461 understanding the behavioral functions of nucleus accumbens dopamine. *Behav Brain Res.*
462 2002;137(1):3-25. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4328\(02\)00282-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4328(02)00282-6).

463 53. Kiang M, Daskalakis ZJ, Christensen BK, Remington G, Kapur S. Actigraphic
464 measurement of the effects of single-dose haloperidol and olanzapine on spontaneous motor
465 activity in normal subjects. *J Psychiatry Neurosci.* 2003;28(4):293-9. PubMed PMID: 12921224.

- 466 54. Ekkekakis P, Lind E, Joens-Matre RR. Can self-reported preference for exercise intensity
467 predict physiologically defined self-selected exercise intensity? *Res Q Exerc Sport*.
468 2006;77(1):81-90.
- 469 55. Ho BC, Wassink TH, Ziebell S, Andreasen NC. Cannabinoid receptor 1 gene
470 polymorphisms and marijuana misuse interactions on white matter and cognitive deficits in
471 schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res*. 2011;128(1-3):66-75. doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2011.02.021. PubMed
472 PMID: 21420833; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3085576.
- 473 56. Devane WA, Dysarz Fr, Johnson MR, Melvin LS, Howlett AC. Determination and
474 characterization of a cannabinoid receptor in rat brain. *Mol Pharmacol*. 1988;34(5):605-13.
- 475 57. Wilkinson AV, Gabriel KP, Wang J, Bondy ML, Dong Q, Wu X, et al. Sensation-seeking
476 genes and physical activity in youth. *Genes Brain Behav*. 2013;12(2):181-8.
- 477 58. Goudet C, Magnaghi V, Landry M, Nagy F, Gereau IV RW, Pin J-P. Metabotropic
478 receptors for glutamate and GABA in pain. *Brain Res Rev*. 2009;60(1):43-56.
- 479 59. De Moor MH, Liu Y-J, Boomsma DI, Li J, Hamilton JJ, Hottenga J-J, et al. Genome-
480 wide association study of exercise behavior in Dutch and American adults. *Med Sci Sports*
481 *Exerc*. 2009;41(10):1887.
- 482 60. Stefan N, Vozarova B, Del Parigi A, Ossowski V, Thompson D, Hanson R, et al. The
483 Gln223Arg polymorphism of the leptin receptor in Pima Indians: influence on energy
484 expenditure, physical activity and lipid metabolism. *Int J obes*. 2002;26(12):1629.
- 485 61. Balthasar N, Coppari R, McMinn J, Liu SM, Lee CE, Tang V, et al. Leptin receptor
486 signaling in POMC neurons is required for normal body weight homeostasis. *Neuron*.
487 2004;42(6):983-91.

- 488 62. Licinio J, Caglayan S, Ozata M, Yildiz BO, De Miranda PB, O'Kirwan F, et al.
489 Phenotypic effects of leptin replacement on morbid obesity, diabetes mellitus, hypogonadism,
490 and behavior in leptin-deficient adults. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2004;101(13):4531-6.
- 491 63. Epstein LH, Roemmich JN. Reducing sedentary behavior: role in modifying physical
492 activity. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev*. 2001;29(3):103-8. PubMed PMID: 11474956.

	Male (n=51)	Female (n=127)	Total (n=178)
Age (years)	26.3 ± 6.7	27.1 ± 9.3	26.9 ± 8.6
BMI (kg/m ²) ¹	27.0 ± 5.1*	25.2 ± 4.4*	25.7 ± 4.7
RRV _{exercise} ²	0.72 ± 0.34	0.71 ± 0.37	0.71 ± 0.4
MVPA ³	50.4 ± 27.3*	35.7 ± 22.9*	40.0 ± 25.1
Preference ⁴	26.1 ± 5.5	26.3 ± 6.2	26.3 ± 6.0
Tolerance ⁵	26.0 ± 5.7*	23.9 ± 5.2*	24.5 ± 5.4

494 Table 1. Demographics, MVPA, and exercise reinforcement of the study participants

495 Data are presented as mean ± SD

496 *means differ ($p \leq 0.05$) between sex

497 ¹BMI: body mass index

498 ²RRV_{AT}: number of sessions completed during the RRV task to gain access to aerobic exercise training
 499 (AT) when sedentary behavior was available as a behavioral alternative.

500 ³MVPA: minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week

501 ⁴Preference: Preference for the Intensity of Exercise Questionnaire score (au)

502 ⁵Tolerance: Tolerance of the Intensity of Exercise Questionnaire score (au)

504 Table 2. List of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) assessed in the present study

SNP ID	Gene	Polymorphism	Residue Change
rs8066276	ACE	C/T Transition Substitution (TCT[C/T]ACT)	N/A
rs11615016	TPH2	A/G transition substitution (TAC[A/G]TTC)	N/A Intron Variant
rs6454672	CNR1	C/T Transition Substitution (CTT[C/T]ACA)	N/A Intron Variant
rs6280	DRD3	C/T Transition Substitution (GGC[C/T]ACT)	C [Gly] $\Rightarrow$ S [Ser]
rs8049933	FTO	C/T Transition Substitution (AAT[C/T]GGT)	N/A Intron Variant
rs9936768	FTO	C/T Transition Substitution (TAT[C/T]GTC)	N/A Intron Variant
rs12446047	FTO	C/T Transition Substitution (GAC[C/T]TCA)	N/A Intron Variant
rs11076022	FTO	A/G transition substitution (GTC[A/G]TTC)	N/A
rs7199716	FTO	C/T Transition Substitution (TTC[C/T]CTC)	N/A Intron Variant
rs6314	HTR2A	A/G transition substitution (AAT[A/G]CTG)	A [His] $\Rightarrow$ G [Tyr]
rs1800497	DRD2/AN KK1	A/G transition substitution (GTC[A/G]AGG)	A [Glu] $\Rightarrow$ G [Lys]
rs10887741	PAPSS2	C/T Transition Substitution (GGG[C/T]TCC)	N/A Intron Variant

rs12612420	None	A/G transition substitution (TCC[A/G]GAT)	N/A
rs8097348	None	A/G transition substitution (TA[A/G]CTAG)	N/A
rs12405556	LEPR	G/T Transversion Substitution (CAG[G/T]ATA)	N/A Intron Variant
rs8036270	GABRG3	A/G transition substitution (GAA[A/G]TGA)	N/A Intron Variant
rs6265	BDNF	C/T Transition Substitution (TCA[C/T]GTG)	C [Val] ⇒ T [Met]
rs1076560	DRD2	A/C Transversion Substitution (TC[A/C]CCC)	N/A Intron Variant
rs4680	COMT	A/G transition substitution (GGC[A/G]TGA)	G [Val] ⇒ A [Met]
rs265981	DRD1	A/G transition substitution (GGC[A/G]GCC)	N/A
rs1800955	DRD4	C/T Transition Substitution (GGG[C/T]GCG)	N/A
rs1611115	DBH	C/T Transition Substitution (TTG[C/T]GGG)	N/A
rs6275	DRD2	A/G transition substitution (ACC[A/G]TGG)	A [His] ⇒ G [His]

506 Table 3. prevalence of genotypes with significant predictive values

507

SNP	Allele	Frequency	Percent	Genotype	Frequency	Percent
rs1800497	A:A	10	5.6	All A	10	5.6
	A:G	52	29.2	Has G	168	94.4
	G:G	116	65.2			
rs6454672	C:C	28	15.8	Has C	116	65.5
	C:T	88	49.7			
	T:T	61	34.5	All T	61	34.5
rs8036270	A:A	52	29.2	All A	52	29.2
	A:G	88	49.4	Has G	126	70.8
	G:G	38	21.4			
rs12405556	G:G	84	47.2	All G	84	47.2
	G:T	80	44.9	All T	94	52.8
	T:T	14	7.9			

508

Table 4. ANOVA results and regression model results predicting the relative reinforcing value of exercise from SNP rs1800497 and covariates

	Coefficient ± SE	P
Full regression model		
R ² = 0.11		
Intercept	-1.10 ± 1.01	0.28
BMI	-0.01 ± 0.02	0.55
MVPA	0.003 ± 0.004	0.43
Tolerance	0.03 ± 0.02	0.14
Liking of exercise	0.16 ± 0.08	0.05
Sex = Female	-0.02 ± 0.23	0.94
rs1800497 A:A	-1.20 ± 0.42	0.005
Regression model of significant predictors		
R ² = 0.06		
Intercept	0.75 ± 0.11	<0.001
rs1800497 A:A	-1.38 ± 0.42	0.001
RRV by genotype (from ANOVA)		
Genotype	Mean ± SE	
AA	0.35 ± 0.09*	
AG,GG	0.68 ± 0.02*	

*Means ± SE differ (p<0.01)

Single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP), body mass index (BMI), moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA), tolerance for exercise intensity (Tolerance), sex coded as: female = 0, male = 1

526 Table 5. ANOVA results and regression model results predicting tolerance for exercise intensity from SNP rs6454672, rs8036270 or rs12405556,
527 and covariates

rs6454672			rs8036270			rs12405556		
Coefficient ± SE		P	Coefficient ± SE		P	Coefficient ± SE		P
Full regression models								
R² = 0.21			R² = 0.24			R² = 0.21		
Intercept	19.36 ± 4.31	< 0.001	Intercept	20.27 ± 4.19	< 0.001	Intercept	20.33 ± 4.31	< 0.001
BMI	0.06 ± 0.10	0.58	BMI	0.06 ± 0.10	0.57	BMI	0.04 ± 0.10	0.73
MVPA	0.05 ± 0.01	<0.001	MVPA	0.06 ± 0.02	< 0.001	MVPA	0.06 ± 0.01	< 0.001
RRV _{Exercise}	2.95 ± 1.09	0.008	RRV _{Exercise}	3.17 ± 1.12	0.005	RRV _{Exercise}	2.88 ± 1.14	0.01
Liking of exercise	-0.03 ± 0.38	0.95	Liking of exercise	-0.03 ± 0.37	0.93	Liking of exercise	0.12 ± 0.37	0.75
Sex = Female	-1.40 ± 0.96	0.15	Sex = Female	-1.10 ± 0.99	0.27	Sex = Female	-1.52 ± 1.02	0.14
rs6454672 T:T	2.12 ± 0.90	0.02	rs8036270 A:A	-2.86 ± 0.89	0.002	rs12405556 G:G	-1.86 ± 0.82	0.025
Regression models of significant predictors								
R² = 0.19			R² = 0.21			R² = 0.19		
Intercept	19.40 ± 0.91	< 0.001	Intercept	20.67 ± 1.0	< 0.001	Intercept	20.88 ± 1.02	< 0.001
rs6454672 T:T	2.39 ± 0.88	0.007	rs8036270 A:A	-2.95 ± 0.82	< 0.001	rs12405556 G:G	-2.08 ± 0.77	0.0072
MVPA	0.06 ± 0.01	< 0.001	MVPA	0.07 ± 0.01	< 0.001	MVPA	0.063 ± 0.01	< 0.001

RRV _{Exercise}	2.72 ± 1.03	0.009	RRV _{Exercise}	2.86 ± 1.05	0.007	RRV _{Exercise}	2.90 ± 1.11	0.0096
-------------------------	-------------	-------	-------------------------	-------------	-------	-------------------------	-------------	--------

Tolerance by genotype (from ANOVA)

Genotype	Mean ± SE		Mean ± SE		Mean ± SE
TT	26.04 ± 0.73*	AA	22.41 ± 0.69**	GG	23.41 ± 0.58*
CT,CC	23.65 ± 0.46*	AG,GG	25.36 ± 0.45**	GT,TT	25.49 ± 0.51*

*means ± SE differ between genotype (p<0.05)

**means ± SE differ between genotype (p<0.01)

single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP), body mass index (BMI), moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA), tolerance for exercise intensity

(Tolerance), sex coded as: female = 0, male = 1

529 Table 6. ANOVA results and regression model results predicting the natural logarithm of daily minutes of
530 moderate-to-vigorous physical activity from SNP rs6454672 and covariates

	Coefficient $\pm$ SE	P
Full regression model		
$R^2 = 0.22$		
Intercept	3.38 ± 0.55	< 0.001
BMI	-0.01 ± 0.01	0.32
RRV_{Exercise}	0.09 ± 0.15	0.54
Liking_AT	-0.02 ± 0.04	0.71
Tolerance	0.02 ± 0.01	0.02
rs6454672 T:T	0.35 ± 0.10	< 0.001
Sex = Female	-0.37 ± 0.09	< 0.001
Regression model of significant predictors		
$R^2 = 0.19$		
Intercept	3.01 ± 0.23	< 0.001
Tolerance	0.02 ± 0.01	0.01
Sex = Female	-0.30 ± 0.10	0.002
rs6454672 T:T	0.32 ± 0.09	< 0.001
MVPA by genotype (from ANOVA)		
Genotype	Mean $\pm$ SE	
TT	$42.95 \pm 2.48^*$	
CT,CC	$31.1 \pm 2.1^*$	

*means $\pm$ SE differ ($p < 0.01$)

531 Single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP), body mass index (BMI), relative reinforcing value of exercise
532 (RRV_{Exercise}) tolerance for exercise intensity (Tolerance), ANOVA model means and standard errors are
533 back-transformed from natural logarithmic function.