

Autism Biology and the Environment

Martha R. Herbert, MD, PhD



Autism is a severe disorder of communication and emotional attachment. Once thought rare, it is now recognized as a significant cause of chronic illness in childhood. Autistic children are caught in the middle of an intense debate about whether or not their numbers are increasing—that is, whether or not there is an autism epidemic. Hanging in the balance are the nature of the treatments and services available to them, the funding levels for providing these, and the urgency with which their problems are addressed. And for these children, time is a pressing concern, as everyone agrees that interventions work far better for autistic children when they are begun early and pursued intensively.

Parallel and intertwined with the debate about whether there is an autism epidemic under way are a series of other areas where we can see also substantially different points of view. These include different framings of the way genes influence autism, the way the brain produces autistic behaviors, the relationship of physical symptoms to the core defining behaviors in the autism syndrome (impaired language, social reciprocity and behavior), and the levels at which treatment targets should be sought. In addition, because autism appears to be markedly heterogeneous, the question arises of what it is that “autisms” of different etiologies have in

common to produce a common behavioral syndrome.

It is not surprising that autism should engage discussion at all of these levels, because while autism is defined behaviorally, it is clearly a biologically based disorder. The difficulty at this time is that the biological basis for the autism syndrome has not been established. This uncertainty about both cause and disease mechanisms also has great significance for autistic children, because while we are waiting for clearer science, we are operating on the basis of provisional models that shape how we choose and prioritize care regimens for these children.

The positions in the parallel sets of debates tend to cluster into two provisional models, each of which links clinical and research data into a different gestalt.⁶ One model sees autism as a strongly genetic brain-based disorder, with a constant prevalence but a recent increase in awareness that has led to the appearance—but not the reality—of an epidemic. The other model sees autism as a genetically influenced but environmentally modulated condition involving multiple systems of the body, with increased numbers being real and related to changes in environmental factors.

The model of autism as strongly genetic and brain based is associated with a set of hypotheses about the relationships between genes, brains and behavior.

Autism is defined by a cluster of three specific behaviors, though there is a lot of heterogeneity in how these behaviors manifest. The specificity of behaviors is assumed to rest on alterations of specific brain regions or discrete neural systems that are genetically based.³ These behaviors and brain changes are often construed to be due to a set of independent genes and brain alterations that aggregate to yield autism.

This model has led to a research program seeking to identify autism genes, and to choose candidate genes from regions in the genome on the basis of their relevance to brain or behavior. It has also led to investigations of brain regions associated with the behavioral domains altered in autism. However, the yield of this program has been more modest than had been hoped. Genetic investigations have been inconclusive and regional brain findings in the brain have been intriguing but variable.

On the other hand, a series of unexpected findings have emerged that challenge the expectations of the strongly genetic, brain-based model. These include:

- A tendency toward large brains, the most strongly replicated brain finding in autism. Brains of children (though not adults) in autism are upwardly shifted in their size distribution—about 20 percent

Continued on page 15

Autism Biology and the Environment

Continued from page 13

of autistic individuals have head circumferences over the 97th percentile, while most have head circumferences that are above average, while volumes measured by MRI in adults are not increased over controls. This finding needs further specification but it does not fit into localization-oriented models of brain-behavior correlation.⁵

- Widespread reductions in “functional connectivity”—the tightness of signaling coordination across the brain—that are also not strictly localized. Impaired connectivity could preferentially impact functions requiring the highest degrees of brain networking—such as autism’s three defining behavioral domains.⁹
- Evidence of inflammation and oxidative stress in autistic brain tissue from individuals ranging from childhood to middle age,¹¹ as well as in peripheral blood and urine samples.⁸ These changes are signs not of inborn alterations of brain architecture in otherwise healthy tissue, but rather of chronic and ongoing disease processes in the same class as those found in conditions such as Alzheimer’s disease, Parkinson’s disease or HIV.
- Common patterns of nonnervous system somatic illness, particularly involving the gastrointestinal and immune systems. These organ systems are both on the front lines of encounters with the environment.¹
- Mitochondrial abnormalities milder than would be expected from clear genetic etiology. Environmental toxins are known to inhibit mitochondrial metabolism.⁴
- A higher relative risk associated with combinations of gene polymor-

phisms in pathways associated with metabolic biotransformation of environmental chemicals. These involve environmentally responsive rather than brain- or behavior-associated genes.⁷

- Evidence of an increased “excitation-inhibition ratio” in the autistic brain. This could be a consequence of multiple genetic factors (e.g., GABA- or glutamate-related mutations) as well as multiple toxins (e.g., PCBs, heavy metals), which could interact to synergistically increase overall risk.¹⁰ It could also be related to metabolic changes that are not restricted to the brain but are systemic, including inflammation and oxidative stress. Indeed, the degree of environmental exposures may affect both whether genetic vulnerability turns into disease and how severe this disease becomes.

It can be argued that these are just the types of findings that one would predict from a gene-environment interaction model, where the environmental exposures are subtoxic, persistent and multiple. These levels of exposures alter the body’s signaling mechanisms without killing cells. In the brain, impacts may include subtle but pervasive changes in brain volume detectable only through volumetric measurement, as well as modest but systemic degradation of connectivity—just what we see in autism. And in the body, modest shifts may lead to a bias toward different disease patterns—e.g., autistic children appear to have reduced ability to fight infections but greater vulnerability to immune and autoimmune problems.

These findings raise a further question. Could common underlying mechanisms underlie both brain and body symptoms in autism? This question would probably not be asked from the “strongly genetic, brain-based” disease model vantage point, but it is central within a “systemic, gene-environment interaction” approach. If there are indeed such

common mechanisms, it has enormous implications for autism treatment targets. It would mean that instead of treating autism symptomatically (one set of treatments for behaviors, another for seizures, further medications for gastrointestinal disease and still others for the commonly seen allergies and recurrent ear infections), there might instead be a few underlying but strategic treatment targets that would address the basic causes driving inflammation, oxidative stress and the increased excitatory chemistry that may underlie both the defining behaviors and many other “comorbid” features. This argument is supported by the Fragile X mouse model, which has a glutamate receptor deficit; these animals show a spectrum of features ranging from repetitive behaviors and poor socialization to anxiety, sleep disorders and even gut dysmotility, all frequent in autism.² Moreover, we may be able to target certain final common pathways as treatment targets even though they are downstream of heterogeneous causal mechanisms.

We thus come around full circle, back to the children. How can we best help them? It appears that the “systemic, gene-environment” model for autism not only has support from research findings, but also opens a range of new avenues toward potential treatment targets that may give us fresh ways to improve quality of life and even level of functioning. While the idea of an autism epidemic is certainly disturbing, no one has definitively explained it away. Now we need to forthrightly look at the mechanisms such a phenomenon would imply, because they may contain keys not only to understanding autism but also to treating it.

Dr. Herbert is a pediatric neurologist at the Center of Morphometric Analysis, Massachusetts General Hospital. She can be reached at mherbert1@partners.org.

Continued on page 16

Autism Biology and the Environment

Continued from page 15

REFERENCES

1. Ashwood P, Van de Water J. A review of autism and the immune response. *Clin Dev Immunol* 11: 165-74; 2004.
2. Bear MF, Huber KM, Warren ST. The mGluR theory of fragile X mental retardation. *Trends Neurosci* 27:370-7; 2004.
3. Dawson G, Webb S, Schellenberg GD, et al. Defining the broader phenotype of autism: genetic, brain, and behavioral perspectives. *Dev Psychopathol* 14:581-611; 2002.
4. Filipek, PA, Juranek J, Nguyen MT, et al. Relative carnitine deficiency in autism. *J Autism Dev Disord* 34:615-23; 2004.
5. Herbert MR. Large brains in autism: the challenge of pervasive abnormality. *Neuroscientist* 11:417-40; 2005.
6. Herbert M. Autism: A brain disorder or a disorder that affects the brain? "Clinical Neuropsychiatry" In press.
7. James S, Melnyk S, Jernigan S. Low plasma methionine, cysteine, and glutathione levels are associated with increased frequency of common polymorphisms affecting methylation and glutathione pathways in children with autism. Abstract # 59.14. *FASEB Experimental Biology* 2005 19:A51-A522005.
8. James SJ, Cutler P, Melnyk S, et al. Metabolic biomarkers of increased oxidative stress and impaired methylation capacity in children with autism. *Am J Clin Nutr* 80:1611-7; 2004.
9. Just MA, Cherkassky VL, Keller TA, Minshew NJ. Cortical activation and synchronization during sentence comprehension in high-functioning autism: evidence of underconnectivity. *Brain* 127:1811-21; 2004.
10. Rubenstein JL, Merzenich MM. Model of autism: increased ratio of excitation/inhibition in key neural systems. *Genes Brain Behav* 2:255-67; 2003.
11. Vargas DL, Nascimbene C., Krishnan C, et al. Neuroglial activation and neuroinflammation in the brain of patients with autism. *Ann Neurol* 57:67-81; 2005. 

Fact Sheet on Interventions for Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD)

The National Academy of Sciences of the United States has conducted the most comprehensive, impartial review of comprehensive interventions for children with ASD currently available (Committee on Educational Interventions for Children with Autism, 2001). The academy report cites ten programs that have some research support behind them, including the three most widely used approaches—ABA Discrete Trial, TEACCH, and the Developmental, Individual-Difference, Relationship-Based (DIR-Floortime) model.

The academy report points out, however, that "although there is evidence that interventions lead to improvement, there does not appear to be a clear, direct relationship between any particular intervention and children's progress" (page 5). The report also states that while the majority of children participating in comprehensive programs make significant progress in at least some developmental domains, "methodological limitations preclude definitive attribution of that progress to specific procedures" (page 172). Furthermore, it points out "there are no adequate comparisons of different comprehensive treatments" (page 8) and "virtually no data on the relative merit of one model over another" (page 171).

In examining the research on the cited programs that have some evidence supporting them, the academy report further elaborates:

With regard to the ABA Discrete Trial Approach, an intensive behavioral intervention, the report indicates that the original 1987 Lovaas study showing 9 of 19 children with very good outcomes was limited by a number of methodological problems. The Academy report indicates that while there have been a number of studies on Discrete Trial approaches, only one followed strict scientific methods and used a clinical trial design: "Only one of the studies (Smith, Groen, & Wynn, 2000) practiced random assignment of children to conditions" (page 172). This more recent replication of the 1987 Lovaas study dealt with the original study's limitations. It showed, however, only modest educational gains (compared to the original study) and little to no emotional and social gains: "There were no significant changes in the children's diagnoses or their adaptive or problem behaviors" (page 171).

With regard to the TEACCH program, which combines developmental and behavioral elements, a number of studies are cited, including follow-up studies, and in one study comparing a home-based TEACCH program with an ABA Discrete Trial classroom, after four months, "The TEACCH home-based program showed more improvement...on imitation, on fine and gross motor skills, and on tests of nonverbal, conceptual skills" (page 170).

With regard to the Developmental, Individual-Difference, Relationship-Based (DIR-Floortime) approach, referred to in the academy report as the Developmental Intervention Model, it works on the building blocks of relating, communicating and thinking. The academy report cites a detailed review of 200 children with ASD receiving this approach (Greenspan & Wieder, 1997; Greenspan & Wieder, 1999) that shows that more than half the children had good to outstanding outcomes on the "Functional Emotional Assessment Scale" (high levels of language, creative and reflective thinking, and social interaction). A more in-depth examination of 20 of the highest functioning children detailed marked gains on the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (Sparrow, Balla, & Cicchetti, 1984) and the CARS autism rating scale (Schopler, Reichler, & Renner, 1988) (page 168).

Given that there is no definitive evidence for any one approach and no adequate comparisons of the different comprehensive approaches, the academy report recommends that "effective services will and should vary considerably across individual children, depending on a child's age, cognitive or language levels, behavioral needs, and family

Continued on page 20