Elevated inflammation in association with alcohol abuse among Blacks but not Whites: results from the MIDUS biomarker study
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Abstract
Some studies document racial disparities in self-reported health associated with alcohol use and abuse. However, few studies examined biomarkers that underlie the onset of alcohol-related chronic diseases. We investigated whether the association between alcohol abuse and five biomarkers of inflammation (CRP, IL-6, fibrinogen, E-selectin, sICAM-1) vary between Black and White Americans aged 35 to 84 \((n = 1173)\) from the Midlife in the United States Biomarker Study. Multivariable Ordinary Least Squares regressions were used to assess Black–White differences in the association between alcohol abuse and the biomarkers. Race moderated the association between alcohol abuse and CRP \((b = 0.56, SE = 0.28, p = 0.048)\), IL-6 \((b = 0.65, SE = 0.22, p = 0.004)\), and a composite inflammation score \((b = 0.014, SE = 0.07, p = 0.041)\). These findings potentially shed light for why alcohol has a stronger negative association with poorer health for Blacks compared to Whites. Analysis should be replicated in larger prospective cohorts.
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Abbreviations
BMI  Body mass index
CRP  C-reactive protein
CVD  Cardiovascular diseases
E-selectin  Endothelial leukocyte adhesion molecule-1
Alcohol abuse  Alcohol use disorders
ELISA  Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay
GCRC  General clinical research center
IL-6  Interleukin-6
MIDUS  Midlife in the United States Study
sICAM-1  Soluble intercellular adhesion molecule-1

Introduction
In the United States, approximately 88,000 lives are lost annually to behaviors that stem from alcohol abuse, which ranks third among leading causes of preventable mortality (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2016). Alcohol abuse is causally related to over 60 chronic conditions and diseases (Bauer et al., 2014; Connor et al., 2015), and is associated with elevated levels of inflammation among humans (Duell, 2012; Mathews et al., 2015). Biomarkers of inflammation such as C-reactive protein, fibrinogen, endothelial leukocyte adhesion molecule (E-selectin) and interleukin-6 (IL-6) are risk factors for several chronic diseases such as cardiovascular diseases (CVD), diabetes, heart attack, stroke, cancer, premature mortality (Agarwal & Seitz, 2001; Duell, 2012) and disability burden in the
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population (Maggio et al., 2006; The Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration, 2010; Friedman et al., 2015; McEwen, 2015).

Black Americans (hereafter Blacks) compared to Whites have higher rates of many of the chronic diseases (Mozaffarian et al., 2016) and cardiovascular mortality (Magnani et al., 2016) linked to the aforementioned inflammatory markers. At present, we do not yet know whether poorer health among Blacks is related to Black–White differences in the impact of alcohol abuse on inflammation.

On average, Blacks are less likely to drink alcohol than Whites (Chartier & Caetano, 2010), and have lower 12-month and lifetime risks of alcohol abuse and use disorder (AUD) (Grant et al., 2015). However, despite lower risks among Blacks, once alcohol abuse and dependence occurs, recurrent abuse/dependence is more persistent (Dawson et al., 2005). In addition, alcohol dependence was associated with accelerated health declines among Blacks compared to Whites, which in part may be attributed to higher risk of developing liver disease (Ehlers et al., 2007) and hepatitis B or C viral infections (Flores et al., 2008). Among individuals who consume alcohol, Blacks report more frequent heavy drinking than Whites (Sembros, 2003). Notably, among drinkers, Black–White differences in alcohol-related problems (social consequences and dependence) are largest at the lowest consumption level and were not significant at moderate or highest levels (Mulia et al., 2009).

Black–White differences in biomarkers of inflammation are well documented in multiple cross-sectional and prospective national cohort studies with large samples. For instance, in the National Social Life, Health and Aging Project the mean CRP level was three times higher among Blacks than among Whites (0.63 vs. 0.20 mg/L) (Herd et al., 2012). In the Multi Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA) study, Blacks had higher mean levels of IL-6 across categorical gradients of education and income (Ranjit et al., 2007). In the Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults (CARDIA) study, Black men and women independently had higher mean levels of both CRP and IL-6 than their White counterparts (Gruenewald et al., 2009).

To date, however, only a handful of studies investigated Black–White differences in alcohol-related health outcomes. The weight of current evidence documents more adverse alcohol-related health problems among Blacks compared to Whites (Zapolski et al., 2014). For example, among Blacks compared to Whites, excessive alcohol use was associated with higher mortality risk (Williams et al., 2012; Jackson et al., 2015), years of potential life lost (Shield et al., 2013), incidence of CVD (Fuchs et al., 2001, 2004) and breast cancer (Park et al., 2014). However, the existing studies have mainly examined mortality or self-reported health outcomes, and studies using biomarker health outcomes are rare.

Of those few existing studies, two showed that Blacks who consumed alcohol had markedly higher levels of two liver disease biomarkers—ascpartate aminotransferase and y-glutamyltransferase—compared to Whites (Stewart, 2002; Stranges et al., 2004). Those findings raise the question of whether the association between alcohol abuse and elevated levels of inflammation may be particularly pronounced for Blacks compared to Whites. This question is additionally supported by recent research documenting that alcohol abuse was associated with higher mean levels of norepinephrine and a sympathetic nervous system composite marker among Blacks but not Whites (Ransome et al., 2017).

Race is not a biologic variable that determines differential biological responses to alcohol, but rather a social construct that embodies a set of latent factors that can influence epigenetic alterations (Lillie-Blanton & Laveist, 1996) and these factors could have stronger negative impacts on Blacks compared to Whites. For instance, excessive exposures to chronic stressors have been found to contribute to greater levels and accelerated trajectories of physiological deteriorating among Blacks (Chae et al., 2014) and compared to Whites (Geronimus et al., 2006, 2007). The relationship between alcohol abuse and inflammation system dysregulation may be different for Blacks compared to Whites because of divergent environmental exposures, socioeconomic, and health behaviors; however, empirical quantification of these explanations are lacking.

In the present study, we examined Black–White differences in the association between alcohol abuse and five individual biomarkers of inflammation: CRP, IL-6, fibrinogen, E-selectin, and sICAM-1 and a composite inflammation score consisting of all five components to capture the overall inflammation burden. For any observed associations, we also investigated whether Black–White differences persisted net of sociodemographic characteristics, health behaviors, and medication use.

Sample

Data were drawn from the biomarker subsample of the Midlife in the United States (MIDUS) Study. MIDUS I (n = 7108) recruited individuals ages 25–74 years between the years of January 1995 and September 1996 from a national random-digit-dial sample of non-institutionalized adults living in the 48 contiguous states (Love et al., 2010). The sample was designed to include siblings for some participants and pairs of twins. Between 2004 and 2006, a follow up survey (MIDUS II) was conducted among persons from MIDUS I, yielding a 70% response rate (n = 4963). During this survey period, a supplement sample of Black Americans (n = 592) was recruited from Milwaukee, WI. The goal of that supplement was to increase the number of Black Americans in MIDUS II and to enable analyses of psychosocial determinants of health in a highly segregated
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Alcohol abuse in MIDUS (in the past 12 months) was
captured using a computer-aided personal interview device
and assessed with a five-item modified Michigan Alcohol-
ism Screening Test (MAST) (Selzer et al., 1975). MAST is
a diagnostic measure used in the clinical settings to access
alcohol abuse, which exhibited comparable levels of validity
to other commonly used scales such as CAGE and AUDIT
(Gibbs, 1983; Hays et al., 1995). The 5-item MAST ques-
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yes or no. The responses were summed and alcohol abuse is
dichotomized into 1 if a respondent answered yes to at least
one of the four items, and computed only among cases with
at least one valid response to the four questions. In MIDUS
II, question (e) was not available. However, the internal con-
sistency coefficient (Cronbach’s α) for the 5-item MAST
based on MIDUS I was 0.67 for Blacks and 0.75 for Whites and
the Cronbach’s α for the four items (a–d) was 0.68 for
Blacks and 0.73 for Whites. In MIDUS II, the Cronbach’s α
for the four remaining items was 0.76 for Blacks and 0.70 for
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Race was assessed via self-report and includes (Black vs.
White, only).

Sociodemographic covariates were: sex (men vs. women);
age (continuously in years), educational attainment (continu-
ously in years of schooling), and household income (catego-
rized in 3 equal sample groups, a fourth group assigned for
missing responses).

Health behaviors were selected based on prior studies as
potential confounders of alcohol abuse and or in relation to
physiological biomarkers of inflammation (Volpato et al.,
2004; Oliveira et al., 2010; Galán et al., 2014). Drinking fre-
cuity in the past month (never drinking, drinking < 1 day/
week, 1 or 2 days/week, 3 or 4 days/week, 5 or 6 days/week, and every day). Smoking history (yes if ever smoked regularly—corresponding to smoking a few cigarettes every day vs. no); physical activity (defined as greater than or equal to 20 min three times per week vs. no) and fast food consumption (never vs. less than once per week vs. once per week and more).

**Health and medication use variables**

BMI (calculated using height and weight measured by the GCRC staff [continuously in kg/m²]); self-reported physician-diagnosed history of ever having cardiovascular disease (CVD) (including stroke, heart attack, angina, and chest pain, yes, no, or borderline/unsure); diabetes mellitus (yes, no, unsure/borderline); high blood pressure (yes, no, unsure/borderline). Medication use (anti-hypertensive, lipid-lowering, corticosteroid, and antidepressant) were all binary variables (yes, no).

**Statistical analyses**

All analyses were performed using STATA 14.1. Descriptive statistics included means and standard deviations for continuous variables and number and percent for binary or categorical variables. Statistical significance was assessed at \( p < 0.05 \). Multivariable analysis was performed using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models to examine the independent association of race and alcohol abuse on each inflammatory marker for Blacks and Whites pooled, adjusting for covariates: age, sex, education, income, and health behaviors (e.g., drinking frequency, smoking, physical activity) (Model 1). We then included an interaction term, alcohol abuse by race to examine effect modification on the inflammation makers adjusted for covariates (Model 2). We then added the health and medication use variables (BMI, CVD, diabetes, high blood pressure, and medications for anti-hypertensive, lipid-lowering, corticosteroid, and antidepressant) to Model 2, to examine what happened to the alcohol abuse by race coefficient (Model 3) given it is possible that dysregulation of the inflammation system due to alcohol abuse could contribute to chronic disease.

For the multivariable analysis, we addressed any potential non-normality of the error term due to small sample size in the race variable and potential heteroscedasticity in the exposure. Specifically, bootstrapped estimates of the standard errors stratified by alcohol abuse were conducted via 500 iterations using the bias corrected and accelerated (bca) method (Carpenter & Bithell, 2000) and robust standard errors were retrieved. There were too few pairs among Blacks to clustering by twin siblings and parameter estimates failed to converge. Therefore, we continued using OLS regression for all analyses.

Alcohol by race interactions were assessed for statistical significant through a Wald Chi squared test with one degree of freedom at \( p < 0.05 \). To provide visual representation of significant interactions only, we computed the marginal predicted mean and 95% confidence interval of the biomarkers for Blacks and Whites and plotted with bar graphs, adjusting for sociodemographic, health behaviors, health and medication use variables (i.e., from Model 3). For CRP only, we conducted sensitivity analysis removing individuals with levels > 10 (n = 23 Blacks and n = 27 Whites) since it may not be possible to determine if inflammation is legitimate or due to an acute infection. There were no differences in results when those individuals were included or excluded. We present all results for CRP with the sample inclusive of individuals with levels over 10.

**Results**

Table 1 shows that alcohol abuse is nearly twice as common among Blacks (7.9%) than among Whites (4.2%), \( p = 0.21 \). Blacks were on average 4 years younger, had higher a proportion of females, lower years of educational attainment and lower household income than Whites. Blacks were more likely to never/do not drink (45 vs. 32.2%) but more likely to smoke regularly, exercise less, and had high blood pressure and diabetes than White respondents (all \( p < 0.001 \)). For sICAM-1, there was no significant difference by race (\( p = 0.643 \)). For all other inflammatory outcomes, Blacks had higher mean serum levels than Whites (all \( p \) values < 0.001).

Table 2 presents OLS regression results for the main associations and interaction associations between alcohol abuse by race on the biomarkers. Model 1 shows the independent associations of race and alcohol abuse and on each biomarker adjusted for sociodemographic and health behavior variables. Blacks had higher levels of CRP: \( b \) (SE) = 0.32 (0.10), \( p = 0.001 \); IL-6: \( b \) (SE) = 0.36 (0.06), \( p = 0.000 \); fibrinogen: \( b \) (SE) = 41.92 (7.24), \( p = 0.001 \); E-selectin \( b \) (SE) = 8.46 (2.09), \( p = 0.000 \); and inflammation summary score \( b \) (SE) = 0.12 (0.02), \( p = 0.000 \) compared to Whites. Statistically, alcohol abuse was not independently associated with any of the outcomes.

Model 2 shows results from the interaction of alcohol abuse by race on the inflammatory biomarkers adjusted for sociodemographic and health behaviors variables (e.g., age, gender, education, income, drinking, smoking, physical activity, fast food). The data revealed a significant interaction for race by alcohol abuse on IL-6 \( [Wald \chi^2 (1) = 6.43, p = 0.011] \) but not for the other biomarkers or the composite score. Adjusted models indicated that the positive association between alcohol abuse and IL-6 \( [b \) (SE) = 0.55 (0.21), \( p = 0.010] \) was stronger for Blacks relative to Whites.
Model 3 shows that an interaction of alcohol abuse by race on CRP and composite inflammation score emerged after additionally adjusting for health and medication use variables (e.g., Model 2 + BMI, history of CVD, blood pressure, and medication use); the test for race by alcohol abuse impact on CRP was [Wald $\chi^2 (1) = 3.85$, $p = 0.049$].

### Table 1

**Characteristics of White and Black/African American respondents in this study; Midlife in the United States Study (MIDUS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White ($n = 958$)</th>
<th>Black/African American ($n = 215$)</th>
<th>$p$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol abuse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40 (4.2)</td>
<td>17 (7.9)</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflammatory markers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP (mg/L)</td>
<td>2.7 (4.4)</td>
<td>4.5 (6.4)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL-6 (pg/mL)</td>
<td>2.8 (2.8)</td>
<td>4.1 (3.7)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrinogen (mg/dL)</td>
<td>339.5 (83.1)</td>
<td>388.6 (96.4)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-selectin (ng/mL)</td>
<td>41.3 (20.7)</td>
<td>52.1 (28.9)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sICAM-1 (ng/mL)</td>
<td>288.8 (100.1)</td>
<td>283.2 (169.2)</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite inflammation summary score$^a$</td>
<td>0.24 (0.25)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.27)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociodemographic variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>55.4 (11.8)</td>
<td>51.1 (10.6)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>438 (45.7)</td>
<td>71 (33.0)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>506 (54.3)</td>
<td>144 (67.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education$^b$</td>
<td>7.8 (2.4)</td>
<td>6.1 (2.5)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 (mean, $$13,572)</td>
<td>231 (24.1)</td>
<td>122 (56.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 (mean, $$34,865)</td>
<td>346 (36.1)</td>
<td>65 (30.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 (mean, $$74, 305)</td>
<td>374 (39.0)</td>
<td>28 (13.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7 (0.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health behavior variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never/don’t drink</td>
<td>309 (32.2)</td>
<td>97 (45.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; One day per week</td>
<td>268 (28.0)</td>
<td>50 (23.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or two days per week</td>
<td>150 (15.7)</td>
<td>30 (13.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or four days per week</td>
<td>85 (08.9)</td>
<td>27 (12.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or six days per week</td>
<td>54 (05.6)</td>
<td>04 (1.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>92 (09.6)</td>
<td>07 (03.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking history (% ever smoked regularly)</td>
<td>421 (43.9)</td>
<td>131 (60.9)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity (20 min) ≥ 3 times/week (% yes)</td>
<td>766 (80.0)</td>
<td>138 (64.2)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food consumption (% &gt; once per week)</td>
<td>464 (48.4)</td>
<td>104 (48.4)</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and medication use variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body mass index</td>
<td>29.0 (5.9)</td>
<td>32.6 (8.3)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVD diagnosis (% yes)</td>
<td>113 (11.8)</td>
<td>25 (11.6)</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes diagnosis (% yes)</td>
<td>92 (09.6)</td>
<td>52 (24.2)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure diagnosis (% yes)</td>
<td>317 (33.1)</td>
<td>115 (53.5)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medication use (% yes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure medication</td>
<td>333 (34.8)</td>
<td>100 (46.5)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol medication</td>
<td>284 (29.6)</td>
<td>45 (20.9)</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corticosteroid medication$^c$</td>
<td>120 (12.5)</td>
<td>19 (8.4)</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-depressant medication</td>
<td>151 (15.8)</td>
<td>14 (06.5)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$The composite inflammation score ranges from 0 to 5

$^b$Education (6 = 1–2 years of college no degree yet, 7 = 3 or more years of college no degree yet

$^c$Corticosteroid medication includes adrenals, estrogens, antiestrogens and estrogen agonists-antagonists
positive association between alcohol abuse and CRP was stronger for Blacks relative to Whites [b (SE) = 0.56 (0.28), p = 0.048]. Figure 1a shows that the level of CRP among Blacks with alcohol abuse is nearly double that observed among Blacks who do not report alcohol abuse (4.83 vs. 9.13 mg/L, p = 0.049), whereas there were no statistical differences between White non-abusers and abusers (2.76 vs. 3.09 mg/L).

The significant Black–White difference of alcohol abuse on IL-6 remained and the magnitude was larger than in Model 2 [b (SE) = 0.65 (0.22), p = 0.004] after adjusted for socio-demographics, health behaviors, and health medication use variables. Figure 1b shows the marginal predicted means of IL-6 adjusted for variables from Model 3. Among Blacks, alcohol abuse was associated with upregulated levels of IL-6 serum (3.93 pg/mL) that was more than twice times the levels for established clinical cut-point (3.09 pg/mL) and compared to the levels among Whites with alcohol abuse (2.42 pg/mL). Among Whites, there was no significant difference in IL-6 serum between those who abuse and did not abuse alcohol.

Black–White differences in the association between alcohol abuse and the composite inflammation score was significant [Wald $X^2 (1) = 4.16$, $p = 0.041$]. Among Blacks, alcohol abuse was associated with an elevated composite inflammation score (0.53 vs. 0.41), which was more than twice times higher than the level among White abusers (0.23) (Fig. 1c).
Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study to report that Blacks significantly differ from Whites in the association between alcohol abuse and CRP, pro-inflammatory cytokine IL-6, and composite inflammation score. Our analysis extends prior studies that investigated Black–White differences in alcohol abuse and mortality, breast cancer and self-reported health outcomes. Although multiple physiological systems interact to produce health disparities (Seeman et al., 2010), we focused on biomarkers of inflammation because of the strong links to multiple chronic disease and mortality outcomes (e.g. CVD and cancer) for which Blacks have a higher prevalence.

The direction of Black–White association found in this study is consistent with the wider literature that shows a stronger negative association between alcohol and health for Blacks compared to Whites (Zapolski et al., 2014). Our findings that Blacks overall had higher levels of CRP and IL-6 are also consistent with current evidence (O’Connor et al., 2009, Paalani et al., 2011). These findings for IL-6 are clinically significant because the observed levels associated with alcohol abuse were more than double the established levels for risk of heart attack, stroke, and cardiovascular-related mortality (Ridker, 2003; Liu et al., 2004). The results of the impact of alcohol abuse on CRP and composite inflammation score—which conceptualizes overall burden of inflammation also have clinical relevance. Black–White differences in CRP and composite inflammation score emerged after health and medication use variables were adjusted, which suggests that medication use could be protective of CRP and overall inflammation dysregulation.

The Black–White differences in the association between alcohol abuse and IL-6, CRP, and the composite inflammation score was robust net adjustments for health behaviors and health and medication use variables (e.g., smoking, drinking, CVD, BMI, blood pressure medication), which suggests that association may be due to other non-health related factors. Emerging evidence documents both direct and effect modifying epigenetic pathways between environmental pollutants and psychosocial stressors as potential sources of health disparities (Kuzawa & Sweet, 2009; Thayer & Kuzawa, 2011). Environmental stressor exposures have been linked to epigenetic alterations in individual’s risk of alcohol use and abuse (Moonat & Pandey, 2012) and may be a potential source of Black–White differences in physiological health.

The connections among environmental pollutants and epigenetic alterations that potentially drive Black–White disparities could be illustrated with the following. For instance, Blacks live in neighborhoods with higher

![Graphs showing predicted mean levels of CRP, IL-6, and composite inflammation score by alcohol abuse for Black and White respondents. Estimates were derived from OLS regression model as described in the text and results in Table 2, model 3 which was adjusted for age, sex, education, income, drinking frequency, smoking, exercise, body mass index, fast food consumption, diagnosis of cardiovascular, diabetes, and blood pressure), and medication use (blood pressure, cholesterol, steroid, and anti-depressant medications)]
exposure to a range of ecologic stressors including poverty, violence, and air pollution (Boardman et al., 2001). Blacks in these environments also have fewer access to healthy forms of coping (Akins et al., 2010). The environment affordances model demonstrates that Blacks in comparison to Whites engage in behaviors such as drinking to cope with stress associated with disadvantaged environments, which protects against mental disorder but, paradoxically, deteriorates their physiological health (Mezuk et al., 2013). Moreover, empirical studies show that alcohol abuse is related to stress and social disadvantage among Blacks more strongly than it is among Whites (Mulia et al., 2008; Karriker-Jaffe et al., 2012).

One example of a potential epigenetic pathway is the effects of air pollution, which is an exposure more concentrated in low-income communities with high proportion of racial/ethnic minorities (Clougherty & Kubzansky, 2009). Air pollution is associated with epigenetic alterations (Zhong et al., 2017) and significantly higher levels of psychological distress among Blacks compared to Whites (Sass et al., 2017). Air pollution has also been associated with higher rates of cardiovascular disease (Zeka et al., 2006) through pathways of dysregulated allostatic load, which includes inflammation system markers (Clougherty & Kubzansky, 2009). Epigenetic studies showed that air pollution was associated with higher CRP, ICAM-1, and fibrinogen levels and that effect was stronger among individuals with higher degrees of LINE-1 DNA-methylation, a surrogate marker for global genome methylation (Bind et al., 2012). In addition, there is a small but emerging evidence of racial differences in DNA methylation (Terry et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2011).

Currently, we are unaware of any empirical studies that evaluated whether the interaction between epigenetic and psychosocial mechanisms can account for Black–White differences in the alcohol-health association, thus is one potential avenue of future research. The findings of non-statistically significant difference in CRP and lower but non-significant IL-6 levels among Whites with alcohol abuse compared to Whites without abuse is unclear and deserves further research.

There are some limitations with this study. Although MIDUS II allowed us to examine alcohol abuse in a population-based sample of Blacks, the sample with alcohol abuse was small. However, we adjusted statistically for sample size through bootstrapping and obtained robust standard errors—a technique which strengthen confidence in coefficient estimates produced from analyses involving effect modification (Preacher et al., 2007). The relatively few number of respondents endorsing alcohol abuse could have also reduced power to detect associations with the biomarkers. Next, the sample of Blacks was primarily from Milwaukee, WI in contrast to Whites who were selected from a wider geographic distribution. Milwaukee has high levels of racial residential segregation, which gives rise to place-based disparities in conditions that facilitate risk of alcohol abuse, higher incidence of chronic diseases, and racial disparities in health (Williams & Collins, 2001). Thus, Blacks in this sample could be at higher risk for alcohol abuse as well as inflammation burden. For example, HIV infection is associated with elevated levels of IL-6 plasma (Breen et al., 1990). Data from 2015 revealed the prevalence of Black people living with diagnosed HIV infection in Milwaukee was 55% compared to 26% among Whites (AIDSVu, 2017). Compared to Whites, on average, Blacks were found to have lower rates of antiretroviral therapy (ART) medication adherence, likely due to limited health care access (Simoni et al., 2012). We did not have chronic HIV infection data to adjust in multivariable analyses, thus it is possible that HIV infection could be an unobserved confounder.

In MIDUS II, only four of five MAST items were measured. However, we show that reliability based on the four-item measure was fair to good compared to the original 5-item measure and had good reliability for both Blacks and Whites. No available published evidence exists about race/ethnic differences in the psychometric properties of the MAST. We found that a higher prevalence of alcohol abuse among Blacks in the sample. This is in contrast to what is reported in The National Epidemiological Survey on Alcohol Related Conditions (NESARC), wave 2, which was conducted around a similar time as MIDUS II (Hasin et al., 2007). However, NESARC contained a national oversample of Blacks, which could potentially explain these differences in prevalence. Nevertheless, alcohol consumption is implicit in an alcohol abuse diagnosis. Thus, our finding of higher alcohol abuse prevalence corroborates with existing evidence showing that among drinkers, Blacks experience a greater number of alcohol abuse and dependence symptoms than Whites (Mulia et al., 2009; Chartier & Caetano, 2010; Witbrodt et al., 2014).

Moreover, while there are known differences in the risk and prevalence of alcohol abuse between men and women across race/ethnicity (Chartier et al., 2013), we could not further analyze the data by sex because of the small sample size. The MIDUS II biomarker study was also cross-sectional, thus our results are limited to correlational associations. If our study is replicated in larger prospective cohorts and results hold, this could suggest that proximate-level interventions consider clinical and behavioral approaches that provide coping alternatives to stem alcohol abuse and reduce inflammation burden.

In conclusion alcohol abuse was associated with elevated levels of IL-6, CRP, and a composite score reflecting overall inflammation burden among Black but not among White respondents. Replication of this study in larger prospective cohorts with greater representation of Blacks and Whites is necessary to confirm these findings.
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