

Additional file 5: Supplementary Tables

Table S3 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy drinkers vs. non-drinkers using different marker sets

Table S4 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy drinkers vs. light drinkers using different marker sets.

Table S5 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy drinkers vs. light and non-drinkers using different marker sets.

Table S6 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy drinkers vs. at-risk drinkers using different marker sets.

Table S7 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of at-risk drinkers vs. non-drinkers using different marker sets.

Table S8 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of at-risk drinkers vs. light drinkers using different marker sets.

Table S9 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of light drinkers vs. non-drinkers using different marker sets.

Table S10 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy and at-risk drinkers vs. light and non-drinkers using different marker sets.

Table S11 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy, at-risk and light drinkers vs. non-drinker using different marker sets.

Table legend: Table S3- Table S11

Prediction accuracy for alcohol consumption expressed as Area Under the Curve (AUC) using the CpG marker sets from Liu *et al.* ‘Internal Validation’: Obtained AUCs using ten-fold cross-validation in the model building data set; ‘External Validation’: AUCs from external validation by applying our model trained in the model building dataset to data from three external validation cohorts (Rotterdam Study, N= 648; SHIP-Trend, N= 433; and TwinsUK, N= 713 and N=442). Based on interview or self-reported information, non-drinkers were defined as participants with no alcohol consumption; light drinkers with an alcohol consumption of $0 < \text{g per day} \leq 28$ in men and $0 < \text{g per day} \leq 14$ in women; and heavy drinkers with an alcohol consumption of ≥ 42 g per day in men and ≥ 28 g per day in women. Abbreviations: RS- The Rotterdam Study; TwinsUK- The TwinsUK Study; TwinsUK2- Subset of the TwinsUK Study; SHIP- Study of Health in Pomerania-Trend cohort; ABS- Null model including only age, body mass index, and sex.

Table S3 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy drinkers vs. non-drinkers using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.78±0.06	0.80	0.84	0.68	0.60
78-CpGs	0.81±0.06	0.85	0.83	0.66	0.63
23-CpGs	0.83±0.05	0.81	0.87	0.65	0.61
5-CpGs	0.83±0.05	0.89	0.79	0.60	0.58
ABS	0.73±0.05	0.81	0.68	0.52	0.50

Table S4 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy drinkers vs. light drinkers using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.73±0.06	0.72	0.84	0.57	0.53
78-CpGs	0.74±0.04	0.76	0.89	0.57	0.53
23-CpGs	0.74±0.04	0.73	0.85	0.57	0.54
5-CpGs	0.72±0.04	0.84	0.77	0.56	0.52
ABS	0.59±0.07	0.76	0.71	0.57	0.55

Table S5 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy drinkers vs. light and non-drinkers using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.73±0.05	0.74	0.85	0.60	0.54
78-CpGs	0.75±0.07	0.76	0.89	0.61	0.55
23-CpGs	0.73±0.12	0.75	0.85	0.60	0.55
5-CpGs	0.72±0.10	0.86	0.78	0.59	0.54
ABS	0.59±0.08	0.78	0.72	0.58	0.55

Table S6 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy drinkers vs. at-risk drinkers using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.62±0.06	0.66	0.63	0.51	0.53
78-CpGs	0.62±0.05	0.77	0.72	0.53	0.54
23-CpGs	0.66±0.07	0.82	0.73	0.51	0.60
5-CpGs	0.67±0.05	0.88	0.65	0.48	0.57
ABS	0.66±0.06	0.84	0.58	0.54	0.53

Table S7 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of at-risk drinkers vs. non-drinkers using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.69±0.04	0.67	0.67	0.60	0.68
78-CpGs	0.70±0.06	0.62	0.66	0.60	0.67
23-CpGs	0.73±0.04	0.63	0.55	0.57	0.62
5-CpGs	0.73±0.04	0.57	0.56	0.56	0.57
ABS	0.66±0.06	0.57	0.53	0.52	0.53

Table S8 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of at-risk drinkers vs. light drinkers using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.62±0.05	0.58	0.49	0.59	0.66
78-CpGs	0.64±0.05	0.62	0.49	0.59	0.68
23-CpGs	0.65±0.05	0.65	0.50	0.58	0.69
5-CpGs	0.66±0.07	0.67	0.50	0.60	0.68
ABS	0.58±0.06	0.59	0.57	0.47	0.52

Table S9 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of light drinkers vs. non-drinkers using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.61±0.04	0.59	0.54	0.50	0.52
78-CpGs	0.65±0.04	0.58	0.52	0.51	0.54
23-CpGs	0.66±0.03	0.56	0.51	0.52	0.53
5-CpGs	0.67±0.03	0.56	0.53	0.53	0.52
ABS	0.67±0.03	0.54	0.54	0.53	0.54

Table S10 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy and at-risk drinkers vs. light and non-drinkers using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.67±0.02	0.61	0.66	0.61	0.61
78-CpGs	0.68±0.03	0.65	0.70	0.60	0.65
23-CpGs	0.68±0.04	0.65	0.66	0.60	0.63
5-CpGs	0.67±0.05	0.65	0.66	0.60	0.62

Table S11 Accuracy of epigenetic inference of heavy, at-risk and light drinkers vs. non-drinker using different marker sets.

<i>Marker set</i>	<i>Internal validation</i>	<i>External validation</i>			
		<i>RS</i>	<i>SHIP-Trend</i>	<i>TwinsUK</i>	<i>TwinsUK2</i>
144-CpGs	0.55±0.04	0.61	0.62	0.57	0.59
78-CpGs	0.56±0.05	0.61	0.60	0.59	0.63
23-CpGs	0.55±0.05	0.58	0.60	0.58	0.57
5-CpGs	0.54±0.04	0.61	0.54	0.58	0.59