

## Evidence for a shared genetic contribution to loneliness and Borderline Personality Disorder

Anna Schulze<sup>1\*</sup>; Fabian Streit, PhD<sup>2\*</sup>; Lea Zillich<sup>2</sup>; Swapnil Awasthi<sup>3,4</sup>; Alisha S M Hall<sup>2,5,6</sup>; Martin Jungkunz, PhD<sup>7</sup>; Nikolaus Kleindienst, PhD<sup>8</sup>; Josef Frank<sup>2</sup>; Cornelia E Schwarze, PhD<sup>9</sup>; Norbert Dahmen, MD<sup>10</sup>; Björn H Schott, MD, PhD<sup>11,12,13</sup>; Markus Nöthen, MD<sup>14</sup>; Arian Mobascher, MD<sup>15</sup>; Dan Rujescu, MD<sup>16</sup>; Klaus Lieb, MD<sup>10</sup>; Stefan Roepke, MD<sup>17</sup>; Sabine C Herpertz, MD<sup>18</sup>; Christian Schmahl, MD<sup>8</sup>; Martin Bohus, MD<sup>8,19</sup>; Stephan Ripke, MD, PhD<sup>3,4,20</sup>; Marcella Rietschel, PhD<sup>2</sup>; Stefanie Lis, PhD<sup>1,8\*</sup>; Stephanie Witt, PhD<sup>2\*</sup>

\*contributed equally

Word Count: 4.664

<sup>1</sup>Department of Clinical Psychology, Central Institute of Mental Health, Medical Faculty Mannheim, Heidelberg University, Mannheim, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Department of Genetic Epidemiology in Psychiatry, Central Institute of Mental Health, Medical Faculty Mannheim, Heidelberg University, Mannheim, Germany

<sup>3</sup>Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA

<sup>4</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Campus Mitte, Berlin, Germany

<sup>5</sup>Department of Clinical Medicine, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

<sup>6</sup>Department of Affective Disorders, Aarhus University Hospital-Psychiatry, Aarhus, Denmark

<sup>7</sup>Section for Translational Medical Ethics, National Center for Tumor Diseases, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>8</sup>Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, Central Institute of Mental Health, Medical Faculty Mannheim, Heidelberg University, Germany

<sup>9</sup>Department of Developmental and Biological Psychology, Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>10</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Mainz, Mainz, Germany

<sup>11</sup>Leibniz Institute for Neurobiology, Magdeburg, Germany

<sup>12</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

<sup>13</sup>German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Göttingen, Germany

<sup>14</sup>Institute of Human Genetics, University Hospital Bonn, Bonn, Germany

<sup>15</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, St. Elisabeth Krankenhaus Lahnstein, Lahnstein, Germany

<sup>16</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

<sup>17</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Neuroscience, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

<sup>18</sup>Department of General Psychiatry, Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Medical Faculty, Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>19</sup>Department of Clinical Psychology, Ruhr University Bochum, Bochum, Germany

<sup>20</sup>Massachusetts General Hospital and Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Analytic and Translational Genetics Unit, Boston, MA, USA

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

Corresponding Author: Anna Schulze ([anna.schulze@zi-mannheim.de](mailto:anna.schulze@zi-mannheim.de), +49 621 1703 4409)

Co-Corresponding Author: Fabian Streit ([fabian.streit@zi-mannheim.de](mailto:fabian.streit@zi-mannheim.de))

Central Institute of Mental Health, P.O. Box 12 21 20, 68072 Mannheim, Germany

1 **Abstract**

2 Loneliness, influenced by genetic and environmental factors such as childhood maltreatment, is one  
3 aspect of interpersonal dysfunction in Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD). Numerous studies link  
4 loneliness and BPD and twin studies indicate a genetic contribution to this association. The aim of  
5 our study was to investigate whether genetic predisposition for loneliness and BPD risk overlap and  
6 whether genetic risk for loneliness contributes to higher loneliness reported by BPD patients, using  
7 genome-wide genotype data. We assessed the genetic correlation of genome-wide association  
8 studies (GWAS) of loneliness and BPD using linkage disequilibrium score regression and tested  
9 whether a polygenic score for loneliness (loneliness-PGS) was associated with case-control status in  
10 two independent genotyped samples of BPD patients and healthy controls (HC; Witt2017-sample:  
11 998 BPD, 1545 HC; KFO-sample: 187 BPD, 261 HC). In the KFO-sample, we examined associations of  
12 loneliness-PGS with reported loneliness, and whether the loneliness-PGS influenced the association  
13 between childhood maltreatment and loneliness. We found a genetic correlation between the GWAS  
14 of loneliness and BPD in the Witt2017-sample ( $r_g = .23, p = .015$ ), a positive association of loneliness-  
15 PGS with BPD case-control status (Witt2017-sample:  $NkR^2 = 2.3\%, p = 2.7 \times 10^{-12}$ ; KFO-sample:  $NkR^2 =$   
16  $6.6\%, p = 4.4 \times 10^{-6}$ ), and a positive association between loneliness-PGS and loneliness across patient  
17 and control groups in the KFO-sample ( $\beta = .185, p = .002$ ). The loneliness-PGS did not moderate the  
18 association between childhood maltreatment and loneliness in BPD. Our study is the first to use  
19 genome-wide genotype data to show that the genetic factors underlying variation in loneliness in the  
20 general population and the risk for BPD overlap. The loneliness-PGS was associated with reported  
21 loneliness. Further research is needed to investigate which genetic mechanisms and pathways are  
22 involved in this association and whether a genetic predisposition for loneliness contributes to BPD  
23 risk.

24 *Keywords:* Borderline Personality Disorder; Loneliness; Polygenic Score

## 25 **1 Introduction**

26 A pervasive feeling of loneliness is one aspect of interpersonal dysfunction in Borderline Personality  
27 Disorder (BPD) [1]. It is defined as a negative affective state resulting from the discrepancy between  
28 desired and experienced social connectedness [2]. Objective social isolation may contribute to feelings  
29 of loneliness, but it is neither necessary nor sufficient to fully explain them: for example, people who  
30 are embedded in a large social network may feel lonely, whereas people with a small number of social  
31 contacts may not [3]. A short-lasting acute experience of loneliness is assumed to have a beneficial  
32 evolutionary function, promoting behaviours to reconnect to the social environment [4]. In contrast,  
33 long-lasting feelings of loneliness have been linked to an increased risk to health and a detrimental  
34 effect on the course of both somatic and mental disorders [5-7]. It has been discussed for a long time  
35 that loneliness is partly attributable to environmental factors like childhood maltreatment as well as  
36 to genetic factors, which is supported by the results of family and twin studies [8-10]. In the recent  
37 years, genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have identified genetic variation associated with  
38 loneliness [11] and, to a lesser degree, with BPD [12]. Despite findings from twin studies supporting a  
39 genetic correlation between BPD and loneliness, it has not yet been investigated whether the genetic  
40 variants associated with loneliness are more common in individuals with BPD. Therefore, the current  
41 study uses genome-wide genetic data to assess the genetic and phenotypic overlap between loneliness  
42 and BPD and explore its association with childhood maltreatment.

43 While loneliness is a transdiagnostic feature of psychopathology, it plays a central role in interpersonal  
44 dysfunction in BPD: individuals with BPD often report a lack of sense of belonging and the fear of being  
45 abandoned or socially excluded [13]. BPD is a personality disorder with a prevalence of 0.92–1.90 % in  
46 western countries [14], associated with a high economic burden to the health care system and  
47 economy [e.g. 15] and partly attributable to genetic factors [12]. Adler and Buie observed intensely  
48 painful aloneness as a core experiential state in their characterological work with BPD patients already  
49 in 1979 [16], Gunderson emphasized that the fear of aloneness discriminates BPD from other  
50 personality disorders [1] and contributes to their high sensitivity towards social rejection [17, 18].

51 Additionally, the interpersonal style of BPD patients, characterized as intense and unstable, maintains  
52 the pattern of recurrent interpersonal problems [17]. Several studies have shown increased levels of  
53 loneliness in BPD, which have been linked to smaller social networks [19, 20]. Furthermore, loneliness  
54 in BPD is linked to impairments of social-cognitive processing such as the experienced confidence in  
55 one's own social-emotional judgments [21] and the strength of basic affiliative behaviors, such as  
56 behavioral mimicry [22]. BPD patients describe the feeling of loneliness as a persisting state arising as  
57 early as in childhood [23], suggesting that an increased propensity towards loneliness might be  
58 apparent at an early age already. Disorder-specific therapeutic interventions are successful in  
59 improving acute symptoms such as impulsivity or non-suicidal self-harming behaviours, but are less  
60 effective in reducing the feeling of loneliness with consequences for persistence of impairments in the  
61 patients' social functioning level [24, 25]. Therefore, a deeper understanding of the determinants of  
62 loneliness in BPD is of particular interest.

63 Genetic studies have contributed substantially to our understanding of inter-individual differences in  
64 mental health [26]. Twin and family studies aim to estimate the influence of genetic and environmental  
65 influences on the variation of traits or disorder risk using the information on genetic relatedness and  
66 shared family environment [27]. As a complementary approach, genome-wide association studies  
67 (GWAS) aim to identify single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), i.e. common changes of single base  
68 pairs in the DNA, associated with a specific phenotype. For psychiatric symptoms and disorders, the so  
69 called SNP-based heritability, i.e. the variance explained by the common variants assessed in a GWAS,  
70 usually accounts for around one third of the heritabilities estimated in twin studies [26]. Besides  
71 insights into specific genes and pathways involved in disease etiology, GWAS also allow the estimation  
72 to what degree the association signal, and thereby the underlying genetic factors, are shared between  
73 disorders and traits. For example, genetic correlations are point estimates of the genetic similarity, and  
74 can be estimated using summary statistics of independent GWAS with linkage disequilibrium (LD)-  
75 score regression [28]. Another approach is the calculation of polygenic scores (PGS) based on the  
76 identified associations in GWAS (discovery samples) in independent target samples of healthy or

77 affected individuals, representing the individual's propensity towards a disease or trait [29]. PGS of  
78 psychiatric phenotypes still only explain a limited amount of variance and are therefore not applicable  
79 in clinical practice. However, they have the advantage that they can be also computed in smaller  
80 samples, and have proven to be a useful tool in research to investigate, for example, the association  
81 of the genetic predisposition to a trait with related phenotypes.

82 Family and twin studies demonstrate that genetic factors contribute to BPD as well as to loneliness.  
83 The heritability of BPD is estimated to be around 46–69% [30, 31], while genetic factors explain  
84 approximately 38–48% of the variance in loneliness in adults [8-10]. Analyses of shared genetic and  
85 environmental factors for borderline personality features and loneliness revealed a high genetic  
86 correlation of  $r = .64$ , but also a unique environmental correlation of  $r = .40$  in a twin study [32].  
87 Findings of another twin study indicated that loneliness might mainly be a consequence of the genetic  
88 determinants of BPD traits [33].

89 A GWAS assessing borderline personality features as a dimensional trait found a SNP-heritability of  
90 23% [34]. Moreover, the polygenic score (PGS) for borderline personality features based on this GWAS  
91 was found to have a positive association with neuroticism [35], a personality trait associated with  
92 loneliness [36]. So far, one case-control GWAS, i.e. comparing BPD patients diagnosed using  
93 established diagnostic systems to controls, has been performed which did not identify associated  
94 single variants but indicated significant gene-based associations in the genes coding for  
95 dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase (*DPYD*) and plakophilin-4 (*PKP4*), which have been previously linked  
96 to other mental disorders, e.g. schizophrenia [12]. BPD was found to have positive genetic correlations  
97 with major depression, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia [12] as well as with the personality traits  
98 neuroticism and, to a lesser degree, openness to experience [37]. At the same time, a recent GWAS in  
99 the UK Biobank identified 15 genome-wide significant loci associated with loneliness [11], measured  
100 by three variables assessing the feeling of loneliness, the frequency of interacting with others and the  
101 possibility to confide in others. In a phenome-wide association study the PGS for loneliness was  
102 associated with personality traits, especially neuroticism, and a wide range of somatic but also

103 psychiatric disorders such as mood disorders and depression [38]. However, this approach has not  
104 been used yet to study the association of loneliness with BPD.

105 Childhood maltreatment has been identified a major environmental risk factor for BPD with individuals  
106 with a diagnosis of BPD being around thirteen times more likely to report childhood maltreatment than  
107 non-clinical controls [39, 40]. Some studies suggest an interaction between adverse life events and the  
108 genetic risk for mental disorders [e.g. 41, 42]. For example, the genetic correlation of major depression  
109 disorder with waist circumference was significantly greater in individuals reporting exposure to trauma  
110 compared to those not reporting trauma exposure [41]. Moreover, genetic vulnerability and stressful  
111 life events have not only shown additive but also an interactive effect on depressive symptoms with  
112 especially increased depression scores in subjects with both, stressful life events and high polygenic risk  
113 [42]. Since childhood maltreatment is also related to a higher risk for perceived social isolation in  
114 adulthood [43-45], childhood maltreatment might be crucial in gene-environment interactions  
115 associated with loneliness in BPD.

116 The aim of the present study was to investigate the genetic and phenotypic overlap between loneliness  
117 and BPD and explore its association with childhood maltreatment. For this, we analyzed data from two  
118 independent genotyped BPD samples. The first, previously published, sample (Witt2017-sample)  
119 consisted of 998 BPD patients and 1545 HCs [12]. The second sample (KFO-sample) was an  
120 independent clinical sample of 187 well-characterized patients with BPD and 261 HCs who provided  
121 data on loneliness and childhood maltreatment and were part of the sample recruited by the clinical  
122 research unit KFO 256 [46]. Due to the genetic correlation of loneliness with borderline personality  
123 features observed in a twin study [32] and known association of loneliness-PGS with psychiatric  
124 disorders in a phenomewide association study [38], we wanted to test this association in our samples  
125 in a first step. We expected 1) a positive genetic correlation between loneliness and BPD, 2) higher  
126 loneliness-PGS in BPD cases compared to controls, and 3) a positive association of the loneliness-PGS  
127 and an individual's loneliness. Furthermore, we analyzed whether our findings can be explained by the  
128 genetic disposition to neuroticism, a personality trait associated with loneliness and BPD in the past

129 [36-38]. Finally, we explored whether 4) the severity of childhood maltreatment predicts loneliness  
130 stronger for BPD patients with a high genetic risk for loneliness in the KFO-sample.

## 131 **2 Materials and Methods**

### 132 **2.1 Witt2017-Sample – characteristics and methods**

#### 133 **2.1.1 Sample Characteristics**

134 The Witt2017-sample consisted of a BPD GWAS sample described in detail previously in Witt et al. [12].  
135 Briefly, controls and subjects meeting DSM-IV criteria for BPD were recruited at three university  
136 hospitals in Germany. All subjects provided written informed consent, and the study was approved by  
137 the local ethics committees. After quality control (see below), the sample consisted of 998 cases  
138 (91.58% female, mean age 29.58, range: 18–65 years,  $SD = 8.64$ ) and 1545 controls (56.18% female,  
139 mean age 44.19 years, range: 18–72 years,  $SD = 13.24$ ).

#### 140 **2.1.2 Genetic correlation analysis**

141 To obtain a point estimate of the genetic correlation of loneliness with BPD, we used LD-score  
142 regression [28]. LD-score regression allows the calculation of genetic correlations of GWAS that have  
143 been carried out in independent samples. Calculations were carried out with a free intercept and the  
144 European ancestry samples from the 1000 Genomes data as LD structure reference panel [47].  
145 Summary statistics from the GWAS of loneliness ( $N = 445\,024$ ) [11] and the GWAS of BPD (998 cases,  
146 1545 controls) [12] were used as input. In order to capture associations with the feeling of loneliness,  
147 as assessed with the ULS-R in the current study, we used the GWAS based on the single item 'Do you  
148 often feel lonely?' instead of the 3 item measure reflecting more strongly social isolation, that is, the  
149 frequency of social interaction.

#### 150 **2.1.3 Polygenic Scores**

151 For the present analyses, PGS were calculated based on an updated quality control and imputation  
152 procedure, which has been described in detail in Streit et al. [37]. Subjects were genotyped using  
153 Illumina Infinium PsychArray-24 Bead Chips (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). Genetic markers and  
154 subjects were filtered after the following exclusion criteria: genotypic and individual missingness ( $>$

155 2%), missingness differences between cases and controls ( $> 2\%$ ), deviation from autosomal  
156 heterozygosity ( $|F_{het}| > 0.2$ ) or deviation from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (controls:  $p < 1 \times 10^{-6}$ ,  
157 cases:  $p < 1 \times 10^{-10}$ ). Additionally, subjects were excluded when they showed sex mismatches, cryptical  
158 relatedness, or were genetic outliers.

159 Imputation was performed with the publicly available reference panel from the Haplotype Reference  
160 Consortium (EGAD00001002729), using EAGLE/MINIMAC3 [default settings, variable chunk size of 132  
161 genomic chunks; 48, 49], and best-guess genotypes were used for PGS analyses.

162 For PGS calculation, variants in the Witt2017-sample were filtered for imputation quality with an INFO  
163 score of  $\geq 0.9$ , and minor allele frequency of  $\geq 5\%$ . PGS were then calculated using PRSice 2.1.6  
164 clumping SNPs based on the p-value in the discovery samples and LD-structure in the target sample  
165 with standard settings (distance = 250kb,  $p = 1$ ,  $r^2 = 0.1$ ) [50]. PGS were calculated for loneliness  
166 (loneliness-PGS) using summary statistics from Day et al. [11] based on the GWAS for loneliness  
167 assessed as a single item, and for neuroticism using summary statistics from Nagel et al. [51], excluding  
168 SNPs with an INFO score  $< 0.9$  in the discovery sample. PGS were calculated for 10 p-value thresholds  
169 (p-value threshold (PT):  $5 \times 10^{-8}$ ,  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ ,  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ , 0.001, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5 and 1.0; see  
170 Supplementary Table S1 for number of included SNPs). There was no sample overlap of the discovery  
171 samples with the Witt2017-sample.

172 PRSice2 [50] was used to calculate logistic regression models with case-control status as the dependent  
173 variable, and loneliness-PGS as a predictor of interest and the first 5 ancestry principal components  
174 (PC1–PC5) as covariates. As effect size measure, the increase in Nagelkerke's pseudo- $R^2$  ( $NkR^2$ ), was  
175 calculated, comparing the full model (including PGS and covariates as predictors) to the reduced a  
176 model (including only covariates as predictors).

## 177 **2.2 KFO-Sample – characteristics and methods**

### 178 **2.2.1 Sample Characteristics**

179 A total of 448 female adult individuals who passed genetic quality control were included in the present  
180 analysis, 187 of whom met DSM-IV criteria for BPD (age  $M = 29.35$ ,  $SD = 7.69$ ) and 261 were healthy



181 controls (HC, age  $M = 27.56$ ,  $SD = 6.94$ ). Participants of the BPD group were slightly older ( $t = -2.58$ ,  $p$   
182  $= .010$ ,  $d = -.25$ ). Data on childhood traumatization was available for subsample of 409 participants  
183 (169 BPD, 240 HC), and data on loneliness for 290 individuals (155 BPD, 135 HC). For 276 subjects (144  
184 BPD, 132 HC), both were available. Recruitment was carried out by the central project of the KFO 256,  
185 which is a clinical research unit funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) dedicated to  
186 investigating mechanisms of disturbed emotion processing in BPD [46]. The diagnosis of BPD according  
187 to DSM-IV was made by trained clinical psychologists using the International Personality Disorder  
188 Examination [52], a semistructured clinical interview assessing personality disorders for both the DSM-  
189 IV and the ICD-10 classification systems. All patients met at least five of the nine DSM-IV criteria for  
190 BPD.

191 General exclusion criteria were a lifetime history of psychotic or bipolar I disorder, current substance  
192 addiction, current pregnancy, history of organic brain disease, skull or brain damage, severe  
193 neurological illness or psychotropic medication at the time of the testing as well as a positive urine  
194 toxicology screen for illicit drugs. Additional exclusion criteria for the healthy controls were any lifetime  
195 or current psychiatric diagnoses.

196 The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the  
197 Research Ethics Board of the University of Heidelberg. Subjects provided written informed consent  
198 prior to study participation.

### 199 **2.2.2 Measures**

200 **Loneliness.** Loneliness, that is the subjective experience of social isolation, was assessed using the  
201 Revised University of California Los Angeles Loneliness Scale (ULS-R) [53, German version: 54]. The  
202 ULS-R consists of 20 items that are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (range: 1 'not at all' to 5 'totally')  
203 combined in a sum score (range: 20–100) with higher scores indicating higher levels of loneliness.  
204 Internal consistency for the ULS-R was  $\alpha = .972$  (BPD: Cronbach's  $\alpha = .938$ ; HCs: Cronbach's  $\alpha = .886$ ).

205 **Childhood Maltreatment.** Severity of childhood maltreatment was assessed using the short form of  
206 the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-SF) [55, German version: 56]. Subjects rated the frequency

207 of maltreatment in childhood and adolescence in 25 items using a 5-point Likert scale (range: 1 ‘not at  
208 all’ to 5 ‘very often), with sum-scores ranging from 25 to 125. Internal consistency for the CTQ-SF was  
209  $\alpha = .954$  (BPD: Cronbach’s  $\alpha = .930$ ; HCs: Cronbach’s  $\alpha = .873$ ).

### 210 **2.2.3 Genotyping, quality control and imputation**

211 DNA was extracted from peripheral blood samples using automated DNA extraction with the chemagic  
212 Magnetic Separation Module I (Chemagen Biopolymer-Technologie, Baesweiler, Germany). All  
213 samples were genotyped using Illumina InfiniumGlobal Screening Arrays (Illumina, San Diego, CA,  
214 USA).

215 Genetic quality control and imputation for the KFO-sample was carried out in the frame of a larger  
216 ongoing BPD GWAS study [57], and was done as described for the Witt2017-sample. For the present  
217 analyses, the subjects from the KFO-sample were extracted from the larger data set, and homogeneity  
218 of the dataset was ensured by excluding subjects  $>|4.5|$  SD on the first 20 PCs.

### 219 **2.2.4 Polygenic Scores**

220 PGS for loneliness and neuroticism were calculated and tested for association with case-control status  
221 using PRSice2 as described for the Witt2017-sample. There was no sample overlap of the discovery  
222 samples with the KFO-sample. The number of included SNPs for each p-value threshold are shown in  
223 Supplementary Table S1.

### 224 **2.2.5 Statistical Analysis**

225 The loneliness-PGS which showed the strongest association with case-control status in sample 2,  $PT =$   
226  $0.1$ , was selected for further analyses in the sample. To analyze the relationship between self-reported  
227 loneliness and the loneliness-PGS, we applied multiple linear regression analysis with the loneliness-  
228 PGS as predictor and ULS-R score as dependent variable, controlling for the target cohort’s specific  
229 principal components (PC1–PC5). To examine whether the loneliness-PGS moderates the association  
230 of the severity of childhood maltreatment and the ULS-R score in the BPD group, a moderation analysis  
231 with the z-standardized predictors CTQ score, ULS-R score and their interaction term was performed.  
232 We used the PROCESS macro by Hayes AF [58], which uses ordinary least squares regression, yielding

233 unstandardized coefficients for all effects. Bootstrapping with 5000 samples together with  
234 heteroscedasticity consistent standard errors (HC3) [59] were employed to compute the confidence  
235 intervals. In all analyses, the first five PCs were included as covariates to control for population  
236 stratification. In addition, the PGS for neuroticism (neuroticism-PGS) was included as a covariate in a  
237 second step in order to control for its often reported association to BPD and loneliness [60].

## 238 **3 Results**

### 239 **3.1 Genetic correlation**


240 In the LD-score regression analysis, the BPD GWAS [12] showed a positive genetic correlation with  
241 the loneliness GWAS ([11];  $rg = .23$  [95% CI: .046 - .42];  $p = .015$ ).

### 242 **3.2 PGS association with case-control status**

243 Loneliness-PGS showed a positive association with BPD case-control status: higher loneliness-PGS  
244 were observed in the BPD cases (see Figure 1, details see Supplementary Tables S2-S7). For the  
245 Witt2017-sample, the strongest association was observed for the PT = 0.5 ( $NkR^2 = 2.3\%$ ,  $p = 2.7 \cdot 10^{-12}$ ),  
246 and the association was replicated in the KFO-sample (PT = 0.1,  $NkR^2 = 6.6\%$ ,  $p = 4.4 \cdot 10^{-6}$ ). When adding  
247 the best fit neuroticism-PGS (both studies PT = 0.1) as a covariate, a reduced  $NkR^2$  was observed, but  
248 the association remained significant (Witt2017-sample: PT = 0.5,  $NkR^2 = 0.6\%$ ,  $p = 0.00019$ ; KFO-  
249 sample: PT = 0.1,  $NkR^2 = 2.7\%$ ,  $p = 0.0021$ ).

250

Genetic overlap of loneliness and Borderline Personality Disorder



251

252 *Fig. 1: Association of Loneliness Polygenic Scores (loneliness-PGS) with Borderline Personality Disorder*

253 *case-control status.* Left panel: Nagelkerke's R<sup>2</sup> describing explained variance in case-control status by PGS

254 at ten P-value thresholds. Right panel: Odds ratio for case-control status depicted by loneliness-PGS

255 quintile, with the first quintile as reference, depicted for the most strongly associated PT. Loneliness-PGS

256 was based on Day et al. (2017). The number of SNPs included in the PGS are shown in Table 1. \*  $p < 0.05$ ;

257 \*\*  $p < 0.005$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ ; 4\*  $p < 1 \times 10^{-4}$ ; 5\*  $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$ ; 6\*  $p < 1 \times 10^{-8}$

258


259 **3.3 Prediction of loneliness by loneliness-PGS**

260 BPD patients reported a higher level of loneliness than HC ( $t = -22.186, p < .001, d = -2.493$ ). Multiple

261 linear regression analyses revealed that the loneliness-PGS and PCs predicted 5.8% of the variance of

262 the ULS-R score in the KFO-sample combined for patient and control groups ( $F(6, 283) = 2.92, p = .009$ ,  
263 adjusted  $R^2 = .038$ ), with the loneliness-PGS as the only significant predictor ( $\beta = .185, p = .002$ , Figure  
264 2). This finding remained significant when we additionally controlled for the neuroticism-PGS ( $F(7, 282)$   
265  $= 3.46, p = .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .056, \beta = .126, p = .046$ ). Separate analyses for the BPD and HC group  
266 revealed no significant relationship within the subgroups (BPD:  $F(6, 148) = 1.24, p = .287$ ; HC:  $F(6, 128)$   
267  $= 1.05, p = .396$ , additionally controlled for neuroticism-PGS BPD:  $F(7, 147) = 1.06, p = .390$ ; HC:  $F(7,$   
268  $127) = 0.89, p = .513$ ).

269



270

271 *Fig. 2. Association between the standardized loneliness-PGS and loneliness assessed with the ULS-R in HC*  
272 *and BPD.*

273

### 274 **3.4 Exploring loneliness-PGS as a potential modulating factor of the association between childhood** 275 **traumatization and loneliness in BPD**

276 To analyze the role of the genetic risk for loneliness as a vulnerability factor that might modulate the  
277 association of childhood traumatization and loneliness, moderation analysis was applied for the BPD  
278 group. The overall model was not significant,  $F(8, 135) = 1.712, p = .101, R^2 = .103$ . Results show that  
279 the loneliness-PGS did not moderate the effect between CTQ and loneliness,  $\Delta R^2 = .004, F(1,$   
280  $135) = 0.458, p = .500, [95\% \text{ CI}: -2.484; 5.067]$ . This did not change with the addition of the

281 Neuroticism-PGS (overall  $F(9,134) = 1.506$ ,  $p = .152$ ,  $R^2 = .104$ ; no interaction effect:  $F(1,$   
282  $134) = 0.452$ ,  $p = .503$ ,  $\Delta R^2 = .004$ , 95% CI: [-2.483; 5.038]; Table 1).

283

## 284 **Table 1**

285 *Prediction of loneliness by childhood maltreatment and Loneliness-PGS*

	$\beta$	$SE$	$t$	$p$
intercept	59.071	1.386	42.620	< .001
CTQ	3.581	1.523	2.351	.020
loneliness-PGS	-0.685	1.453	-0.471	.638
CTQ*loneliness-PGS	1.278	1.901	0.672	.503
PC1	-2.397	1.342	-1.786	.076
PC2	-0.979	1.520	-0.644	.520
PC3	-0.559	1.517	-0.369	.713
PC4	-0.855	1.378	-0.621	.536
PC5	-2.302	1.467	-1.570	.119
neuroticism-PGS	0.319	1.288	0.248	.605

286 *Note.* Predictors were z-standardized, PGS = polygenic score, CTQ = childhood trauma questionnaire

287

## 288 **4 Discussion**

289 The aims of the present study were to test a possible genetic overlap between loneliness and BPD, to  
290 examine whether a higher genetic risk for loneliness is associated with higher loneliness experienced  
291 by BPD patients, and to investigate whether the genetic risk for loneliness modulates the relationship  
292 of the severity of childhood maltreatment and experienced loneliness in BPD. Therefore, we examined  
293 genetic and self-report questionnaire data of patients with a clinical confirmed diagnosis of BPD and  
294 HC. We found evidence for a genetic overlap of BPD and loneliness, indicated by the genetic correlation  
295 of the two GWAS, and the higher loneliness-PGS in the BPD groups in both samples. In addition, a  
296 higher loneliness-PGS was associated with higher loneliness in the KFO-sample, but did not moderate  
297 the relationship between childhood maltreatment and loneliness. The associations remained even  
298 when controlling for the neuroticism-PGS, indicating that the genetic bridge between BPD and  
299 loneliness is partly but not only explained by a genetic propensity towards neuroticism as an anxious  
300 personality trait.

301 Our findings indicate that the genetic factors contributing to BPD risk and to variation in loneliness in  
302 the general population are partially shared via the observed genetic correlation of loneliness and BPD  
303 as well as the positive association of the loneliness-PGS with BPD case-control status. This is in line  
304 with former findings of a genetic association of borderline personality features and loneliness in a twin  
305 study [32]. Together with repeated findings on increased levels of loneliness and smaller social  
306 networks in BPD [19, 20], this finding underlines the relevance of loneliness in the context of BPD. The  
307 fact that a genetic correlation has already been shown for several other somatic and psychiatric  
308 diseases [38], supports prior research assuming loneliness as a transdiagnostically relevant risk factor  
309 [5-7].

310 In the combined sample of patients and controls from the KFO-sample, we found loneliness-PGS to be  
311 a positive predictor of self-reported loneliness, pointing towards the relevance of a genetic  
312 vulnerability for loneliness. The small effect size suggests that other components such as actual social  
313 isolation are important factors. That this association was not significant in the subgroups could be due  
314 to the fact that HCs and BPD represent extreme groups regarding experienced loneliness, showing  
315 reduced within-group but strong between-group variance. This suggests the need for further studies  
316 that enroll participants in both groups varying more broadly in the level of loneliness. While the current  
317 approach investigates the aggregate of the genetic association signal with loneliness and BPD, future  
318 studies in larger samples should examine which genes and pathways contribute to the genetic  
319 correlation. This might generate further insight in the underlying biological contribution to loneliness.

320 In contrast to our hypothesis, the association of the severity of childhood maltreatment and reported  
321 loneliness was not moderated by the loneliness-PGS in the BPD group. While this suggests that that  
322 there are no interacting contributions of genetics and childhood maltreatment to subjective  
323 experienced loneliness, the lack of evidence may also have been caused by a lack of power due to the  
324 rather small sample. Although we have not found a significant interaction, future studies in larger  
325 samples should investigate whether subjects with an increased PGS for loneliness are especially  
326 vulnerable when additionally exposed to childhood maltreatment.

#### 327 **4.1 Limitations**

328 The present study has some limitations. First, due to the overrepresentation of women with BPD in  
329 the health care system, our results are largely based on female subjects. In the Witt2017-sample, 92%  
330 of the BPD cases were female, and the KFO-sample consists of female participants only. Additionally,  
331 both samples were of central European ancestry. Therefore the generalisability is limited and  
332 replication in male or more balanced samples, and samples of other ancestries are needed.

333 Second, as already mentioned, our sample size was rather small for the investigation of the often small  
334 genetic effects. In this regard, we consider it a strength of the study, that the evidence for a shared  
335 genetic contribution to BPD and loneliness was replicated over different methods and two  
336 independent samples. However, especially for the more detailed analyses in the KFO-sample, there is  
337 need for studies replicating or extending those findings in larger samples. Larger samples would  
338 possibly allow to find effects that we could not confirm with our sample. Concurrently, larger GWAS  
339 samples, particularly for BPD, are warranted and would allow for more accurate estimations of genetic  
340 correlations, and more detailed biostatistical analyses of the shared genetics of loneliness and BPD,  
341 e.g. using methods taking both variants with equidirectional and opposing effects effect into account  
342 [61], or applying methods such as Mendelian randomisation to allow for inference of causality [62].

343 While prior studies on genes that are associated with loneliness reported enriched genetic signals for  
344 genes expressed in specific brain tissues in cortical and cerebellar regions [38], a conclusion on the  
345 genetic architecture is not possible based on our data, as we examined the aggregate of the genetic  
346 association signal. Larger GWAS samples for BPD would also allow methods such as local genetic  
347 correlations to be applied that are suitable to identify the genes and pathways shared between  
348 loneliness and BPD [63]. This could be helpful to further differentiate whether higher genetic risk  
349 directly affects feelings of loneliness or perceptions and behaviours that may lead to more loneliness.

350 Thus, further research is needed to study the potentially complex interplay of genetic risk and e.g.  
351 personality dispositions such as rejection sensitivity and behaviors such as social withdrawal which



352 might affect not only loneliness, but also the objective social isolation as indicated by smaller social  
353 networks in people with BPD [17-20].

354 Third, as a self-report questionnaire, the CTQ represents a retrospective assessment of childhood  
355 experiences rather than an objective description of the exposure and experiences of adverse childhood  
356 experiences [64]. That should be considered in the interpretation of effects of childhood maltreatment  
357 and emphasizes the need for studies with prospective designs. In addition, with the CTQ sum score we  
358 captured childhood maltreatment as a global measure, as a more detailed investigation of the interplay  
359 of different subtypes of maltreatment with the genetic propensity to loneliness was not possible due  
360 to the sample size. However, the type and timing of childhood maltreatment has been shown to  
361 influence its consequences [65] and should therefore be taken into account in future studies with  
362 larger samples, which would allow finer-grained analyses of different types of maltreatment such as  
363 emotional, physical and sexual abuse and neglect. Moreover, the measurement of the chronicity of  
364 loneliness might be the more appropriate tool to capture an association with genetic predispositions.  
365 Although the ULS-R is the most established instrument for measuring loneliness, originally  
366 conceptualized as a trait measure, it has been shown that most often it varies across time influenced  
367 by an individual's current state instead of being exclusively a trait [66].

#### 368 **4.2 Conclusion**

369 Despite the limitations mentioned above, our study is, as far as we know, the first study using genome-  
370 wide genetic data to link the polygenic propensity for loneliness to BPD, finding evidence for a higher  
371 genetic risk for loneliness in BPD compared to HC in two independent samples. Further studies and  
372 larger samples are needed to further dissect the genetic overlap, investigate possible effects of  
373 different types of childhood maltreatment interacting with the loneliness-PGS and address whether  
374 the association is specific for BPD or reflects a transdiagnostically relevant association. It is important  
375 to note that even though our findings have shown that genetic risk for loneliness explains some of the  
376 reported loneliness, this does not mean that it is not responsive to psychotherapeutic interventions.  
377 Therefore, our findings emphasize the importance of considering genetic risk when investigating the

378 determinants of loneliness in BPD in order to tailor interventions like social skill training or the  
379 reappraisal of social interactions to the specific mechanism relevant to loneliness in people with BPD.

### 380 **5 Acknowledgements**

381 We thank all participants involved in the study. This project was funded the German Research  
382 Foundation (KFO-256 and GRK2350/3 – 324164820).

### 383 **6 Competing interests**

384 The authors declare none.

385

386 **References**

- 387 1. Gunderson JG, The borderline patient's intolerance of aloneness: insecure attachments and  
388 therapist availability. *Am J Psychiatry*, 1996. 153(6): 752-8  
389 <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.153.6.752>.
- 390 2. Peplau L & Perlman D, *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy*. Vol.  
391 36. 1982: John Wiley & Sons Incorporated.
- 392 3. Cacioppo JT, Ernst JM, Burleson MH, McClintock MK, Malarkey WB, Hawkley LC, *et al.*, Lonely  
393 traits and concomitant physiological processes: The MacArthur social neuroscience studies.  
394 *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 2000. 35(2-3): 143-154  
395 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-8760\(99\)00049-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-8760(99)00049-5).
- 396 4. Cacioppo JT, Cacioppo S, & Boomsma DI, Evolutionary mechanisms for loneliness. *Cognition &*  
397 *emotion*, 2014. 28(1): 3-21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2013.837379>.
- 398 5. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Baker M, Harris T, & Stephenson D, Loneliness and social isolation as  
399 risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 2015.  
400 10(2): 227-237 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352>.
- 401 6. Mushtaq R, Shoib S, Shah T, & Mushtaq S, Relationship between loneliness, psychiatric  
402 disorders and physical health? A review on the psychological aspects of loneliness. *Journal of*  
403 *clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*, 2014. 8(9): WE01  
404 <https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2014/10077.4828>.
- 405 7. Pengpid S & Peltzer K, Associations of loneliness with poor physical health, poor mental health  
406 and health risk behaviours among a nationally representative community-dwelling sample of  
407 middle-aged and older adults in India. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*, 2021.  
408 36(11): 1722-1731 <https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.5592>.

- 409 8. Boomsma DI, Willemsen G, Dolan CV, Hawkey LC, & Cacioppo JT, Genetic and environmental  
410 contributions to loneliness in adults: The Netherlands Twin Register Study. *Behavior genetics*,  
411 2005. 35: 745-752 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-005-6040-8>.
- 412 9. Distel MA, Rebollo-Mesa I, Abdellaoui A, Derom CA, Willemsen G, Cacioppo JT, *et al.*, Familial  
413 resemblance for loneliness. *Behavior genetics*, 2010. 40: 480-494  
414 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-010-9341-5>.
- 415 10. Matthews T, Danese A, Wertz J, Odgers CL, Ambler A, Moffitt TE, *et al.*, Social isolation,  
416 loneliness and depression in young adulthood: a behavioural genetic analysis. *Social psychiatry*  
417 *and psychiatric epidemiology*, 2016. 51: 339-348 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-016-1178-7>.
- 418 11. Day F, Ong K, & Perry J, Elucidating the genetic basis of social interaction and isolation. *Nature*  
419 *communications*, 2018. 9(1): 2457 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04930-1>.
- 420 12. Witt S, Streit F, Jungkunz M, Frank J, Awasthi S, Reinbold C, *et al.*, Genome-wide association  
421 study of borderline personality disorder reveals genetic overlap with bipolar disorder, major  
422 depression and schizophrenia. *Translational psychiatry*, 2017. 7(6): e1155-e1155  
423 <https://doi.org/10.1038/tp.2017.115>.
- 424 13. Association AP, *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5*. Vol. 5. 2013:  
425 American psychiatric association Washington, DC.
- 426 14. Volkert J, Gablonski TC, & Rabung S, Prevalence of personality disorders in the general adult  
427 population in Western countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry*, 2018.  
428 213(6): 709-715 <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2018.202>.
- 429 15. Meuldijk D, McCarthy A, Bourke ME, & Grenyer BF, The value of psychological treatment for  
430 borderline personality disorder: Systematic review and cost offset analysis of economic  
431 evaluations. *PloS one*, 2017. 12(3): e0171592 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0171592>.
- 432 16. Adler G & Buie DH, Jr., Aloneness and borderline psychopathology: the possible relevance of  
433 child development issues. *Int J Psychoanal*, 1979. 60(1): 83-96.

- 434 17. Gunderson JG, Disturbed relationships as a phenotype for borderline personality disorder. *Am*  
435 *J Psychiatry*, 2007. 164(11): 1637-40 <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.07071125>.
- 436 18. Gao S, Assink M, Cipriani A, & Lin K, Associations between rejection sensitivity and mental  
437 health outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*, 2017. 57: 59-74  
438 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2017.08.007>.
- 439 19. Liebke L, Bungert M, Thome J, Hauschild S, Gescher DM, Schmahl C, *et al.*, Loneliness, social  
440 networks, and social functioning in borderline personality disorder. *Personality Disorders:*  
441 *Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 2017. 8(4): 349-356 <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000208>.
- 442 20. Nenov-Matt T, Barton BB, Dewald-Kaufmann J, Goerigk S, Rek S, Zentz K, *et al.*, Loneliness,  
443 social isolation and their difference: a cross-diagnostic study in persistent depressive disorder  
444 and borderline personality disorder. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 2020. 11: 608476  
445 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2020.608476>.
- 446 21. Thome J, Liebke L, Bungert M, Schmahl C, Domes G, Bohus M, *et al.*, Confidence in facial  
447 emotion recognition in borderline personality disorder. *Personality Disorders: Theory,*  
448 *Research, and Treatment*, 2016. 7(2): 159-168 <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000142>.
- 449 22. Hauschild S, Winter D, Thome J, Liebke L, Schmahl C, Bohus M, *et al.*, Behavioural mimicry and  
450 loneliness in borderline personality disorder. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 2018. 82: 30-36  
451 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2018.01.005>.
- 452 23. Sagan O, The loneliness of personality disorder: a phenomenological study. *Mental health and*  
453 *social inclusion*, 2017. 21(4): 213-221 <https://doi.org/10.1108/MHSI-04-2017-0020>.
- 454 24. Zanarini MC, Frankenburg FR, Reich DB, & Fitzmaurice GM, Fluidity of the subsyndromal  
455 phenomenology of borderline personality disorder over 16 years of prospective follow-up.  
456 *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 2016. 173(7): 688-694  
457 <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2015.15081045>.

- 458 25. Zanarini MC, Frankenburg FR, Reich DB, Silk KR, Hudson JI, & McSweeney LB, The  
459 subsyndromal phenomenology of borderline personality disorder: a 10-year follow-up study.  
460 *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 2007. 164(6): 929-935  
461 <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.2007.164.6.929>.
- 462 26. Andreassen OA, Hindley GF, Frei O, & Smeland OB, New insights from the last decade of  
463 research in psychiatric genetics: discoveries, challenges and clinical implications. *World*  
464 *Psychiatry*, 2023. 22(1): 4-24 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.21034>.
- 465 27. Shih RA, Belmonte PL, & Zandi PP, A review of the evidence from family, twin and adoption  
466 studies for a genetic contribution to adult psychiatric disorders. *International review of*  
467 *psychiatry*, 2004. 16(4): 260-283 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540260400014401>.
- 468 28. Bulik-Sullivan BK, Loh P-R, Finucane HK, Ripke S, Yang J, Consortium SWGotPG, *et al.*, LD Score  
469 regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies.  
470 *Nature genetics*, 2015. 47(3): 291-295 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3211>.
- 471 29. Wray NR, Lee SH, Mehta D, Vinkhuyzen AA, Dudbridge F, & Middeldorp CM, Research review:  
472 polygenic methods and their application to psychiatric traits. *Journal of child psychology and*  
473 *psychiatry*, 2014. 55(10): 1068-1087 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12295>.
- 474 30. Skoglund C, Tiger A, Rück C, Petrovic P, Asherson P, Hellner C, *et al.*, Familial risk and heritability  
475 of diagnosed borderline personality disorder: a register study of the Swedish population.  
476 *Molecular psychiatry*, 2021. 26(3): 999-1008 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-019-0442-0>.
- 477 31. Torgersen S, Lygren S, Øien PA, Skre I, Onstad S, Edvardsen J, *et al.*, A twin study of personality  
478 disorders. *Comprehensive psychiatry*, 2000. 41(6): 416-425  
479 <https://doi.org/10.1053/comp.2000.16560>.
- 480 32. Schermer JA, Colodro-Conde L, Grasby KL, Hickie IB, Burns J, Ligthart L, *et al.*, Genetic and  
481 environmental causes of individual differences in borderline personality disorder features and

- 482 loneliness are partially shared. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 2020. 23(4): 214-220  
483 <https://doi.org/10.1017/thg.2020.62>.
- 484 33. Skaug E, Czajkowski NO, Waaktaar T, & Torgersen S, The role of sense of coherence and  
485 loneliness in borderline personality disorder traits: a longitudinal twin study. *Borderline*  
486 *Personality Disorder and Emotion Dysregulation*, 2022. 9(1): 19  
487 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40479-022-00190-0>.
- 488 34. Lubke G, Laurin C, Amin N, Hottenga JJ, Willemsen G, van Grootheest G, *et al.*, Genome-wide  
489 analyses of borderline personality features. *Molecular psychiatry*, 2014. 19(8): 923-929  
490 <https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2013.109>.
- 491 35. Gale CR, Hagenaars SP, Davies G, Hill WD, Liewald DC, Cullen B, *et al.*, Pleiotropy between  
492 neuroticism and physical and mental health: findings from 108 038 men and women in UK  
493 Biobank. *Translational psychiatry*, 2016. 6(4): e791-e791 <https://doi.org/10.1038/tp.2016.56>.
- 494 36. Buecker S, Maes M, Denissen JJ, & Luhmann M, Loneliness and the Big Five personality traits:  
495 A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Personality*, 2020. 34(1): 8-28  
496 <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2229>.
- 497 37. Streit F, Witt SH, Awasthi S, Foo JC, Jungkunz M, Frank J, *et al.*, Borderline personality disorder  
498 and the big five: molecular genetic analyses indicate shared genetic architecture with  
499 neuroticism and openness. *Translational Psychiatry*, 2022. 12(1): 153  
500 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-022-01912-2>.
- 501 38. Abdellaoui A, Sanchez-Roige S, Sealock J, Treur JL, Dennis J, Fontanillas P, *et al.*, Phenome-wide  
502 investigation of health outcomes associated with genetic predisposition to loneliness. *Human*  
503 *molecular genetics*, 2019. 28(22): 3853-3865 <https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddz219>.
- 504 39. Porter C, Palmier-Claus J, Branitsky A, Mansell W, Warwick H, & Varese F, Childhood adversity  
505 and borderline personality disorder: a meta-analysis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 2020.  
506 141(1): 6-20 <https://doi.org/10.1111/acps.13118>.

- 507 40. Kleindienst N, Vonderlin R, Bohus M, & Lis S, Childhood adversity and borderline personality  
508 disorder. Analyses complementing the meta-analysis by Porter et al. (2020). *Acta Psychiatr*  
509 *Scand*, 2021. 143(2): 183-184 <https://doi.org/10.1111/acps.13256>.
- 510 41. Coleman JR, Peyrot WJ, Purves KL, Davis KA, Rayner C, Choi SW, *et al.*, Genome-wide gene-  
511 environment analyses of major depressive disorder and reported lifetime traumatic  
512 experiences in UK Biobank. *Molecular psychiatry*, 2020. 25(7): 1430-1446  
513 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-019-0546-6>.
- 514 42. Colodro-Conde L, Couvy-Duchesne B, Zhu G, Coventry WL, Byrne EM, Gordon S, *et al.*, A direct  
515 test of the diathesis–stress model for depression. *Molecular psychiatry*, 2018. 23(7): 1590-  
516 1596 <https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2017.130>.
- 517 43. Gibson RL & Hartshorne TS, Childhood sexual abuse and adult loneliness and network  
518 orientation. *Child abuse & neglect*, 1996. 20(11): 1087-1093 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(96)00097-x)  
519 [2134\(96\)00097-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(96)00097-x).
- 520 44. Sheikh MA, Childhood physical maltreatment, perceived social isolation, and internalizing  
521 symptoms: a longitudinal, three-wave, population-based study. *European Child & Adolescent*  
522 *Psychiatry*, 2018. 27(4): 481-491 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-017-1090-z>.
- 523 45. Shevlin M, McElroy E, & Murphy J, Loneliness mediates the relationship between childhood  
524 trauma and adult psychopathology: Evidence from the adult psychiatric morbidity survey.  
525 *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 2015. 50: 591-601  
526 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-014-0951-8>.
- 527 46. Schmahl C, Herpertz SC, Bertsch K, Ende G, Flor H, Kirsch P, *et al.*, Mechanisms of disturbed  
528 emotion processing and social interaction in borderline personality disorder: state of  
529 knowledge and research agenda of the German Clinical Research Unit. *Borderline personality*  
530 *disorder and emotion dysregulation*, 2014. 1(1): 1-17 [https://doi.org/10.1186/2051-6673-1-](https://doi.org/10.1186/2051-6673-1-12)  
531 [12](https://doi.org/10.1186/2051-6673-1-12).



- 532 47. Consortium TGP, A map of human genome variation from population-scale sequencing.  
533 *Nature*, 2010. 467(7319): 1061-1073 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09534>.
- 534 48. Das S, Forer L, Schönherr S, Sidore C, Locke AE, Kwong A, *et al.*, Next-generation genotype  
535 imputation service and methods. *Nature genetics*, 2016. 48(10): 1284-1287  
536 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3656>.
- 537 49. Loh P-R, Danecek P, Palamara PF, Fuchsberger C, A Reshef Y, K Finucane H, *et al.*, Reference-  
538 based phasing using the Haplotype Reference Consortium panel. *Nature genetics*, 2016.  
539 48(11): 1443-1448 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3679>.
- 540 50. Choi SW & O'Reilly PF, PRSice-2: Polygenic Risk Score software for biobank-scale data.  
541 *Gigascience*, 2019. 8(7): giz082 <https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz082>.
- 542 51. Nagel M, Jansen PR, Stringer S, Watanabe K, De Leeuw CA, Bryois J, *et al.*, Meta-analysis of  
543 genome-wide association studies for neuroticism in 449,484 individuals identifies novel  
544 genetic loci and pathways. *Nature genetics*, 2018. 50(7): 920-927  
545 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-018-0151-7>.
- 546 52. Loranger AW, *International personality disorder examination: IPDE; DSM-IV and ICD-10;*  
547 *interviews*. 1999: PAR.
- 548 53. Russell D, Peplau LA, & Cutrona CE, The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: concurrent and  
549 discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 1980. 39(3): 472-  
550 480 <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.39.3.472>.
- 551 54. Döring N & Bortz J, Psychometrische Einsamkeitsforschung: Deutsche Neukonstruktion der  
552 UCLA Loneliness Scale. *Diagnostica*, 1993. 39(3): 224–239.
- 553 55. Bernstein DP, Stein JA, Newcomb MD, Walker E, Pogge D, Ahluvalia T, *et al.*, Development and  
554 validation of a brief screening version of the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire. *Child abuse &*  
555 *neglect*, 2003. 27(2): 169-190 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134\(02\)00541-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(02)00541-0).

- 556 56. Klinitzke G, Romppel M, Häuser W, Brähler E, & Glaesmer H, The German Version of the  
557 Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ): psychometric characteristics in a representative  
558 sample of the general population. *Psychotherapie, Psychosomatik, Medizinische Psychologie*,  
559 2011. 62(2): 47-51 <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0031-1295495>.
- 560 57. Witt S, Awasthi S, Rietschel M, Ripke S, Streit F, & Consortium IBG, 45. GENOME-WIDE  
561 ASSOCIATION STUDY OF BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER-AN UPDATE FROM THE  
562 INTERNATIONAL BORDERLINE GENOMICS CONSORTIUM. *European*  
563 *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 2022. 63: e69 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2022.07.133>.
- 564 58. Hayes AF, *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A*  
565 *regression-based approach*. 2017: Guilford publications.
- 566 59. Davidson R & MacKinnon JG, *Estimation and inference in econometrics*. Vol. 63. 1993: Oxford  
567 New York.
- 568 60. Abdellaoui A, Chen HY, Willemsen G, Ehli EA, Davies GE, Verweij KJ, *et al.*, Associations  
569 between loneliness and personality are mostly driven by a genetic association with  
570 neuroticism. *Journal of personality*, 2019. 87(2): 386-397 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12397>.
- 571 61. Smeland OB, Bahrami S, Frei O, Shadrin A, O'Connell K, Savage J, *et al.*, Genome-wide analysis  
572 reveals extensive genetic overlap between schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and intelligence.  
573 *Molecular psychiatry*, 2020. 25(4): 844-853 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-018-0332-x>.
- 574 62. Burgess S, Butterworth A, & Thompson SG, Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple  
575 genetic variants using summarized data. *Genetic epidemiology*, 2013. 37(7): 658-665  
576 <https://doi.org/10.1002/gepi.21758>.
- 577 63. Werme J, van der Sluis S, Posthuma D, & de Leeuw CA, An integrated framework for local  
578 genetic correlation analysis. *Nat Genet*, 2022. 54(3): 274-282 [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01017-y)  
579 [022-01017-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01017-y).

- 580 64. Baldwin JR, Reuben A, Newbury JB, & Danese A, Agreement between prospective and  
581 retrospective measures of childhood maltreatment: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
582 *JAMA psychiatry*, 2019. 76(6): 584-593 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.0097>.
- 583 65. Herzog JI & Schmahl C, Adverse Childhood Experiences and the Consequences on  
584 Neurobiological, Psychosocial, and Somatic Conditions Across the Lifespan. *Front Psychiatry*,  
585 2018. 9: 420 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2018.00420>.
- 586 66. Martín-María N, Caballero FF, Lara E, Domènech-Abella J, Haro JM, Olaya B, *et al.*, Effects of  
587 transient and chronic loneliness on major depression in older adults: A longitudinal study.  
588 *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*, 2021. 36(1): 76-85  
589 <https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.5397>.