1 Multi-organ imaging-derived polygenic indexes for brain and body health

2

3 Running title: Brain and body IDP index

- 4
- 5 Xiaochen Yang^{1*}, Patrick F. Sullivan², Bingxuan Li³, Zirui Fan⁴, Dezheng Ding⁵, Juan Shu¹,
- 6 Yuxin Guo⁶, Peristera Paschou⁶, Jingxuan Bao^{7,8}, Li Shen⁷, Marylyn D. Ritchie^{9,10}, Gideon
- 7 Nave¹¹, Michael L. Platt¹¹⁻¹³, Tengfei Li^{14,15}, Hongtu Zhu^{2,15-18*}, and Bingxin Zhao^{4,10,19-22*#}
- 8
- ¹Department of Statistics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA.
- 10 ²Department of Genetics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA.
- ³UCLA Samueli School of Engineering, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA.
- 12 ⁴Department of Statistics and Data Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104,
- 13 USA.
- 14 ⁵Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
- 15 19104, USA.
- 16 ⁶Department of Biological Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA.
- 17 ⁷Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania,
- 18 Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- 19 ⁸Graduate Group in Genomics and Computational Biology, University of Pennsylvania,
- 20 Philadelphia, PA, USA.
- ⁹Department of Genetics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- 22 ¹⁰Institute for Biomedical Informatics, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine,
- 23 Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- ¹¹Marketing Department, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- ¹²Department of Neuroscience, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- 26 ¹³Department of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- 27 ¹⁴Department of Radiology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA.
- 28 ¹⁵Biomedical Research Imaging Center, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel
- 29 Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA.
- 30 ¹⁶Department of Biostatistics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599,
- 31 USA.

- 1 ¹⁷Department of Computer Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC
- 2 27599, USA.
- 3 ¹⁸Department of Statistics and Operations Research, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,
- 4 Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA.
- 5 ¹⁹Applied Mathematics and Computational Science Graduate Group, University of Pennsylvania,
- 6 Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- 7 ²⁰Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics, Perelman School of Medicine,
- 8 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- 9 ²¹Population Aging Research Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
- 10 ²²Institute for Translational Medicine and Therapeutics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia,
- 11 PA 19104, USA.
- 12
- 13 **Corresponding authors*:
- 14 Xiaochen Yang (<u>yang1641@purdue.edu</u>), Hongtu Zhu (<u>htzhu@email.unc.edu</u>), and
- 15 Bingxin Zhao (bxzhao@upenn.edu)
- 16
- 17 *#Lead contact:*
- 18 Bingxin Zhao
- 19 413 Academic Research Building
- 20 265 South 37th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104.
- 21 E-mail: bxzhao@upenn.edu Phone: (215) 898-8222

1 Abstract

2 The UK Biobank (UKB) imaging project is a crucial resource for biomedical research, but is 3 limited to 100,000 participants due to cost and accessibility barriers. Here we used genetic 4 data to predict heritable imaging-derived phenotypes (IDPs) for a larger cohort. We 5 developed and evaluated 4,375 IDP genetic scores (IGS) derived from UKB brain and body 6 images. When applied to UKB participants who were not imaged, IGS revealed links to 7 numerous phenotypes and stratified participants at increased risk for both brain and 8 somatic diseases. For example, IGS identified individuals at higher risk for Alzheimer's 9 disease and multiple sclerosis, offering additional insights beyond traditional polygenic risk scores of these diseases. When applied to independent external cohorts, IGS also 10 11 stratified those at high disease risk in the All of Us Research Program and the Alzheimer's 12 Disease Neuroimaging Initiative study. Our results demonstrate that, while the UKB 13 imaging cohort is largely healthy and may not be the most enriched for disease risk 14 management, it holds immense potential for stratifying the risk of various brain and body 15 diseases in broader external genetic cohorts.

16

17 **Keywords**: Abdominal MRI; Brain MRI; Cardiovascular magnetic resonance; Disease risk

18 assessment; OCT imaging; Genetic prediction; Alzheimer's disease

The large-scale imaging data from the UK Biobank (UKB) imaging study has proven to be 1 2 an immensely valuable resource for characterizing the structural and functional organizations of the human brain and body¹⁻⁴. These data have been used to establish 3 links with clinical biomarkers^{5,6}, predict biological aging⁷⁻⁹, study socioeconomic 4 outcomes^{10,11}, and facilitate early disease detection¹². Launched in 2014, the UKB imaging 5 project reached a milestone in 2022 by completing the multimodal brain magnetic 6 7 resonance imaging (MRI) of its 60,000th participant. Although it is already the world's 8 largest imaging study, the UKB imaging study will ultimately include nearly 100,000 9 participants⁴, or about 20% of all UKB participants. Given the cost and difficulty of 10 collecting additional imaging data, it is crucial to develop strategies that extend the utility 11 of the existing UKB imaging data.

12

13 Polygenic indices¹³ (also known as genetic scores, polygenic scores, or polygenic risk 14 scores [PRS]) can be used to predict traits or disease genetic risk by aggregating genetic 15 information across the genome¹⁴⁻²¹. The development of numerous prediction methods²², reporting standards²³, genetic data resources²⁴, and data sharing platforms²⁵ has enabled 16 the application of these indices to a wide variety of complex diseases and traits. Both 17 18 family and population-based studies have shown that variations in brain and body, as measured by structural and functional MRI, are heritable^{2,26-32}. Recent genome-wide 19 association studies (GWAS)^{2,29,33-41} have identified many genetic loci associated with brain 20 and body imaging-derived phenotypes (IDPs). Given the cost and complexity of imaging 21 22 phenotypes, it is natural to ask whether genetic data can be used to predict IDPs for UKB participants who are not imaged or who are part of other cohorts of interest (e.g., another 23 biobank-scale cohort, or a cohort dedicated to Alzheimer's disease). Several GWAS have 24 25 reported the prediction accuracy (out-of-sample R^2) of genetically predicted brain IDPs^{33,42,43} in small-scale independent testing data, indicating that genetic predictors 26 27 could partially recover imaging variations. These pilot studies demonstrate that IDP 28 genetic scores (IGS) can serve as valuable proxy biomarkers of the brain and body in the absence of readily available imaging data^{29,40,44}. In particular, since IGS are genetic 29 30 predictions of imaging traits, we expect to see links between IGS and various phenotypes 31 when there are shared genetic effects.

1 Here, we systematically developed and evaluated IGS for UKB brain and body images. We 2 examined 4,206 brain IDPs from various imaging modalities and independent processing pipelines, including 3,905 traits generated by the UKB brain imaging team^{1,2,34} (referred 3 4 to as UKB-Oxford data hereafter) and 301 traits processed by the Brain Imaging Genetics Knowledge Portal (BIG-KP)^{33,35,37}. These imaging biomarkers spanned major brain MRI 5 categories, including structural MRI (sMRI) such as regional brain volumes⁴⁵, cortical 6 7 thicknesses, and surface areas¹; diffusion MRI (dMRI) such as diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) parameters^{46,47}; resting-state functional MRI (rfMRI) such as independent 8 9 component analysis (ICA)^{1,2,48,49} or parcellation-based⁵⁰ functional connectivity and 10 activity/amplitude⁵¹ traits; task-based functional MRI (tfMRI) such as activation zstatistics¹: and susceptibility weighted brain MRI, incorporating regional median $T2^{*5}$. 11 12 Moreover, we analyzed 169 body IDPs, including 82 from cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR)^{3,29}, 41 from abdominal MRI⁵²⁻⁵⁴ (covering organs such as liver, kidney, 13 and lung), and 46 from optical coherence tomography (OCT) imaging⁴⁰. The **Methods** 14 15 section provides more detailed information of these 4,375 IDPs (4,206 brain + 169 body) 16 (Table S1). Figure 1A presents an overview of the study design.

17

18 **RESULTS**

19 Genetic scores for 4,206 brain IDPs and 169 body IDPs

20 To develop the genetic scores for IDPs, we used data from UKB individuals of British 21 ancestry with both imaging and genotyping array for training (average n = 34,293 for MRI 22 and 54,761 for OCT). An independent hold-out dataset containing participants of non-23 British European ancestry served as a testing dataset to evaluate the predictive performance of the IGS (average n = 5,116 for MRI and 4,801 for OCT). We generated 24 25 GWAS summary statistics for each IDP, which were then used as input to derive IGS for all UKB participants without imaging data. We used PRS-CS⁵⁵ to construct the IGS with 26 27 genotyping data, and 461,488 genetic variants were included in the prediction model 28 after standard genetic data quality controls (Methods).

29

We found that 68.14% (2,866/4,206) of brain IDPs and 95.27% (161/169) of body IDPs
were significantly predicted in the UKB European testing dataset (Benjamini-Hochberg
false discovery rate [FDR] < 5%; Table S2). Among the IDPs showing significant prediction,

the average R² was 1.40% (range = [0.10%, 7.62%]) for brain MRI, 0.85% (range = [0.06%,
6.32%]) for heart CMR, 1.80% (range = [0.26%, 5.67%]) for abdominal MRI, and 4.99%
(range = [1.10%, 10.01%]) for eye OCT. In the brain, we observed genetically predictable
IDPs in both UKB-Oxford and BIG-KP across all brain MRI modalities, and IDPs from the
same imaging modality exhibited similar predictive accuracy ranges in the two separate
processing pipelines (Fig. S1A).

7

8 Among BIG-KP sMRI regional brain volumes, the highest prediction accuracy was 9 observed for brain stem volume ($R^2 = 7.01\%$). Similarly, the UKB-Oxford sMRI IDP with the 10 highest prediction accuracy (R^2 = 7.62%) was the volume of pons by subcortical volumetric 11 sub-segmentation of the brain stem. Among BIG-KP dMRI DTI parameters, the highest 12 prediction accuracy was the mean fractional anisotropy (FA) of the posterior limb of 13 internal capsule ($R^2 = 4.72\%$). For rfMRI IDPs, the highest prediction accuracy was 14 observed on one ICA-based global functional connectivity trait that captured the central 15 executive, salience, and default mode networks ($R^2 = 5.04\%$). In addition, the IDP with the highest prediction accuracy was the ascending aorta minimum area for heart CMR (R^2 = 16 6.32%) and the liver iron corrected T1 for abdominal MRI ($R^2 = 7.38\%$). For eve OCT, the 17 18 thickness from the inner nuclear layer (INL) to the retinal pigment epithelium of the right eye had the highest prediction accuracy ($R^2 = 10.01\%$). 19

20

21 UKB has smaller numbers of non-European participants with imaging data. In an 22 exploratory analysis, we found that many developed IGS exhibited predictive utility for 23 individuals of Asian and African ancestries (average n = 460 and 252, respectively), although the prediction accuracy was generally smaller in these cohorts (Figs. 1B-1D, S1B-24 25 **S1D**, and **Tables S3-S4**). To ensure the robustness of our prediction models, we also conducted the same analyses on all 4,375 IDPs using DBSLMM⁵⁶ and evaluated the 26 consistency of prediction performance (Figs. S2A-S2B). Moreover, we performed 27 28 prediction using imputed genetic data, which required far greater computational 29 resources. We observed similar patterns with improved prediction accuracy (Figs. S2C-30 **S2D**). In summary, our results provide converging evidence that multi-organ IGS can be 31 reliably developed using different prediction methods and genetic data types, and these 32 IGS can be potentially applied to diverse populations.

1

2 IGS can stratify participants with a higher risk of brain and body diseases

3 Stratifying participants into different disease risk groups and identifying high-risk 4 individuals is crucial in clinical research and has potential for clinical translation⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹. Various factors and biomarkers have been examined for risk stratification, such as disease 5 polygenic risk scores (dPRS)⁶⁰⁻⁶³, lifestyle factors^{64,65}, and imaging traits^{66,67}. Here we 6 7 evaluated the performance of IGS in disease risk stratification for 871 phecode-based^{68,69} 8 diseases (**Table S5**). Considering the comparable prediction accuracy and association 9 results (Supplementary Note, Figs. S3-S7, and Tables S6-S9) between BIG-KP and UKB-10 Oxford brain IGS, we focused on a selected set of 383 multi-modality brain IGS together 11 with 41 abdominal IGS, 82 heart IGS, and 46 eye IGS in the following stratification analysis. 12 For both brain and body IGS, we randomly divided 318,781 unrelated UKB discovery (non-13 imaging) participants into three groups (after removing the effects of covariates): the 14 lowest 10%, the highest 10%, and the middle 80%. We then compared the difference in 15 disease case rate of these three IGS-stratified groups using a chi-squared test⁷⁰ (**Methods**). 16

We conducted a stratification analysis of 69 brain disorders using 383 brain IGS, which 17 consisted of 101 sMRI IGS (BIG-KP regional brain volumes³³), 110 dMRI IGS (BIG-KP DTI 18 parameters³⁵), and 172 rfMRI IGS (82 ICA-based² and 90 parcellation-based³⁷ traits). After 19 controlling FDR at 5% (69 × 383 tests), on UKB discovery cohort, we found that 141 brain 20 IGS stratified 25 disorders into groups with significantly different disease case rates, 21 22 resulting in a total of 294 IGS-disease pairs, and 247 of them were replicated on the UKB replication cohort (*P* range = $[5.31 \times 10^{-45}, 5.49 \times 10^{-4}]$) (Figs. 2A-2C and S8, and Table S10. 23 Methods). Among them, we found that rfMRI IGS accounted for almost two-thirds of the 24 25 identified stratifications with brain disorders (167/247, 67.61%). The majority (150/167, 26 89.82%) of the rfMRI IGS-brain disorder stratifications involved delirium, dementia, and Alzheimer's disease (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.16, 2.46], P range = $[5.31 \times 10^{-45}, 5.43 \times 10^{-45}]$ 27 28 10^{-4}] (Supplementary Note), and the rest mainly related to multiple sclerosis and 29 cerebrovascular diseases (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.06, 1.92], P range = $[2.34 \times 10^{-7},$ 30 5.06×10^{-4}]). Besides, both the ICA-based and parcellation-based rfMRI IGS displayed a 31 consistent pattern in stratifying delirium, dementia, and Alzheimer's disease, with the ICA-based traits exhibiting higher power. For example, 14 parcellation-based rfMRI IGS 32

had 38 stratification pairs with delirium, dementia, and Alzheimer's disease, while 39 ICAbased rfMRI IGS had 119 such pairs, representing 67.86% (38/56) and 90.84% (119/131)
of all parcellation-based rfMRI and ICA-based stratification results, respectively (Table
\$10).

5

6 The IGS derived from dMRI and sMRI also stratified multiple brain disorders. Out of the 7 110 dMRI IGS, 33 significantly stratified 14 disorders (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.04, 2.10], P range = $[1.65 \times 10^{-8}, 5.12 \times 10^{-4}]$, corresponding to 54 IGS-disease pairs, including 8 9 multiple sclerosis, dementia, Alzheimer's disease, and cerebrovascular diseases such as 10 intracranial hemorrhage, cerebral ischemia, and occlusion of cerebral arteries (Fig. 2B). 11 Among the 101 sMRI IGS, 14 significantly stratified 9 disorders (IGS tail case ratio range = 12 [1.09, 1.98], P range = $[3.50 \times 10^{-11}, 5.49 \times 10^{-4}]$, with a total of 26 IGS-disease pairs (**Fig.** 13 **2C**). We found that both dMRI and sMRI IGS showed strong stratifications with multiple 14 sclerosis, a heritable common neurodegenerative disease and a leading cause of 15 nontraumatic disability among young adults⁷¹⁻⁷³. For example, the IGS of the cingulum 16 axial diffusivity was found to have significantly more MS patients in its lower 10% tail than its upper 10% tail (IGS tail case ratio = 1.76, $P = 3.45 \times 10^{-8}$), consistent with results of 17 previous association analysis using dMRI data⁷⁴. Participants with the smallest 10% IGS of 18 the left and right thalamus proper volumes contained 1.73 and 1.96-fold ($P < 5.37 \times 10^{-5}$) 19 20 more MS cases than those with the largest 10% IGS, respectively. Similarly, IGS of the left and right putamen and the accumbens area volumes all stratified MS patients such that 21 22 the lower 10% IGS tail had a significantly higher case number than the upper 10% IGS tail (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.55, 1.85], *P* range = $[2.09 \times 10^{-10}, 4.11 \times 10^{-4}]$). These findings 23 are in line with previous studies identifying decreased brain volume in the thalamus^{75,76}, 24 putamen⁷⁷, and accumbens⁷⁸ in multiple sclerosis patients, highlighting the potential of 25 26 these brain IGS in identifying individuals at high risk for multiple sclerosis without actual 27 imaging data.

28

Body IGS also stratified diseases in their corresponding organs and systems. Using the 41
abdominal IGS, we stratified 104 digestive system diseases and 100 genitourinary system
diseases (204 × 41 tests) and identified 280 significant IGS-disease pairs after controlling
FDR at 5% level, where 229 of them were replicated on the UKB replication cohort,

associated with 37 abdominal IGS and 51 diseases (P range = $[4.80 \times 10^{-250}, 1.66 \times 10^{-3}]$) 1 2 (Fig. S9A). For example, we found that chronic renal failure patients were significantly 3 stratified by the IGS of kidney volume and kidney parenchyma volume (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.25, 1.37], *P* range = $[2.05 \times 10^{-18}, 6.42 \times 10^{-10}]$). The lower 10% IGS tail contained 4 more patients, and indeed the kidney volume and kidney parenchyma volume have been 5 6 found associated with kidney function (such as positive correlation with as glomerular filtration rate and negative correlation with creatinine)^{79,80}. In addition, patients with 7 chronic liver disease and cirrhosis were significantly stratified by the IGS of several 8 9 abdominal MRI traits, including liver proton density fat fraction and total abdominal fat 10 (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.22, 1.99], *P* range = $[4.88 \times 10^{-40}, 1.55 \times 10^{-3}]$), consistent with previous studies on the association between liver disease risk and liver/abdominal 11 12 fat⁸¹⁻⁸³. Furthermore, we examined the stratification of 90 circulatory system diseases 13 using 82 heart IGS (90 × 82 tests), discovered 202 IGS-disease pairs after controlling FDR at 5% level, and replicated 180 pairs between 54 heart IGS and 40 diseases (P range = 14 15 $[2.40 \times 10^{-34}, 1.37 \times 10^{-3}]$) (Fig. 2D). The strongest stratifications were found between 16 aortic aneurysms and the IGS of ascending/descending aorta maximum area, and ascending/descending aorta minimum area (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.32, 1.75], P 17 range = $[5.71 \times 10^{-14}, 6.75 \times 10^{-4}]$, which is the area of the region where a rtic aneurysm 18 occurs⁸⁴. We found that aortic aneurysm was monotonely stratified across all values of 19 20 the IGS of the ascending aorta maximum area such that larger IGS corresponded to higher risk (Figs. 2E-2F). MRI-measured aortic dimensions are frequently used for diagnosis of 21 aortic aneurysms⁸⁵, and large aortic diameters are considered abnormal and even 22 diagnostic of aortic aneurysms⁸⁶. Similarly, we stratified 38 eye and adnexa-related 23 disorders using 46 eye IGS (38 × 46 tests) and replicated 67 of the 107 IGS-disease pairs 24 25 with significant stratifications, corresponding to 27 eye IGS and 13 eye disorders (P range = $[5.65 \times 10^{-49}, 2.25 \times 10^{-3}]$ (Fig. S9B). For example, we found significantly more glaucoma 26 27 cases presented in the 10% upper tail of the IGS of the raw vertical cup-to-disc ratio (VCDR) of the left eye and the VCDR regressed on disc diameter⁸⁷ (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.51,28 1.98], P range = $[3.41 \times 10^{-22}, 3.77 \times 10^{-9}]$). The large value of observed VCDR has been 29 used clinically as a robust indicator for glaucoma⁸⁸. 30

1 We also evaluated the performance of IGS in cross-organ applications. First, we stratified 2 69 brain disorders by the 41 abdominal IGS, 82 heart IGS, and 46 eye IGS. We identified 3 and replicated 19 pairs between 19 IGS (6 heart IGS and 13 abdominal IGS) and 9 brain disorders (*P* range = $[4.16 \times 10^{-13}, 9.97 \times 10^{-5}]$) (Fig. S9C and Table S11). For example, the 4 IGS of the right ventricular ejection fraction had 1.62-fold more multiple sclerosis patients 5 6 in its lower 10% tail than its upper 10% tail ($P = 7.03 \times 10^{-6}$). This result matched previous 7 findings that multiple sclerosis patients had decreased ventricular ejection fractions^{89,90}. 8 Second, we stratified 90 circulatory system diseases by the 383 brain IGS, 41 abdominal 9 IGS, and 46 eye IGS. After controlling FDR at 5% level and replicating on UKB replication 10 cohort, we found that 27 circulatory system diseases were significantly stratified by 13 abdominal IGS, 79 brain IGS, and 3 eye IGS (*P* range = $[1.04 \times 10^{-10}, 2.78 \times 10^{-4}]$) (Fig. S9D). 11 12 Among these, peripheral vascular disease was widely stratified by all modalities of brain 13 IGS (IGS tail case ratio range = [1.10, 1.36], P range = $[2.25 \times 10^{-8}, 2.71 \times 10^{-4}]$), with the majority of signals in dMRI IGS (56.36%, 31/55). For example, the FA IGS of the body of 14 15 corpus callosum and anterior corona radiata both had more cases in their upper 10% tail, 16 and the mean diffusivity IGS of these two had fewer cases in their upper 10% tail, 17 consistent with prior findings on the associations between dMRI traits and peripheral vascular diseases⁹¹. Additionally, the IGS of the thickness of the inner nuclear of both eyes 18 significantly stratified hypertension patients, consistent with the reported associations 19 between higher blood pressure and thicker INL⁹², as well as our association results 20 between eye IGS and quantitative measures of blood pressure (Supplementary Note). 21

22

23 IGS broadly contribute to disease stratification in addition to disease genetic risk

24 Following disease stratification by IGS, we measured the predictive power of IGS for 25 disease by area under the curve (AUC), as AUC was widely used to measure power of PRS^{93,94} and allowed us to better measure the clinical utility of IGS. For each IGS-disease 26 27 pair that showed significant stratification (Figs. 2A-2D and S9, and Tables S10-S11), we 28 evaluated the AUC gain by including the IGS for disease prediction, compared to a 29 baseline model. Since dPRS is a frequently used genetic risk measure, we also analyzed the AUC gain from the additional inclusion of IGS when FinnGen⁹⁵-derived dPRS was 30 31 already incorporated (Methods).

1 As previously shown, brain and body IGS demonstrated marginal stratification capability 2 for diseases in both same-organ and cross-organ applications (Figs. 2A-2D and S10). To 3 measure the AUC gain from IGS, for each of the 110 diseases significantly stratified by IGS 4 and for each IGS that significantly stratified the disease, we constructed two logistic 5 regression models to measure the AUC gain: a baseline model that predicts disease status using basic covariates only, and an IGS model that additionally uses an IGS. The increment 6 7 in the AUC of the IGS model relative to the baseline model is defined as the AUC gain of 8 IGS. Out of the 919 pairs IGS-disease pairs showing replicated stratification patterns, 916 9 pairs had positive AUC gain for disease prediction from the IGS. Comparing the baseline 10 model to the IGS model using DeLong test⁹⁶, after controlling for FDR at level 5%, 80.52% 11 (740/919) pairs had significant AUC gain with the median being 0.0208 (range = $[7.25 \times$ 12 10⁻⁵, 2.11 × 10⁻¹], **Figs. 3A-3C** and **S10**, and **Tables S12-S13**). For example, in **Figure 3A**, the 13 largest AUC gain from brain IGS for brain disorder prediction was achieved by Net25 Node9 IGS for Alzheimer's disease (AUC gain = 0.0858, $P = 8.04 \times 10^{-23}$), whose 14 15 disease stratification patterns were visualized in Figure S8. All dMRI IGS that stratified 16 Alzheimer's disease in Figure 2B also had significant AUC gain (Fig. 3B). The IGS of the ascending aorta maximum area predicted aortic aneurysm with AUC gain 0.0462 (P = 5.9317 18 imes 10⁻⁹), the largest among heart IGS that significantly stratified circulatory system diseases 19 (Fig. 3C). Overall, the AUC gains of IGS suggest that the majority of disease-stratifying IGS 20 not only stratify subsets of subjects at high risk but also contribute to disease prediction 21 at the cohort level.

22

23 We further assessed the contribution of IGS to disease prediction and stratification 24 beyond that provided by dPRS. Briefly, we constructed dPRS using FinnGen GWAS 25 summary statistics of phecode-based diseases. We manually mapped 105 of the 110 UKB 26 diseases that had IGS stratification signals to 78 FinnGen disease endpoints (case number 27 range = [216, 111,581], median = 7,576) following the FinnGen-phecode mapping in Sun et al⁹⁷ and disease description in FinnGen R9⁹⁵ (**Table S14**). After Bonferroni correction at 28 29 5% level, 98 out of the 105 diseases gained significantly in AUC from inclusion of IGS on top of dPRS (AUC gain range = $[5.85 \times 10^{-5}, 3.16 \times 10^{-2}]$, AUC gain median = 4.26×10^{-3} , P 30 range = $[7.24 \times 10^{-35}, 2.27 \times 10^{-3}]$ (Fig. 3D and Table S15). The largest AUC gain (0.0316) 31 32 was achieved for nephrotic syndrome (without mention of glomerulonephritis, phecode

1 580.20), a kidney disorder associated with excessive protein in the urine. Examining the 2 AUC from dPRS alone and the additional AUC gain from IGS in Figure 3D, diseases can be 3 categorized into three types: (1) those with uninformative dPRS and large relative AUC 4 gains from IGS, (2) those with moderate dPRS and moderate AUC gains from IGS, and (3) 5 those with informative dPRS and minimal AUC gains from IGS. This suggests that IGS can help disease stratification, even if it does not always substantially boost the AUC. It makes 6 7 sense because AUC primarily reflects overall predictive performance across the entire 8 cohort and might not capture variations within specific subgroups (e.g., subjects with 9 high/low risk). Multiple diseases from each category were discussed in **Supplementary** 10 Note, and below we highlight a few examples spanning all categories.

11

12 For diseases with "uninformative dPRS," where subjects may have similar disease risks 13 across all dPRS percentile groups, IGS can still effectively stratify these subjects into high 14 and low risk within each dPRS group (Fig. 3E). Typically, these diseases lack large GWAS 15 data resources, and incorporating IGS could substantially improve the AUC. For example, 16 the dPRS of nephrotic syndrome had an AUC gain of 0.0083 and was generated using 17 FinnGen GWAS (FinnGen ID: N14 NEPHROTICSYND), which had a limited sample size of 853 patients but was already large among the existing GWAS of this disease^{98,99}. Cerebral 18 19 degeneration (phecode 331.90) had a dPRS AUC gain of 0.0084 (G6 DEGENOTH) and 20 gained additional AUC of 0.0188 by including three brain IGS. As the predictive performance of dPRS improved, resulting in "moderate dPRS," the stratification ability of 21 22 the IGS-dPRS model remained consistent on top of dPRS across almost all dPRS groups 23 (Figs. 3F-3G). IGS AUC gain remained nontrivial for some diseases, such as delirium 24 (phecode 290.20, AUC gain 0.0122) and aortic aneurysm (phecode 442.10, AUC gain 25 0.0101). Furthermore, Alzheimer's disease and multiple sclerosis had "informative dPRS" 26 such that the dPRS AUC gain was 0.1707 and 0.1503, respectively, and thus the further 27 AUC gain from IGS was significant yet small, both being 0.0022. Nevertheless, individuals 28 with high Alzheimer's disease dPRS, especially the top 10% individuals with highest dPRS, 29 were stratified into subgroups of distinct disease risk by IGS (Fig. 3H). Similar stratification 30 trends from the IGS-dPRS model were observed across multiple sclerosis and various 31 other diseases (Fig. S11).

1 In summary, we conducted a comprehensive AUC analysis of IGS prediction of diseases. 2 Most disease-stratifying IGS showed significant AUC contribution, and various diseases, 3 such as nephrotic syndrome, cerebral degeneration, delirium, and aortic aneurysms, had 4 nontrivial AUC gain from IGS in addition to dPRS. Besides, even for diseases with 5 informative dPRS and seemingly minimal AUC gain from IGS, IGS still stratified individuals with high disease genetic risk into subgroups with distinct risk. We will conduct detailed 6 7 analyses of IGS stratification for Alzheimer's disease and multiple sclerosis in the next 8 section to provide more insights into the IGS contribution to disease stratification in 9 scenarios with minimal AUC gains. It is important to note that these cases may represent 10 the lower bound of IGS utility, as their contribution would likely be greater if the AUC 11 gains were more substantial.

12

IGS stratification of Alzheimer's disease and multiple sclerosis: in-depth analysis and generalizability

15 As presented earlier, Alzheimer's disease and multiple sclerosis are the two 16 neurodegenerative disorders that were most frequently stratified by brain IGS on UKB 17 discovery cohort, with 55 and 27 stratifying brain IGS, respectively. In this section, we 18 provide an in-depth analysis of the stratification patterns of these two diseases using all 19 stratifying brain IGS. Furthermore, we constructed IGS for participants from two independent cohorts: the All of Us research program (AOU, n = 245,394)¹⁰⁰ and 20 Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative study (ADNI, n = 1,152)¹⁰¹ (**Methods**). We 21 22 showed that the Alzheimer's disease stratification patterns observed on UKB can be 23 replicated on AOU and ADNI. Moreover, we considered APOE status, and found that IGS 24 can effectively stratify Alzheimer's disease among participants of same APOE haplotypes. 25 APOE is known to be the strongest genetic factor risk for Alzheimer's disease and its 26 homozygote is considered a form of Alzheimer's disease¹⁰². Similar to Alzheimer's disease, 27 multiple sclerosis stratification patterns on UKB were replicated on AOU as well.

28

We have observed the marginal stratification of Alzheimer's disease on UKB participants by many brain IGS (**Figs. 2A-2B**). To stratify Alzheimer's disease using all the stratifying IGS, we constructed an IGS burden score by counting the number of IGS high-risk tails a subject was in, across the 55 IGS that were marginally stratifying (**Methods**). As expected,

1 Alzheimer's disease risk rose as IGS burden score increased (Fig. S12). Two additional risk 2 factors, age and dPRS, were then evaluated. Ageing is known to be closely related to Alzheimer's disease progression^{103,104}. Upon grouping participants by age, participants of 3 4 similar age were further stratified into "lower IGS burden score" or "higher IGS burden 5 score" groups if their IGS burden scores fell within the lower or upper 20% extremes for 6 their respective stratum. We found a consistent rise in the percentage of disease cases 7 with increasing age. Within each age group, particularly beginning from around age 60 on 8 the UKB cohorts and from around age 65 on the AOU and ADNI cohorts, participants with 9 higher IGS burden score always had much higher disease percentage than those with 10 lower IGS burden score (Figs. 4A-4D and Table S16).

11

12 For Alzheimer's disease dPRS, we first verified that the FinnGen-derived dPRS effectively 13 stratified patients in UKB, AOU, and ADNI cohorts (Fig. S13). We found that the IGS burden 14 score further stratified participants from the same dPRS percentile group. For example, 15 in Figure 4E, among the 31,797 participants with the top 10% dPRS, 2.38% had developed 16 Alzheimer's disease. The subgroup with higher IGS burden scores had an disease 17 percentage of 3.09% and the one with lower IGS burden scores had a disease percentage 18 of 1.85%. That is, inside this dPRS group, the higher IGS burden score subgroup contained 19 1.67-fold of cases, compared with the lower IGS burden score subgroup ($P = 2.58 \times 10^{-6}$). 20 Similar patterns were observed in UKB replication and AOU cohorts (Figs. 4F-4G). In ADNI, 21 we also found that within each dPRS percentile group, the subgroup of higher IGS burden 22 score always had a higher dementia percentage than the lower IGS burden score 23 subgroup (Fig. 4H). These results demonstrated the contribution of IGS stratification on 24 top of dPRS and the generalizability of UKB-derived IGS on external genetic cohorts.

25

We then examined *APOE* and found the IGS stratification power was not dominated by *APOE* status. In the UKB discovery cohort, we focused on subjects of age at least 55, and belong to one of the four common APOE haplotypes (n = 202,304): $\epsilon 2$ carriers, $\epsilon 3$ homozygotes, $\epsilon 4$ heterozygotes, and $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes (**Methods**). $\epsilon 3$ homozygotes were the most common *APOE* haplotype, $\epsilon 2$ carriers had lower disease risk, $\epsilon 4$ heterozygotes had higher risk, and $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes were recently considered a genetic form of Alzheimer's disease¹⁰². $\epsilon 4$ heterozygotes and $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes were also combined into

1 ε4 carriers. In Figure 5A, we found that IGS burden score stratified disease risk among 2 participants of same APOE haplotypes, and IGS stratification power remained when both 3 disease dPRS and APOE status were considered (Figs. 5B-5F). These results demonstrated 4 that IGS stratification of Alzheimer's disease was not simply driven by APOE, suggesting 5 that IGS could be useful for risk stratification when combined with other genetic risk 6 factors.

7

8 Brain IGS and burden scores also stratified multiple sclerosis on both UKB and AOU 9 cohorts. For example, the IGS of the left putamen volume had 1.85-fold of multiple 10 sclerosis patients in its lower 10% tail than its upper 10% tail (Fig. 2C and Table S10). 11 Decreased putamen volume was observed among multiple sclerosis patients in previous 12 studies⁷⁷. Further examining participants across all IGS percentile groups, we found that 13 both UKB discovery participants and AOU European participants had roughly monotone 14 decreasing disease percentage as the left putamen volume IGS increased, with the 15 monotone trend more visible among females (Figs. 6A-6B and Table S17). We then 16 included dPRS as an additional risk factor to stratify multiple sclerosis. Similar to 17 Alzheimer's disease dPRS, we first verified that multiple sclerosis dPRS were able to 18 stratify multiple sclerosis patients in UKB and AOU cohorts (Fig. S14). IGS burden score 19 was then constructed and was able to further stratify participants of similar dPRS into 20 subgroups of different disease percentage (Methods). Among both UKB and AOU 21 participants, further stratification of multiple sclerosis by IGS burden score on top of dPRS 22 was observed, and the stratification was weaker on non-European cohorts as expected 23 (Figs. 6C-6F). The multiple sclerosis stratification patterns on UKB and AOU using UKB-24 derived IGS provided evidence that stratification patterns by UKB-derived IGS could 25 generalize well to external cohort, especially when the ancestry of the external cohort is 26 close the IGS development cohort. We also examined stratification of bipolar disorder in 27 the AOU study (Supplementary Note and Table S18), which represents a scenario where 28 the external cohort has a much larger number of disease cases compared to the UKB study.

29

DISCUSSION 30

31 In this study, we developed 4,375 brain and body IGS and evaluated their performance in 32 disease risk stratification for UKB participants without imaging data and external

1 participants from UKB-independent studies. We confirmed that these IGS can provide 2 biologically relevant information to complex traits and diseases. Brain and body IGS 3 effectively stratified the risk of various diseases not only within their respective organ 4 systems but also in other organs, such as the pair of right ventricular ejection fraction and 5 multiple sclerosis. These results reflect both intra- and inter-organ connections between 6 IGS and clinical outcomes. We also conducted AUC analysis of IGS and found IGS can 7 stratify disease risk on top of disease genetic risk score, regardless of the overall AUC gain. 8 These results highlight differences in AUC measures and stratification capabilities, 9 suggesting the potential of IGS for clinical utility. We conducted a thorough analysis of 10 Alzheimer's disease, detailing age-related trends, replication of findings in both UKB and 11 independent cohorts, and the distinct contributions of IGS beyond dPRS and APOE. Our 12 IGS data resources have been made publicly available, facilitating similar in-depth 13 analyses for numerous brain and somatic diseases. We also provide a second example of 14 this application to multiple sclerosis.

15

16 Ageing is well-recognized for its close association with the progression of Alzheimer's 17 disease. Our findings indicate that IGS burden score consistently stratifies individuals at 18 higher risk of Alzheimer's disease in those aged over 55 in UKB and over 65 in AOU and 19 ADNI (Figs. 4A-4D). The IGS burden score was derived from multiple brain MRI IDPs, many 20 of which have been previously associated with Alzheimer's disease in studies with actual 21 imaging. Given that IGS was constructed solely from genotyping data, it can be readily 22 applied to participants with genetic data, enabling a quick and efficient assessment of 23 disease risk in older individuals, without undergoing real imaging data collection. We 24 further demonstrated that IGS, when combined with dPRS, offered a multi-layered 25 stratification of disease risk, which had better performance than using only the disease 26 genetic risk score (Figs. 4E-4H). Moreover, IGS contributed to Alzheimer's disease 27 stratification when both APOE status and dPRS were considered (Figs. 5A-5F), suggesting 28 stratification power of IGS was not purely driven by APOE. These results indicate that 29 although the UKB imaging study, with its largely healthy participant base, may not have 30 direct proven applicability for disease risk management, it possesses the capacity to 31 stratify disease risk in broader external genetic cohorts. We anticipate that the IGS

1 developed in our study can be widely applied in the stratification and management of

- 2 Alzheimer's disease risk.
- 3

4 When real imaging data are not available, IGS can be used as genetically predicted 5 variables for brain and body structures and functions. In addition to contribute to disease 6 stratification and prediction, established IGS provides an objective pseudo-imaging 7 biomarker associated with a specific organ region, which may serve as informative measure of diseases such as early-stage Alzheimer's disease^{105,106}, early-stage multiple 8 9 sclerosis^{107,108}, and bipolar disorder¹⁰⁹. Furthermore, IGS may also contribute to ongoing efforts on disease subtyping and integration^{110,111}. However, as shown in our prediction 10 11 analysis, IGS was typically only able to partially reconstruct the imaging phenotypes. It has 12 generally been observed that IGS has demonstrated imperfect performance in most 13 complex traits and diseases, which can be attributed to many factors, including a limited number of training samples, heritability, and weak genetic effects¹¹²⁻¹¹⁴. Another 14 15 challenge in IGS applications lies in ancestry and population differences¹¹⁵⁻¹¹⁷. As the 16 current UKB imaging cohort had the majority of the participants of European ancestry, 17 generating IGS in non-UKB and/or non-European studies may have further reduced performance¹¹³. In our UKB replication cohort, comprising non-British and non-European 18 19 participants, we observed that the IGS demonstrated consistent performance similar to 20 that in the discovery cohort (for example, Figs. 4B, 4F, and 6E). More powerful IGS 21 methods that better account for these IGS limitations and cohort differences may result 22 in more informative IGS for potential clinical applications. In addition, we expect to see 23 improvement in IGS prediction accuracy and stratification when more imaging samples 24 and IDPs are released by the UKB and other large imaging genetic studies.

25

26 METHODS

27 Methods are available in the *Methods* section.

28

29 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute On Aging of
 the National Institutes of Health under Award Number RF1AG082938. The content is
 solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official

1 views of the National Institutes of Health. The study has also been partially supported by 2 funding from the Wharton Dean's Research Fund, Analytics at Wharton, and Purdue 3 Statistics Department. This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank resource 4 (application number 76139), subject to a data transfer agreement. We would like to thank 5 the individuals who represented themselves in the UK Biobank for their participation and 6 the research teams for their efforts in collecting, processing, and disseminating these 7 datasets. We gratefully acknowledge all the studies and databases that made GWAS 8 summary-level data publicly available. We would like to thank the research computing 9 groups at Purdue University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the 10 Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania for providing computational resources 11 and support that have contributed to these research results.

12

13 **REFERENCES**

- Alfaro-Almagro, F. *et al.* Image processing and Quality Control for the first 10,000
 brain imaging datasets from UK Biobank. *NeuroImage* 166, 400-424 (2018).
- Elliott, L.T. *et al.* Genome-wide association studies of brain imaging phenotypes
 in UK Biobank. *Nature* 562, 210-216 (2018).
- Bai, W. *et al.* A population-based phenome-wide association study of cardiac and
 aortic structure and function. *Nature Medicine* 26, 1654-1662 (2020).
- 20 4. Littlejohns, T.J. *et al.* The UK Biobank imaging enhancement of 100,000
- participants: rationale, data collection, management and future directions. *Nature communications* **11**, 1-12 (2020).
- 23 5. Miller, K.L. *et al.* Multimodal population brain imaging in the UK Biobank
- 24 prospective epidemiological study. *Nature Neuroscience* **19**, 1523-1536 (2016).
- Smith, S.M. & Nichols, T.E. Statistical challenges in "big data" human
 neuroimaging. *Neuron* 97, 263-268 (2018).
- Cole, J.H. Multimodality neuroimaging brain-age in UK biobank: relationship to
 biomedical, lifestyle, and cognitive factors. *Neurobiology of aging* 92, 34-42
 (2020).
- Cox, S.R. *et al.* Ageing and brain white matter structure in 3,513 UK Biobank
 participants. *Nature communications* 7, 13629 (2016).

1	9.	Peng, H., Gong, W., Beckmann, C.F., Vedaldi, A. & Smith, S.M. Accurate brain age
2		prediction with lightweight deep neural networks. Medical image analysis 68,
3		101871 (2021).
4	10.	Kweon, H. et al. Human brain anatomy reflects separable genetic and
5		environmental components of socioeconomic status. Science advances 8,
6		eabm2923 (2022).
7	11.	Spreng, R.N. et al. The default network of the human brain is associated with
8		perceived social isolation. Nature communications 11 , 6393 (2020).
9	12.	Azevedo, T. et al. Identifying healthy individuals with Alzheimer neuroimaging
10		phenotypes in the UK Biobank. <i>medRxiv</i> (2022).
11	13.	Becker, J. et al. Resource profile and user guide of the Polygenic Index
12		Repository. Nature human behaviour 5 , 1744-1758 (2021).
13	14.	Lewis, C.M. & Vassos, E. Polygenic risk scores: from research tools to clinical
14		instruments. Genome medicine 12, 1-11 (2020).
15	15.	Torkamani, A., Wineinger, N.E. & Topol, E.J. The personal and clinical utility of
16		polygenic risk scores. Nature Reviews Genetics 19 , 581-590 (2018).
17	16.	Rietveld, C.A. et al. Replicability and robustness of genome-wide-association
18		studies for behavioral traits. Psychological science 25, 1975-1986 (2014).
19	17.	Choi, S.W., Mak, T.SH. & O'Reilly, P.F. Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic
20		risk score analyses. Nature protocols 15, 2759-2772 (2020).
21	18.	Wray, N.R., Goddard, M.E. & Visscher, P.M. Prediction of individual genetic risk
22		to disease from genome-wide association studies. Genome research 17, 1520-
23		1528 (2007).
24	19.	Consortium, I.S. Common polygenic variation contributes to risk of schizophrenia
25		and bipolar disorder. <i>Nature 460,</i> 748-752 (2009).
26	20.	Kullo, I.J. et al. Polygenic scores in biomedical research. Nature Reviews Genetics
27		23 , 524-532 (2022).
28	21.	Chatterjee, N., Shi, J. & García-Closas, M. Developing and evaluating polygenic
29		risk prediction models for stratified disease prevention. Nature Reviews Genetics
30		17 , 392 (2016).
31	22.	Ma, Y. & Zhou, X. Genetic prediction of complex traits with polygenic scores: a
32		statistical review. Trends in Genetics 37, 995-1011 (2021).

1	23.	Wand, H. et al. Improving reporting standards for polygenic scores in risk
2		prediction studies. <i>Nature</i> 591 , 211-219 (2021).
3	24.	Uffelmann, E. et al. Genome-wide association studies. Nature Reviews Methods
4		Primers 1, 1-21 (2021).
5	25.	Lambert, S.A. et al. The Polygenic Score Catalog as an open database for
6		reproducibility and systematic evaluation. Nature Genetics 53, 420-425 (2021).
7	26.	Zhao, B. et al. Heritability of regional brain volumes in large-scale neuroimaging
8		and genetic studies. Cerebral Cortex 29, 2904-2914 (2018).
9	27.	Kochunov, P. et al. Homogenizing estimates of heritability among SOLAR-Eclipse,
10		OpenMx, APACE, and FPHI software packages in neuroimaging data. Frontiers in
11		<i>Neuroinformatics</i> 13 , 16 (2019).
12	28.	Thompson, P.M. et al. ENIGMA and global neuroscience: A decade of large-scale
13		studies of the brain in health and disease across more than 40 countries.
14		Translational psychiatry 10 , 1-28 (2020).
15	29.	Zhao, B. et al. Heart-brain connections: Phenotypic and genetic insights from
16		magnetic resonance images. <i>Science</i> 380 , abn6598 (2023).
17	30.	Colclough, G.L. et al. The heritability of multi-modal connectivity in human brain
18		activity. <i>Elife</i> 6 , e20178 (2017).
19	31.	Busjahn, C.A. et al. Heritability of left ventricular and papillary muscle heart size:
20		a twin study with cardiac magnetic resonance imaging. European heart journal
21		30 , 1643-1647 (2009).
22	32.	Chien, KL., Hsu, HC., Su, TC., Chen, MF. & Lee, YT. Heritability and major
23		gene effects on left ventricular mass in the Chinese population: a family study.
24		BMC cardiovascular disorders 6 , 1-9 (2006).
25	33.	Zhao, B. et al. Genome-wide association analysis of 19,629 individuals identifies
26		variants influencing regional brain volumes and refines their genetic co-
27		architecture with cognitive and mental health traits. Nature genetics 51, 1637-
28		1644 (2019).
29	34.	Smith, S.M. et al. An expanded set of genome-wide association studies of brain
30		imaging phenotypes in UK Biobank. Nature neuroscience 24, 737-745 (2021).
31	35.	Zhao, B. et al. Common genetic variation influencing human white matter
32		microstructure. <i>Science</i> 372 , eabf3736 (2021).

1	36.	Grasby, K.L. et al. The genetic architecture of the human cerebral cortex. Science
2		367 , eaay6690 (2020).
3	37.	Zhao, B. et al. Genetic influences on the intrinsic and extrinsic functional
4		organizations of the cerebral cortex. medRxiv, 2021.07. 27.21261187 (2021).
5	38.	Hofer, E. et al. Genetic correlations and genome-wide associations of cortical
6		structure in general population samples of 22,824 adults. Nature
7		<i>communications</i> 11 , 1-16 (2020).
8	39.	Satizabal, C.L. et al. Genetic architecture of subcortical brain structures in 38,851
9		individuals. <i>Nature genetics</i> 51 , 1624-1636 (2019).
10	40.	Zhao, B. et al. Eye-brain connections revealed by multimodal retinal and brain
11		imaging genetics in the UK Biobank. <i>medRxiv</i> , 2023.02. 16.23286035 (2023).
12	41.	Zhao, B. et al. Common variants contribute to intrinsic human brain functional
13		networks. Nature Genetics 54, 508-517 (2022).
14	42.	Zhao, B. et al. Large-scale GWAS reveals genetic architecture of brain white
15		matter microstructure and genetic overlap with cognitive and mental health
16		traits (n = 17,706). <i>Molecular Psychiatry</i> (2019).
17	43.	Zhao, B. et al. Common variants contribute to intrinsic human brain functional
18		networks. <i>Nat Genet</i> 54 , 508-517 (2022).
19	44.	Cordova-Palomera, A. et al. Cardiac Imaging of Aortic Valve Area From 34 287 UK
20		Biobank Participants Reveals Novel Genetic Associations and Shared Genetic
21		Comorbidity With Multiple Disease Phenotypes. Circ Genom Precis Med 13,
22		e003014 (2020).
23	45.	Avants, B.B. et al. A reproducible evaluation of ANTs similarity metric
24		performance in brain image registration. Neuroimage 54, 2033-2044 (2011).
25	46.	Jahanshad, N. et al. Multi-site genetic analysis of diffusion images and voxelwise
26		heritability analysis: A pilot project of the ENIGMA–DTI working group.
27		Neuroimage 81 , 455-469 (2013).
28	47.	Kochunov, P. et al. Multi-site study of additive genetic effects on fractional
29		anisotropy of cerebral white matter: comparing meta and megaanalytical
30		approaches for data pooling. <i>Neuroimage</i> 95 , 136-150 (2014).

1	48.	Beckmann, C.F. & Smith, S.M. Probabilistic independent component analysis for
2		functional magnetic resonance imaging. IEEE transactions on medical imaging
3		23 , 137-152 (2004).
4	49.	Hyvarinen, A. Fast and robust fixed-point algorithms for independent component
5		analysis. IEEE transactions on Neural Networks 10, 626-634 (1999).
6	50.	Glasser, M.F. et al. A multi-modal parcellation of human cerebral cortex. Nature
7		536 , 171-178 (2016).
8	51.	Bijsterbosch, J. et al. Investigations into within-and between-subject resting-
9		state amplitude variations. Neuroimage 159, 57-69 (2017).
10	52.	McKay, A. et al. Measurement of liver iron by magnetic resonance imaging in the
11		UK Biobank population. <i>PLoS One</i> 13 , e0209340 (2018).
12	53.	West, J. et al. Feasibility of MR-Based Body Composition Analysis in Large Scale
13		Population Studies. PLoS One 11, e0163332 (2016).
14	54.	Wilman, H.R. et al. Genetic studies of abdominal MRI data identify genes
15		regulating hepcidin as major determinants of liver iron concentration. Journal of
16		Hepatology 71 , 594-602 (2019).
17	55.	Ge, T., Chen, CY., Ni, Y., Feng, YC.A. & Smoller, J.W. Polygenic prediction via
18		Bayesian regression and continuous shrinkage priors. Nature Communications
19		10 , 1776 (2019).
20	56.	Yang, S. & Zhou, X. Accurate and scalable construction of polygenic scores in
21		large biobank data sets. The American Journal of Human Genetics 106, 679-693
22		(2020).
23	57.	Xiang, R. et al. Recent advances in polygenic scores: translation, equitability,
24		methods and FAIR tools. Genome Med 16, 33 (2024).
25	58.	Lewis, C.M. & Vassos, E. Polygenic risk scores: from research tools to clinical
26		instruments. <i>Genome Med</i> 12 , 44 (2020).
27	59.	Moaddel, R. et al. Proteomics in aging research: A roadmap to clinical,
28		translational research. Aging Cell 20, e13325 (2021).
29	60.	Mavaddat, N. et al. Polygenic Risk Scores for Prediction of Breast Cancer and
30		Breast Cancer Subtypes. Am J Hum Genet 104 , 21-34 (2019).
31	61.	Aly, M. et al. Polygenic risk score improves prostate cancer risk prediction:
32		results from the Stockholm-1 cohort study. <i>Eur Urol</i> 60 , 21-8 (2011).

1	62.	Desikan, R.S. et al. Genetic assessment of age-associated Alzheimer disease risk:
2		Development and validation of a polygenic hazard score. PLoS Med 14, e1002258
3		(2017).
4	63.	de Rojas, I. et al. Common variants in Alzheimer's disease and risk stratification
5		by polygenic risk scores. Nat Commun 12, 3417 (2021).
6	64.	Olsson, T., Barcellos, L.F. & Alfredsson, L. Interactions between genetic, lifestyle
7		and environmental risk factors for multiple sclerosis. Nature Reviews Neurology
8		13 , 25-36 (2017).
9	65.	Virtanen, R., Jula, A., Kuusela, T., Helenius, H. & Voipio-Pulkki, L.M. Reduced
10		heart rate variability in hypertension: associations with lifestyle factors and
11		plasma renin activity. J Hum Hypertens 17, 171-9 (2003).
12	66.	Persyn, E. et al. Genome-wide association study of MRI markers of cerebral small
13		vessel disease in 42,310 participants. Nat Commun 11, 2175 (2020).
14	67.	Thompson, P.M. et al. ENIGMA and global neuroscience: A decade of large-scale
15		studies of the brain in health and disease across more than 40 countries.
16		Translational psychiatry 10 , 100 (2020).
17	68.	Bastarache, L. Using Phecodes for Research with the Electronic Health Record:
18		From PheWAS to PheRS. Annu Rev Biomed Data Sci 4, 1-19 (2021).
19	69.	Dey, R. et al. Efficient and accurate frailty model approach for genome-wide
20		survival association analysis in large-scale biobanks. Nature communications 13,
21		5437 (2022).
22	70.	Bakshi, A. et al. A polygenic risk score predicts incident prostate cancer risk in
23		older men but does not select for clinically significant disease. Cancers 13, 5815
24		(2021).
25	71.	Dobson, R. & Giovannoni, G. Multiple sclerosis - a review. Eur J Neurol 26, 27-40
26		(2019).
27	72.	Hauser, S.L. & Cree, B.A.C. Treatment of Multiple Sclerosis: A Review. Am J Med
28		133 , 1380-1390 e2 (2020).
29	73.	Patsopoulos, N.A. Genetics of Multiple Sclerosis: An Overview and New
30		Directions. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med 8(2018).

1	74.	Koenig, K.A. et al. The relationship between cognitive function and high-
2		resolution diffusion tensor MRI of the cingulum bundle in multiple sclerosis.
3		Multiple Sclerosis Journal 21 , 1794-1801 (2015).
4	75.	Azevedo, C.J. et al. Thalamic atrophy in multiple sclerosis: A magnetic resonance
5		imaging marker of neurodegeneration throughout disease. Ann Neurol 83, 223-
6		234 (2018).
7	76.	Minagar, A. et al. The thalamus and multiple sclerosis: modern views on
8		pathologic, imaging, and clinical aspects. Neurology 80, 210-9 (2013).
9	77.	Kramer, J. et al. Early and Degressive Putamen Atrophy in Multiple Sclerosis. Int J
10		<i>Mol Sci</i> 16 , 23195-209 (2015).
11	78.	Tokarska, N., Tottenham, I., Baaklini, C. & Gawryluk, J.R. How does the brain age
12		in individuals with multiple sclerosis? A systematic review. Frontiers in Neurology
13		14 , 1207626 (2023).
14	79.	Sanusi, A.A. et al. Relationship of ultrasonographically determined kidney
15		volume with measured GFR, calculated creatinine clearance and other
16		parameters in chronic kidney disease (CKD). Nephrol Dial Transplant 24 , 1690-4
17		(2009).
18	80.	Jovanovic, D., Gasic, B., Pavlovic, S. & Naumovic, R. Correlation of kidney size
19		with kidney function and anthropometric parameters in healthy subjects and
20		patients with chronic kidney diseases. <i>Ren Fail</i> 35 , 896-900 (2013).
21	81.	Xia, T. et al. Association between liver MRI proton density fat fraction and liver
22		disease risk. <i>Radiology</i> 309 , e231007 (2023).
23	82.	Zhang, Y.N. et al. Liver fat imaging-a clinical overview of ultrasound, CT, and MR
24		imaging. <i>Br J Radiol</i> 91 , 20170959 (2018).
25	83.	van der Poorten, D. et al. Visceral fat: a key mediator of steatohepatitis in
26		metabolic liver disease. <i>Hepatology</i> 48 , 449-57 (2008).
27	84.	Heikkinen, M., Salenius, JP. & Auvinen, O. Ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm
28		in a well-defined geographic area. Journal of vascular surgery 36 , 291-296
29		(2002).
30	85.	van Hout, M.J. et al. How to measure the aorta using MRI: a practical guide.
31		Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging 52 , 971 (2020).

1	86.	Litmanovich, D., Bankier, A.A., Cantin, L., Raptopoulos, V. & Boiselle, P.M. CT and
2		MRI in diseases of the aorta. American Journal of Roentgenology 193, 928-940
3		(2009).
4	87.	Han, X. et al. Genome-wide association analysis of 95 549 individuals identifies
5		novel loci and genes influencing optic disc morphology. Human Molecular
6		Genetics 28 , 3680-3690 (2019).
7	88.	Crowston, J.G. et al. The effect of optic disc diameter on vertical cup to disc ratio
8		percentiles in a population based cohort: the Blue Mountains Eye Study. Br J
9		<i>Ophthalmol</i> 88 , 766-70 (2004).
10	89.	Olindo, S. et al. Decrease in heart ventricular ejection fraction during multiple
11		sclerosis. <i>Eur J Neurol</i> 9 , 287-91 (2002).
12	90.	Mincu, R.I. et al. Impaired Cardiac Function in Patients with Multiple Sclerosis by
13		Comparison with Normal Subjects. Sci Rep 8, 3300 (2018).
14	91.	Rowe Bijanki, K. et al. Characterizing white matter health and organization in
15		atherosclerotic vascular disease: a diffusion tensor imaging study. Psychiatry Res
16		214 , 389-94 (2013).
17	92.	Xie, H. et al. Arterial hypertension and retinal layer thickness: the Beijing Eye
18		Study. Br J Ophthalmol 108, 105-111 (2023).
19	93.	Sinnott-Armstrong, N. et al. Genetics of 35 blood and urine biomarkers in the UK
20		Biobank. Nat Genet 53 , 185-194 (2021).
21	94.	Lin, J. et al. Integration of Biomarker Polygenic Risk Score Improves Prediction of
22		Coronary Heart Disease. JACC Basic Transl Sci 8, 1489-1499 (2023).
23	95.	Kurki, M.I. et al. FinnGen provides genetic insights from a well-phenotyped
24		isolated population. <i>Nature</i> 613 , 508-518 (2023).
25	96.	DeLong, E.R., DeLong, D.M. & Clarke-Pearson, D.L. Comparing the areas under
26		two or more correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric
27		approach. Biometrics, 837-845 (1988).
28	97.	Sun, B.B. et al. Genetic associations of protein-coding variants in human disease.
29		Nature 603 , 95-102 (2022).
30	98.	Okamoto, K. et al. Common variation in GPC5 is associated with acquired
31		nephrotic syndrome. Nature genetics 43, 459-463 (2011).

1	99.	Sanchez-Rodriguez, E., Southard, C.T. & Kiryluk, K. GWAS-Based Discoveries in
2		IgA Nephropathy, Membranous Nephropathy, and Steroid-Sensitive Nephrotic
3		Syndrome. <i>Clin J Am Soc Nephrol</i> 16 , 458-466 (2021).
4	100.	Investigators, A.o.U.R.P.G. Genomic data in the All of Us research program.
5		Nature 627 , 340 (2024).
6	101.	Petersen, R.C. et al. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI): clinical
7		characterization. <i>Neurology</i> 74, 201-9 (2010).
8	102.	Fortea, J. et al. APOE4 homozygozity represents a distinct genetic form of
9		Alzheimer's disease. Nature Medicine, 1-8 (2024).
10	103.	Braak, H., Thal, D.R., Ghebremedhin, E. & Del Tredici, K. Stages of the pathologic
11		process in Alzheimer disease: age categories from 1 to 100 years. J Neuropathol
12		Exp Neurol 70 , 960-9 (2011).
13	104.	Herrup, K. Reimagining Alzheimer's diseasean age-based hypothesis. J Neurosci
14		30 , 16755-62 (2010).
15	105.	Counts, S.E., Ikonomovic, M.D., Mercado, N., Vega, I.E. & Mufson, E.J.
16		Biomarkers for the Early Detection and Progression of Alzheimer's Disease.
17		Neurotherapeutics 14 , 35-53 (2017).
18	106.	Dubois, B., von Arnim, C.A.F., Burnie, N., Bozeat, S. & Cummings, J. Biomarkers in
19		Alzheimer's disease: role in early and differential diagnosis and recognition of
20		atypical variants. Alzheimers Res Ther 15, 175 (2023).
21	107.	Barillot, C., Edan, G. & Commowick, O. Imaging biomarkers in multiple Sclerosis:
22		From image analysis to population imaging. Med Image Anal 33, 134-139 (2016).
23	108.	Gill, A.J., Schorr, E.M., Gadani, S.P. & Calabresi, P.A. Emerging imaging and liquid
24		biomarkers in multiple sclerosis. <i>Eur J Immunol</i> 53 , e2250228 (2023).
25	109.	Grewal, S., McKinlay, S., Kapczinski, F., Pfaffenseller, B. & Wollenhaupt-Aguiar, B.
26		Biomarkers of neuroprogression and late staging in bipolar disorder: A
27		systematic review. Aust N Z J Psychiatry 57, 328-343 (2023).
28	110.	Lu, Y. et al. Subtyping Schizophrenia Using Psychiatric Polygenic Scores. medRxiv,
29		2023.10. 12.23296915 (2023).
30	111.	Dahl, A. et al. Phenotype integration improves power and preserves specificity in
31		biobank-based genetic studies of major depressive disorder. Nat Genet 55, 2082-
32		2093 (2023).

1	112.	Dudbridge, F. Power and predictive accuracy of polygenic risk scores. <i>PLoS</i>
2		<i>genetics</i> 9 , e1003348 (2013).
3	113.	Wang, Y. et al. Theoretical and empirical quantification of the accuracy of
4		polygenic scores in ancestry divergent populations. Nature communications 11,
5		1-9 (2020).
6	114.	Zhao, B. & Zou, F. On polygenic risk scores for complex traits prediction.
7		Biometrics 78 , 499-511 (2022).
8	115.	Kachuri, L. et al. Principles and methods for transferring polygenic risk scores
9		across global populations. Nature Reviews Genetics, 1-18 (2023).
10	116.	Duncan, L. et al. Analysis of polygenic risk score usage and performance in
11		diverse human populations. Nature communications 10, 1-9 (2019).
12	117.	Zhao, B., Yang, X. & Zhu, H. Estimating trans-ancestry genetic correlation with
13		unbalanced data resources. arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.12154 (2022).
14	118.	Sudlow, C. et al. UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes
15		of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. PLoS medicine 12,
16		e1001779 (2015).
17	119.	Ji, J.L. et al. Mapping the human brain's cortical-subcortical functional network
18		organization. Neuroimage 185, 35-57 (2019).
19	120.	Liu, Y. et al. Genetic architecture of 11 organ traits derived from abdominal MRI
20		using deep learning. <i>Elife</i> 10 (2021).
21	121.	Sorokin, E.P. et al. Analysis of MRI-derived spleen iron in the UK Biobank
22		identifies genetic variation linked to iron homeostasis and hemolysis. Am J Hum
23		Genet 109 , 1092-1104 (2022).
24	122.	Wilman, H.R. et al. Characterisation of liver fat in the UK Biobank cohort. PLoS
25		<i>One</i> 12 , e0172921 (2017).
26	123.	Mojtahed, A. et al. Reference range of liver corrected T1 values in a population
27		at low risk for fatty liver disease-a UK Biobank sub-study, with an appendix of
28		interesting cases. Abdom Radiol (NY) 44, 72-84 (2019).
29	124.	Karlsson, A. et al. Automatic and quantitative assessment of regional muscle
30		volume by multi-atlas segmentation using whole-body water-fat MRI. J Magn
31		Reson Imaging 41 , 1558-69 (2015).

1	125.	Borga, M. et al. Validation of a fast method for quantification of intra-abdominal
2		and subcutaneous adipose tissue for large-scale human studies. NMR Biomed 28,
3		1747-53 (2015).
4	126.	Linge, J. et al. Body Composition Profiling in the UK Biobank Imaging Study.
5		Obesity (Silver Spring) 26 , 1785-1795 (2018).
6	127.	Borga, M. et al. Reproducibility and repeatability of MRI-based body composition
7		analysis. <i>Magn Reson Med</i> 84 , 3146-3156 (2020).
8	128.	Langner, T. et al. Kidney segmentation in neck-to-knee body MRI of 40,000 UK
9		Biobank participants. <i>Sci Rep</i> 10, 20963 (2020).
10	129.	Jiang, L. et al. A resource-efficient tool for mixed model association analysis of
11		large-scale data. Nat Genet 51 , 1749-1755 (2019).
12	130.	Bycroft, C. et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic
13		data. Nature 562, 203-209 (2018).
14	131.	Purcell, S. et al. PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-
15		based linkage analyses. The American Journal of Human Genetics 81, 559-575
16		(2007).
17	132.	Mullins, N. et al. Genome-wide association study of more than 40,000 bipolar
18		disorder cases provides new insights into the underlying biology. Nature genetics
19		53 , 817-829 (2021).
20	133.	Program, A.o.U.R. All of Us Research Program Genomic Research Data Quality
21		Report, All of Us Curated Data Repository (CDR) release C2022Q4R9. Vol. 2024
22		(2024).
23	134.	Guo, Y. et al. Plasma proteomic profiles predict future dementia in healthy
24		adults. Nature Aging, 1-14 (2024).
25	135.	Lumsden, A.L., Mulugeta, A., Zhou, A. & Hypponen, E. Apolipoprotein E (APOE)
26		genotype-associated disease risks: a phenome-wide, registry-based, case-control
27		study utilising the UK Biobank. <i>EBioMedicine</i> 59 , 102954 (2020).
28		
29	METH	ODS

30 Imaging traits.

1 The imaging data used in our study were obtained from the UKB study, which recruited 2 around 500,000 individuals between the ages of 37 and 73 (229,114 males) between 2006 3 and 2010¹¹⁸ (https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/). The ethics approval of the UKB study was 4 obtained from the North West Multicentre Research Ethics Committee (approval number: 5 11/NW/0382). We used a total of 4,206 brain MRI IDPs, 41 abdominal MRI IDPs, 82 heart CMR IDPs, and 46 eye OCT IDPs. The brain MRI IDPS consisted of 301 BIG-KP^{33,35,37} and 6 3,905 UKB-Oxford^{1,2,34} traits. The BIG-KP traits were from our previous studies on three 7 brain MRI modalities. First, we obtained 101 regional brain volumes³³ from sMRI by 8 applying the advanced normalization tools⁴⁵. Second, we generated 110 tract-averaged 9 DTI parameters³⁵ from dMRI using the ENIGMA-DTI pipeline^{46,47}. Third, for rfMRI, we 10 partitioned the cerebral cortex into 360 brain areas using the Glasser360 parcellation⁵⁰. 11 12 We obtained 90 functional activity (amplitude) and functional connectivity (edge) traits³⁷ 13 for 12 functional networks¹¹⁹. The UKB-Oxford had 1,437 IDPs from sMRI (including susceptibility-weighted structural imaging), 675 from dMRI, 1.777 from rfMRI, and 16 14 from task-based tfMRI. Specifically, the sMRI IDPs consisted of FIRST (Category 1102), 15 16 FAST (Category 1101), FreeSurfer ASEG (Category 190), FreeSurfer BA exvivo (Category 17 195), FreeSurfer a2009s (Category 197), FreeSurfer DKT (Category 196), FreeSurfer 18 desikan gw (Category 194), FreeSurfer desikan pial (Category 193), FreeSurfer desikan 19 white (Category 192), FreeSurfer subsegmentation (Category 191), regional T2* (Category 20 109), and white matter hyperintensity volume (Category 112). The 675 dMRI IDPs 21 included 432 TBSS-processed IDPs from Category 134 and 243 ProbtrackX-processed IDPs 22 from Category 135. The 1,777 rfMRI IDPs consisted of 76 activity amplitude (node) traits and 1,701 functional connectivity (edge) traits (Category 111). They were parcellation-23 free and generated by whole brain spatial ICA^{1,2,48,49}. Lastly, there were 16 tfMRI IDPs 24 25 from Category 106. The details of the image acquisition, preprocessing procedures, and 26 quality controls were available in the UKB Brain Imaging Documentation (https://biobank.ctsu.ox.ac.uk/crystal/crystal/docs/brain mri.pdf). The 41 abdominal 27 MRI IDPs^{53,120-128} were from abdominal organ composition (Category 158), kidney-derived 28 29 measures (Category 159), liver MRI (Category 126), and abdominal composition (Category 30 149). For the 82 heart CMR IDPs, the details of the image acquisition, preprocessing procedures, and quality controls were described in previous studies^{3,29}. The 46 eye OCT 31

1 IDPs were all from derived OCT measures⁴⁰ (Category 100079). A list of these IDPs can be

2 found in **Table S1**.

3

4 IGS and dPRS constructions.

We performed the following genetic quality controls (QCs) for the set of participants with 5 both IDP and genetic data³⁷: 1) removed individuals with missing genotype rate > 0.1; 2) 6 7 removed variants with missing genotype rate > 0.1; 3) removed variants with minor allele 8 frequency (MAF) < 0.01; and 4) removed variants that failed the Hardy-Weinberg test for 9 equilibrium at 1×10^{-7} level. Using individuals of British European ancestry, the GWAS was 10 performed using linear mixed effect models via fastGWA¹²⁹ (average n = 34,286 for brain, 11 average n = 31,875 for heart, average n = 39,830 for abdomen, and average n = 54,76112 for eye). The adjusting covariates included age (at imaging), age-squared, sex, the 13 interaction between age and sex, the interaction between age-squared and sex, first 40 genetic principal components¹³⁰ (PCs) for all organs; and additionally the estimated total 14 15 intracranial volume (eTIV), head motion measurements and their squares, brain position 16 measurements and their squares, and volumetric scaling for brain IDPs. Additionally, for 17 BIG-KP regional brain volumes, the total brain volume (TBV) was included as an adjusting covariate to remove global effects³³. For TBV, the eTIV and volumetric scaling were not 18 19 included as covariates due to their high linearity. With the GWAS summary statistics as input, we used PRS-CS⁵⁵ and DBSLMM⁵⁶ to obtain the weights for IGS. The 20 hyperparameters of both methods were the default values and/or the automatically 21 tuned values. We then used PLINK¹³¹ to generate risk scores in testing data by 22 23 summarizing across genetic variants, weighed by their weights.

24

The prediction accuracy of IGS was measured by the incremental R^2 , which was the 25 26 additional phenotypic variation that can be explained by the IGS while adjusting for the 27 effects of covariates in a linear regression model. The covariates included age, age-28 squared, sex, the interaction between age and sex, the interaction between age-squared 29 and sex, and the first 40 genetic PCs. The prediction accuracy was estimated separately in 30 three independent hold-out datasets corresponding to European, Asian, and African 31 ancestries. The European hold-out dataset consisted of UKB individuals of British or non-32 British European ancestry with IDP data and unrelated to the IGS training set used to

generate IDP GWAS (average n = 4,541). The Asian hold-out dataset consisted of UKB individuals of Bangladeshi, Chinese, Indian, or Pakistani ancestry with IDP data (average n = 460). The African hold-out dataset consisted of UKB individuals of African or Caribbean ancestry with IDP data (average n = 252).

5

6 We also used PRS-CS⁵⁵ to construct dPRS. Out of the 110 phecode-based diseases that 7 had IGS stratification signals on UKB (**Tables S10-S11**), we mapped 105 diseases to 75 8 FinnGen R9 disease endpoints that had publicly available GWAS summary statistics (**Table 9 S14**). We used the FinnGen-phecode mapping in Sun et al⁹⁷ and disease description from 10 the FinnGen release R9. For the bipolar disorder analysis on AOU, we used GWAS 11 summary statistics from the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium¹³² to construct BD dPRS.

12

13 **IGS-phenotype associations.**

14 We used a discovery-replication design to examine associations between IGS and 15 phenotypes in UKB participants without brain or body IDPs. We randomly selected 70% 16 of UKB unrelated British European individuals (average n = 202,893) as the discovery 17 dataset for IGS-phenotype associations, while the remaining 30% of UKB unrelated British 18 European individuals, all UKB unrelated non-British European individuals, and all 19 unrelated non-European individuals (average n = 129,333) were used as the replication 20 dataset. We treated the values greater than five times the median absolute deviation 21 from the median as outliers and removed these values. A total of 189 UKB phenotypes 22 were tested, which represented a wide range of traits from various domains. Specifically, 23 the 189 UKB phenotypes included 24 mental health traits (Category 100060), 5 cognitive 24 traits (Category 100026), 12 physical activity traits (Category 100054), 6 electronic device 25 use traits (Category 100053), 8 sun exposure traits (Category 100055), 3 sexual factor 26 traits (Category 100056), 3 social support traits (Category 100061), 21 diet traits (Category 27 100052), 9 alcohol drinking traits (Category 100051), 6 smoking traits (Category 100058), 28 34 blood biochemistry biomarkers (Category 17518), 3 blood pressure traits (Category 29 100011), 3 spirometry traits (Category 100020), 17 early life factors (Categories 135, 30 100033 and 100072), 9 greenspace and coastal proximity (Category 151), 2 hand grip 31 strength (Category 100019), 13 residential air pollution traits (Category 114), 5 residential 32 noise pollution traits (Category 115), 2 body composition traits by impedance (Category

100009), 3 female specific factors (Category 100069), and 1 education trait (Category
 100063) (Table S6).

3

4 Association testing was then conducted to examine the linear relationship between the 5 4,375 IDP-derived IGS and the 189 UKB phenotypes. We adjusted for the same set of 6 covariates separately in the discovery set and the replication set, including age, age-7 squared, sex, the interaction between age and sex, the interaction between age-squared 8 and sex, and 40 genetic PCs. Specifically, we regressed the IDP-derived IGS onto the UKB 9 phenotypes and calculated *P*-values using a two-sided t-test. We prioritized the results 10 that met the following three criteria: 1) significant at 0.05 level after Bonferroni correction 11 in the discovery dataset: 2) significant at a nominal significance level of 0.05 in the 12 replication dataset; and 3) had regression coefficients with matching directions in both 13 the discovery and replication datasets.

14

15 **Disease risk stratifications.**

We used IGS to stratify 871 phecode-based^{68,69} diseases (Table S5) separately on the UKB 16 17 discovery cohort and the UKB replication cohort. The UKB discovery cohort consisted of unrelated British European participants without brain or body IDPs (average n = 318,781). 18 19 The UKB replication cohort consisted of unrelated non-British European participants and 20 unrelated non-European participants, all without brain or body IDPs (average n = 48,015). 21 In each cohort, we residualized IGS with the same covariates used in the association 22 analysis, standardized the residualized IGS to mean 0 and standard deviation 1, sorted all 23 participants according to the value of the standardized IGS, and split participants into 24 three groups: the group of smallest 10% IGS, the group of largest 10% IGS, and the group 25 of middle 80% IGS. The group of the smallest 10% IGS was referred to as the lower 10% 26 tail, and the group of the largest 10% IGS was referred to as the upper 10% tail. For each 27 disease, the number of disease cases was counted, and a chi-squared test of three levels 28 of IGS-based groups (the smallest 10%, middle 80%, and the largest 10%) and two levels 29 of disease status (case/control) was conducted. The original IGS tail case ratios between 30 the two 10% tails were computed for all IGS-disease pairs and were reported in 31 supplementary tables (Tables S10-S11), which were defined as (the number of patients 32 in IGS upper 10% tail) / (the number of patients in IGS lower 10% tail). In Figures 2 and S9,

1 we visualized the maximum of the original IGS tail case ratio and its inverse, that is, a 2 number always greater than or equal to 1. We also only visualized the IGS-disease pairs 3 whose IGS tails contained above-average disease patients. That is, one or both of the two 4 10% tails of IGS contained at least 10% of all cases on the UKB discovery cohort. In total, 5 6 pairs between brain IGS and brain/mental disorders, 3 pairs between abdominal IGS and genitourinary/digestive diseases, 3 pairs between heart IGS and circulatory system 6 7 diseases, and 2 pairs between brain/abdominal/eye IGS and circulatory systems diseases 8 were not visualized because of this.

9

10 For Alzheimer's disease/dementia analysis on AOU, unlike UKB age distribution (Fig. 11 S15A), AOU had a bimodal distribution (Fig. S15B), and thus we restricted our AOU 12 analysis to participants of age between 60 and 90 (at the age of incidence for patients and 13 at the time of survey otherwise), and only included those self-identified as European 14 ('White') (n = 59.261, 26.881 males at birth). For the Alzheimer's disease/dementia 15 patients, we used age at incidence for the analysis in Figure 4C, and age at survey for the 16 controls. Due to the lower disease percentage in AOU, we used both Alzheimer's disease (ICD-10 code: G30) and dementia (ICD-10 code: F01-F03) for cases, and the rest as 17 18 controls. For multiple sclerosis analysis on AOU, we used all participants self-identified as 19 European (n = 128,515,51,390 males at birth, age range = [17, 113]) and all participants 20 self-identified as African ('Black'), or Hispanic, or Asian(African n = 50,139,21,684 males 21 at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic n = 41,575, 13,461 males at birth, age range = [17, 104]; Hispanic [10, 104]; Hispanic [22 100]; Asian n = 7,603, 3,066 males at birth, age range = [17, 100]). For bipolar disorder 23 analysis on AOU, we used all participants self-identified as European. Multiple sclerosis 24 patients were those diagnosed with ICD-10 G35, and bipolar disorder patients were those 25 diagnosed with ICD-10 F31. Using PLINK, we developed IGS and dPRS using the Allele 26 Count/Allele Frequency threshold genotyping data prepared by AOU and the UKB weights generated from PRS-CS. We removed the effects of age, sex and 16 genetic PCs from IGS 27 and dPRS, where the genetic PCs were prepared by AOU as well¹³³. 28

29

For ADNI, we used participants of age at least 60 (n = 1,116, 656 males, age range = [60, 91]), the participants whose final diagnosis was dementia were used as cases and the rest as controls (dementia percentage = 42.92%). After performing the standard genetic QCs³³,

we developed the IGS and dPRS using UKB-derived weights and removed the effects of
 age and sex .

3

4 AUC analysis.

5 To measure the contribution from a single IGS to disease prediction, we trained the following logistic regression models: (1) a baseline model that predicts disease status 6 7 using age and sex as predictors, and (2) an IGS model that predicts disease status using 8 age, sex, and one IGS. We constructed an IGS model for each IGS-disease pair that had 9 significant stratification (Tables S12-S13), a total of 919 IGS models. The increment in the 10 AUC of the IGS model compared with the baseline model is the AUC gain by including a single IGS and visualized in Figures 3A-C and S9. DeLong test⁹⁶ was used to test for the 11 12 difference in AUC between the baseline model and the IGS model. All AUC was obtained 13 using case-control matched individuals. For each disease, each patient was matched with five participants free of this disease¹³⁴, of same age and sex, and of British European 14 15 ancestry.

16

To measure the contribution from IGS when dPRS was included, we considered two 17 18 logistic regression models for disease status prediction: (1) a baseline-dPRS model that 19 included age, sex, and the corresponding dPRS, and (2) an IGS-dPRS model that included 20 age, sex, dPRS, and IGS that marginally stratified this disease. The IGS-dPRS model was 21 selected from the better one between using all stratifying IGS and using only the IGS with 22 the largest stratification tail case ratio. The difference between the AUC of the IGS-dPRS 23 model and the AUC of the baseline-dPRS model was the measure of IGS contribution to 24 disease prediction given dPRS. We averaged the AUC across repeated 100 runs with two-25 fold cross-validation. The increment in the average AUC of the IGS-dPRS model compared 26 with the average AUC of the baseline-dPRS model is the AUC gain visualized in Figure 3D. 27 Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to test for the difference in AUC between the baselinedPRS model and the IGS-dPRS model across all cross-validation replications. 28

29

30 IGS burden scores.

The brain IGS for Alzheimer's disease stratification on UKB cohorts was selected according
to four criteria below: (1) on the UKB discovery cohort, the IGS stratified disease cases so

1 that the chi-squared test was significant after controlling the FDR at a 5% level; (2) the IGS 2 had one of its two 10% tails containing at least 10% of all disease cases of UKB discovery 3 cohort; (3) the IGS had one of its two 10% tails containing at most 10% of all disease cases 4 of UKB discovery cohort; and (4) the IGS tail case ratio direction was consistent between 5 the UKB discovery cohort and the UKB replication cohort (that is, the 10% tail that 6 contained more disease cases was consistent on both cohorts). There were 55 IGS that 7 satisfied these conditions and were selected for Alzheimer's disease stratification (Table 8 **S16**). In Figures 4A-4B, 4E-4F and 5, within each group (defined by age, or by dPRS, or by 9 APOE status, or by both APOE status and dPRS), brain IGS were selected with the following 10 two criteria: (1) the IGS was selected for disease stratification on the entire cohort (that 11 is, among the 55 selected IGS above); and (2) the 10% IGS tail in the group that contained 12 more cases was also the 10% IGS tail that had contained more cases on the entire cohort 13 (that is, the IGS high-risk tail that contained more disease cases remained consistent in 14 this age/dPRS/APOE-defined group).

15

16 IGS burden score of a participant was the number of "IGS high-risk tails" a participant was in. The "IGS high-risk tail" for IGS burden score was the 20% top tail of an IGS that 17 18 contained more patients compared to the lower 20% tail. We constructed an IGS burden 19 score by counting the number of IGS high-risk tails a subject was in, across the selected 20 IGS. For example, if a subject was ranked in the top 20% for five out of the selected brain 21 IGS, they would be assigned an IGS burden score of five. As IGS burden score is an integer 22 as small as zero, for each group, we selected the "Low IGS burden score" to be the 23 smallest nonnegative integer values that corresponded to around 20% of all participants in this group, and the "Higher IGS burden score" to be the largest integer values that 24 25 corresponded to around 20% of all participants in this group. Within a group, the 26 participants with IGS burden score among the "Lower IGS burden score" values were categorized as "Lower IGS burden score", and likewise, those with IGS burden score 27 28 among the "Higher IGS burden score" values were categorized as "Higher IGS burden 29 score". Due to smaller sample size and higher dementia percentage in ADNI, ADNI IGS 30 burden score used 10% tail for "IGS high-risk tail". Besides, ADNI had "Lower IGS burden 31 score" cutoff at 10% for age analysis (Fig. 4D).

Similar to UKB analysis, we grouped AOU participants of European ancestry into different groups (by age as in **Fig. 4C** or by dPRS as in **Fig. 4G**). For each stratum, we again calculated the IGS tail case ratio for the 55 selected IGS and only kept the IGS that had case ratio direction consistent with the UKB discovery cohort, and categorized participants inside each stratum into "Lower IGS burden score" and "Higher IGS burden score". Similar analysis was performed for ADNI participants (**Figs. 4D** and **4H**).

7

8 For multiple sclerosis stratification on UKB and AOU, similar to Alzheimer's disease, we 9 applied the following criterion to select the brain IGS for IGS burden score: (1) on the UKB 10 discovery cohort, the IGS stratified multiple sclerosis cases so that the chi-squared test 11 was significant after controlling the FDR at a 5% level; (2) the IGS had one of its two 10% 12 tails containing at least 10% of all multiple sclerosis cases of UKB discovery cohort; (3) the 13 IGS had one of its two 10% tails containing at most 10% of all multiple sclerosis cases of 14 UKB discovery cohort; and (4) the IGS tail case ratio direction was consistent between the 15 UKB discovery cohort and the UKB replication cohort (that is, the 10% tail that contained 16 more cases was consistent on both cohorts). There were 25 IGS that satisfied these conditions and were selected for IGS burden score of multiple sclerosis (Table S17), and 17 18 then stratification within group defined by multiple sclerosis dPRS were carried out using 19 IGS burden score, similar to Alzheimer's disease analysis described above.

20

21 APOE status.

22 We extracted APOE genotypes for UKB participants based on the genetic variants rs429358 and rs7412. Following prior studies on APOE¹³⁵, we considered five common 23 APOE genotypes ($\epsilon 4 \epsilon 4$, $\epsilon 3 \epsilon 4$, $\epsilon 3 \epsilon 3$, $\epsilon 2 \epsilon 3$ and $\epsilon 2 \epsilon 2$) and mapped the alleles of rs429358 24 25 and rs7412 as follows: rs429358 CC and rs7412 CC to ɛ4ɛ4, rs429358 TC and rs7412 CC to 26 ε3ε4, rs429358 TT and rs7412 CC to ε3ε3, rs429358 TT and rs7412 TC to ε2ε3, and 27 rs429358 TT and rs7412 TT to $\epsilon 2\epsilon 2$. Here $\epsilon 4\epsilon 4$ are $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes, $\epsilon 3\epsilon 4$ are $\epsilon 4$ 28 heterozygotes, $\epsilon 3\epsilon 3$ are $\epsilon 3$ homozygotes, and $\epsilon 2\epsilon 2$ and $\epsilon 2\epsilon 3$ are $\epsilon 2$ carriers. We also 29 combined ɛ4 homozygotes and ɛ4 heterozygotes as "ɛ4 carriers" in Figures 5A and 5E.

30

31 Code availability.

1 We made use of publicly available software and tools. The list of genetic variants and their

2 weights used for the construction of IGS for UKB brain and body IDPs are available at

3 <u>https://github.com/xcyang17/IPRS_UKB</u>.

4

5 Data availability.

6 The individual-level data used in this study can be obtained from 7 https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/ and http://adni.loni.usc.edu/data-samples/. The disease GWAS data can be downloaded from https://www.finngen.fi/en/access results and 8 9 https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/bip2021 noUKBB/22564402. Our IGS data 10 resources can be downloaded at Zenodo (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7709788).

11

12 Figure legends.

13 Fig. 1 Study overview and prediction analysis.

(A) An overview of the study design. (B) The incremental prediction R^2 of brain and body 14 15 IGS in the hold-out UK Biobank (UKB) testing sets of European, Asian, and African 16 ancestries. The structural MRI (sMRI) modality consisted of 101 BIG-KP regional brain 17 volumes, the diffusion MRI (dMRI) modality consisted of 110 BIG-KP DTI parameters, and 18 the resting functional MRI (rfMRI) modality consisted of 90 BIG-KP parcellation-based 19 traits and 82 UKB-Oxford ICA-based rfMRI traits. The abdominal MRI (Abd MRI) modality 20 consisted of 41 abdominal MRI traits, the eye OCT modality consisted of 46 eye traits, and 21 the heart CMR modality consisted of 82 UKB heart CMR traits. The results of other IGS 22 can be found in **Figure S1**. We display the IGS that significantly predicted the 23 corresponding IDPs in the European dataset after controlling the FDR rate at a 5% level. (C) The incremental prediction R^2 of these IGS in the European and Asian testing datasets. 24 (D) The incremental prediction R^2 of these IGS in the European and African testing 25 26 datasets. In (C)-(D), the IGS with the highest prediction R^2 in the European testing set in 27 each modality was marked by an arrow and text. ICA stands for independent component 28 analysis, INL stands for inner nuclear layer, and RPE stands for retinal pigment epithelium. 29

30 Fig. 2 IGS stratification of brain and heart disorders.

31 (A)-(D) The IGS-disease pairs after controlling the FDR rate at a 5% level on UKB discovery

32 cohort, replicated on UKB replication cohort, and with IGS tail case ratio greater than 1.1

1 (brain) or 1.2 (heart) are displayed. Each point represents an IGS-disease pair. The y-axis 2 shows the disease name and the associated phecode (for example, the phecode of 3 Alzheimer's Disease is 290.11). The x-axis shows the disease case ratio between the two 4 IGS tails. We show the results for UKB discovery cohort. (E)-(F) For the pair between aortic 5 aneurysm (AA) and AAo max area (ascending aorta maximum area), we show the disease percentage (y-axis) in quantile-based groups defined by AAo max area IGS (x-6 7 axis) in the UKB discovery and UKB replication cohorts. The horizontal grey dashed line 8 represents the disease percentage for the entire cohort.

9

10 Fig. 3 AUC of IGS for disease prediction.

11 (A)-(C) AUC gain of disease prediction on UKB discovery cohort by including the stratifying 12 IGS for IGS-disease pairs that were significant on UKB discovery cohort after controlling 13 the FDR rate at a 5% level, replicated on UKB replication cohort, and with IGS tail case 14 ratio greater than 1.1 (brain) or 1.2 (heart). Each point represents an IGS-disease pair. The 15 y-axis shows the disease name and the associated phecode. The x-axis shows the AUC 16 gain from the IGS model compared with the baseline model. (D) AUC gain of disease 17 prediction on UKB discovery cohort by including the most stratifying IGS or all stratifying 18 IGS in the IGS-dPRS model, compared with the baseline-dPRS model. The diseases with 19 IGS stratification patterns visualized in Figures 3E-3H and S11 was marked by an arrow 20 and text. (E)-(H) For four select diseases, for each disease polygenic risk score (dPRS) 21 quantile group (x-axis), we show the disease percentage (y-axis) for all participants ("All 22 subjects"), participants in the low 10% tail of the prediction of the IGS-dPRS model of the 23 disease ("Prediction lower tail"), and participants in the high 10% tail of the prediction of 24 the IGS-dPRS model ("Prediction higher tail"). We show the results for UKB discovery 25 cohort.

26

Fig. 4 IGS stratification of Alzheimer's disease across age and disease polygenic risk score groups.

(A)-(D) For each age group (*x*-axis), we show the Alzheimer's disease (AD) or dementia
percentage (*y*-axis) for all participants ("All subjects"), participants in the low 20% tail of
IGS burden score ("Lower IGS burden score"), and participants in the high 20% tail of IGS
burden score ("Higher IGS burden score"). (E)-(H) For each dPRS quantile group (*x*-axis),

we show the AD or dementia percentage (*y*-axis) for all participants ("All subjects"),
participants in the low 20% tail of IGS burden scores ("Lower IGS burden score"), and
participants in the high 20% tail of IGS burden scores ("Higher IGS burden score"). We
show the results for UKB discovery (left panels), UKB replication (middle-left panels), AOU
European (middle-right panels), and ADNI (right panels) cohorts.

6

Fig. 5 IGS stratification of Alzheimer's disease on the basis of APOE status and disease polygenic risk score.

9 (A) For each APOE group (y-axis), we show the relative change in Alzheimer's Disease (AD) 10 percentage (x-axis) in the low 20% tail of IGS burden score ("Lower IGS burden score") 11 and in the high 20% tail of IGS burden score ("Higher IGS burden score") compared to the 12 overall AD percentage of the APOE group (decimals at x=0). (B)-(F) For five APOE groups, 13 for each dPRS quantile group (x-axis), we show the AD percentage (y-axis) for all 14 participants ("All subjects"), participants in the low 20% tail of IGS burden score ("Lower 15 IGS burden score"), and participants in the high 20% tail of IGS burden score ("Higher IGS 16 burden score"). We show the results for the UKB discovery cohort.

17

18 Fig. 6 IGS stratification of multiple sclerosis.

19 (A)-(B) For the pair between multiple sclerosis (MS) and left.putamen (left putamen 20 volume), we show the disease percentage (y-axis) in quantile-based groups defined by 21 left.putamen IGS (x-axis) in the UKB discovery and AOU European cohorts. The horizontal 22 grey dashed line represents the disease percentage for the entire cohort. (C)-(E) For each 23 dPRS quantile group (x-axis), we show the MS percentage (y-axis) for all participants ("All subjects"), participants in the low 20% tail of IGS burden scores ("Lower IGS burden 24 25 score"), and participants in the high 20% tail of IGS burden scores ("Higher IGS burden 26 score"). We show the results for UKB discovery, UKB replication, AOU European, and AOU 27 non-European cohorts.



Figure 1



Figure 2



Figure 3



Figure 4



Figure 5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.18.23288769; this version posted June 3, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. UKB discovery of Pears of the author/funder a CC-BY-NCEND 4.0 International ACTS European (n = 129K)



Figure 6