The duration of lithium use and biological ageing: telomere length, 1 frailty, metabolomic age and all-cause mortality 2

3

4	†Julia	n Mutz ^{1*} , †Win Lee Edwin Wong ^{2, 3, 4} , Timothy R. Powell ¹ , Allan H. Young ^{4, 5} , Gavin
5	S. Dav	ve ^{2, 3, 6} & Cathryn M. Lewis ^{1, 7}
6		
7	1.	Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry,
8		Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, United Kingdom.
9	2.	Department of Pharmacology, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University
10		of Singapore, Singapore.
11	3.	Healthy Longevity Translational Research Programme, Yong Loo Lin School of
12		Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore.
13	4.	Department of Psychological Medicine, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology &
14		Neuroscience, King's College London, London, United Kingdom.
15	5.	South London & Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, Bethlem Royal Hospital, Monks
16		Orchard Road, London, United Kingdom.
17	6.	Neurobiology Programme, Life Sciences Institute, National University of Singapore,
18		Singapore.
19	7.	Department of Medical and Molecular Genetics, Faculty of Life Sciences and
20		Medicine, King's College London, London, United Kingdom.
21		
22	†Thes	e authors contributed equally to this work and are designated as co-first authors.
23		
24	*Corre	esponding author:
25	Dr Jul	ian Mutz; Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry,
26	Psycho	ology & Neuroscience, King's College London, Memory Lane, London, SE5 8AF,
27	United	l Kingdom. Email: julian.mutz@gmail.com.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 ABSTRACT

Background: Lithium is an established first-line treatment for bipolar disorder. Beyond its
therapeutic effect as a mood stabiliser, lithium exhibits potential anti-ageing effects. This study
aimed to examine the relationship between the duration of lithium use, biological ageing and
mortality.

Methods: The UK Biobank is an observational study of middle-aged and older adults. We
tested associations between the duration of lithium use (number of prescriptions, total duration
of use, and duration of the first prescription period) and telomere length, frailty, metabolomic
age, pulse rate and all-cause mortality.

Results: 591 individuals (mean age = 57.49 years; 55% females) had been prescribed lithium.

38 There was no evidence that the number of prescriptions ($\beta = -0.022$, 95% CI -0.081 to 0.037,

39 p = 0.47), the total duration of use ($\beta = -0.005, 95\%$ CI -0.023 to 0.013, p = 0.57) or the duration

40 of the first prescription period ($\beta = -0.018$, 95% CI -0.051 to 0.015, p = 0.29) correlated with

41 telomere length. There was also no evidence that the duration of lithium use correlated with

42 frailty or metabolomic age. However, a higher prescription count or a longer duration of use

43 was associated with a lower pulse rate. The duration of lithium use did not predict mortality.

44 **Conclusions**: We observed no evidence of associations between the duration of lithium use

45 and biological ageing markers, including telomere length. Our findings suggest that the

46 potential anti-ageing effects of lithium do not differ by duration of use.

47 INTRODUCTION

Lithium is considered the gold standard treatment for patients with bipolar disorder who experience recurrent episodes of (hypo)mania and depression.¹ Lithium is also used to augment antidepressant medication, for example in patients with difficult-to-treat major depressive disorder.² While the evidence supports lithium's therapeutic effects,³ its mechanisms of action are incompletely understood. Studies indicate that lithium influences neurotransmitter signalling and acts on second messenger systems including the adenyl cyclase and protein kinase A pathways.⁴

55

Beyond its therapeutic effects as a mood stabiliser, multiple lines of evidence suggest that lithium may impact biological ageing and longevity.⁵ For example, mitochondrial dysfunction is a hallmark of ageing,⁶ and lithium treatment has been shown to enhance mitochondrial metabolism by increasing the activity of electron transport complexes.^{7,8} Preclinical and clinical studies suggest that lithium can reduce oxidative stress, which is linked to several agerelated diseases.^{9,10} Notably, studies have demonstrated that lithium extends the lifespan of model organisms, including *Caenorhabditis elegans* ("*C. elegans*") and Drosophila.^{11,12}

63

64 A specific focus of research on lithium's potential anti-ageing properties has been to examine its link with telomere length. Telomeres, which are repetitive nucleoprotein complexes at the 65 66 ends of chromosomes, progressively shorten with cell division and play an important role in maintaining genomic stability. Telomere attrition is a hallmark of ageing and is linked to 67 68 cellular senescence.⁶ Telomere dysfunction plays a role in many human diseases.¹³ For example, meta-analyses suggest that individuals with bipolar disorder have shorter telomeres 69 than healthy controls.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ However, several studies have also found no evidence of a difference 70 71 in telomere length or observed longer telomeres in patients with bipolar disorder. These 72 inconsistencies may in part result from differences in lithium treatment. Some clinical studies 73 suggest that lithium protects against telomere attrition. For example, studies have shown that bipolar disorder patients treated with lithium had longer telomeres than healthy controls¹⁷ and 74 75 that lithium-treated patients had longer telomeres than patients who were not treated with lithium.^{17,18}. While these group differences in telomere length could be due to other factors, 76 77 several studies found that a longer duration of lithium treatment was correlated with longer telomeres.19 78

79

Building on previous studies in the UK Biobank that have identified predictors and correlates of telomere length,²⁰⁻²² we examined the potential impact of the duration of lithium treatment on telomere length and other markers of biological ageing. We defined three measures of lithium treatment duration using primary care prescription records and assessed multiple markers of biological ageing and longevity, including telomere length, frailty, metabolomic age and all-cause mortality. The overall aim was to elucidate the broader implications of

86 lithium treatment on biological ageing.

87 METHODS

88 Study population

89 The UK Biobank is a prospective community-based study that recruited more than 500,000 middle-aged and older adults, aged 40 to 69 years.²³ Individuals who were registered with the 90 91 UK National Health Service (NHS) and lived within a 25-mile (~40 km) radius of one of 22 assessment centres were invited to participate. At the baseline assessment, which took place 92 93 between 2006 and 2010, participants reported their sociodemographic characteristics, health behaviours and medical history. They also underwent physical examinations and had blood and 94 95 urine samples taken. Data linkage to primary care health records is available for about 230,000 96 participants.

97

98 **Duration of lithium use**

99 The duration of lithium use was derived from medication prescriptions recorded by general 100 practitioner practices as part of routine patient care. These data included prescriptions recorded 101 between July 1945 and September 2017 and were available for 222,073 participants. Lithium 102 prescriptions were identified using a combination of the British National Formulary (BNF), 103 Read v2 and Dictionary of Medicines and Devices (dm+d) codes, and by searching for relevant 104 string permutations across the prescription medication names. The duration of lithium use was defined in three ways, similar to our previous study on antidepressants.²⁴ First, we calculated 105 106 the total number of lithium prescriptions across all primary care prescription records. Second, we calculated the total number of weeks across all prescription windows, which we defined as 107 108 periods of less than 90 days between consecutive prescriptions. Third, we calculated the 109 number of weeks of the first prescription window. Prescriptions after the baseline assessment 110 date were excluded from these calculations.

111

112 Telomere length

Leukocyte telomere length was measured using a quantitative polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assay that expresses telomere length as the ratio of the telomere repeat copy number (T) relative to a single-copy gene (S) that encodes haemoglobin subunit beta.²⁵ The T/S ratio is proportional to an individual's average telomere length.²⁶ Measurements were adjusted for operational and technical parameters (PCR machine, staff member, enzyme batch, primer batch, temperature, humidity, primer batch × PCR machine, primer batch × staff member, A260/A280 ratio of the DNA sample and A260/A280 ratio squared), log_e transformed and Z-standardised.

120

121 **Frailty index**

A frailty index was derived from health deficits that met the following criteria: indicators of 122 123 poor health; more prevalent in older individuals; neither rare nor universal; covering multiple areas of functioning; available for > 80% of participants.²⁷ The index included 49 variables 124 125 ascertained via touch-screen questionnaires and nurse-led interviews. including 126 cardiometabolic, cranial, immunological, musculoskeletal, respiratory, and sensory traits, well-127 being, infirmity, cancer, and pain. Categorical variables were dichotomised (no deficit = 0; 128 deficit = 1), and ordinal variables were mapped onto a score between zero and one. The sum 129 of deficits was divided by the total number of possible deficits, resulting in frailty index scores between zero and one, with higher scores indicating greater levels of frailty.²⁸ Participants with 130 missing data for > 10/49 variables were excluded.²⁷ 131

132

Metabolomic ageing clock 133

134 Nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy-derived metabolomic biomarkers were 135 quantified in non-fasting plasma samples using the Nightingale Health platform, which ascertains 168 circulating metabolites using a high-throughput standardised protocol.²⁹ In 136 137 101,359 participants, we developed a metabolomic ageing clock using a Cubist rule-based 138 regression model. This algorithm is an ensemble technique that derives rules from decision trees and fits linear regression models in the subsets of data defined by these rules. The model 139 140 incorporates boosting techniques and may adjust predictions based on k-nearest neighbors.^{30,31} 141 Model performance was assessed using nested cross-validation with 10 outer loops and 5 inner 142 folds for hyperparameter tuning. The cross-validation mean absolute error (MAE) was 5.42 143 years. Metabolomic age (MileAge) delta represents the difference between predicted and 144 chronological age, with positive and negative values indicating accelerated and decelerated 145 biological ageing, respectively.

146

Pulse rate 147

148 Resting pulse rate in beats per minute was recorded using an Omron 705 IT digital blood pressure monitor device or, exceptionally, a manual sphygmomanometer. We calculated the 149 150 average of the two available readings to reduce potential measurement error.

151

152 **All-cause mortality**

The date of death was obtained through linkage with national death registries: NHS Digital 153 154 (England and Wales) and the NHS Central Register (Scotland). The censoring date was 30

November 2022. The most recent death was recorded on 19 December 2022, although the datawere incomplete for December 2022.

157

158 Covariates

Covariates for the cross-sectional and prospective analyses included chronological age, sex,
body mass index (kg/m²), morbidity count (none/one, two, three, four or five+), gross annual
household income (<£18,000, £18,000-£30,999, £31,000-£51,999 or £52,000-£100,000 /
\$£100,000), highest educational/professional qualification (none, O levels/GCSEs/CSEs, A
levels/NVQ/HND/HNC or degree) and cohabitation status (single or with spouse/partner).

164

165 Statistical analyses

The data processing and analyses were performed in R (version 4.2). Sample characteristics 166 167 were summarised using means and standard deviations or counts and percentages. Associations between the duration of lithium use (number of prescriptions, total duration of use, and duration 168 of the first prescription period) and telomere length were estimated using ordinary least squares 169 170 regression. We further tested associations between the duration of lithium use and two other 171 indicators of biological age, the frailty index and the metabolomic ageing clock, and pulse rate. 172 Hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals were estimated using Cox proportional 173 hazards models to examine associations between the duration of lithium use and all-cause 174 mortality. We examined both quintiles of the distribution, with the lowest quintile as the reference group, and spline functions of the distribution with the median as reference value. 175 176 Age in years was used as the underlying time axis, with age 40 as the start of follow-up. The 177 cross-sectional and prospective analyses were adjusted for chronological age and sex (Model 178 1) and chronological age, sex, body mass index, morbidity count, household income, highest 179 qualification, and cohabitation status (Model 2).

180

181 Sensitivity analyses

We conducted the following sensitivity analyses of the duration of lithium use and biological ageing markers: we restricted the sample to individuals with a total duration of lithium use of (a) at least 1 year (52 weeks) or (b) at least 4.5 years (234 weeks); we additionally adjusted for

185 current antidepressant medication use (yes/no) at the time of the baseline assessment.

186 **RESULTS**

187 **Sample characteristics**

188 Of the 502,476 participants in the UK Biobank, 222,073 individuals (about 44.2% of the 189 sample) had prescription data available through their linked primary care records. Of the 773 190 participants with a lithium prescription in their primary care record, n = 182 were excluded 191 because their first prescription followed the baseline assessment. The duration of lithium use 192 was estimated for 591 participants (Figure S1). Sample characteristics are shown in Table 1. Based on our previously reported criteria,^{32,33} 71.74% of participants had a lifetime history of 193 mood disorders (n = 248 had bipolar disorder and n = 176 had depression). 194 195

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	n		Primary care	No primary care ¹
Age; mean (SD) $57.49 (7.51)$ $56.58 (8.05)$ $56.48 (8.13)$ SexFemale $327 (55.3\%)$ $121618 (54.9\%)$ $151420 (54.0\%)$ Male $264 (44.7\%)$ $99864 (45.1\%)$ $128982 (46.0\%)$ EthnicityWhite $572 (96.8\%)$ $210119 (94.9\%)$ $261977 (93.4\%)$ Non-White $14 (2.4\%)$ $10322 (4.7\%)$ $16695 (6.0\%)$ Missing ² $5 (0.8\%)$ $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ Highest qualification $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ None $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC ³ $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing ² $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ $Very low$ $198 (33.5\%)$ $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing ² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation V $122.2\%)$ $45205 (2.1\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Mith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>(<i>N</i>=221,482)</th><th>(<i>N</i>=280,403)</th></t<>			(<i>N</i> =221,482)	(<i>N</i> =280,403)
SexFemale $327 (55.3\%)$ $121618 (54.9\%)$ $151420 (54.0\%)$ Male $264 (44.7\%)$ $99864 (45.1\%)$ $128982 (46.0\%)$ EthnicityWhite $572 (96.8\%)$ $210119 (94.9\%)$ $261977 (93.4\%)$ Non-White $14 (2.4\%)$ $10322 (4.7\%)$ $16695 (6.0\%)$ Missing ² $5 (0.8\%)$ $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ Highest qualification $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC ³ $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing ² $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ V $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing ² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ CohabitationWith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing ² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		Age; mean (SD)	56.58 (8.05)	56.48 (8.13)
Female $327 (55.3\%)$ $121618 (54.9\%)$ $151420 (54.0\%)$ Male $264 (44.7\%)$ $99864 (45.1\%)$ $128982 (46.0\%)$ Ethnicity $372 (96.8\%)$ $210119 (94.9\%)$ $261977 (93.4\%)$ Non-White $14 (2.4\%)$ $10322 (4.7\%)$ $16695 (6.0\%)$ Missing ² $5 (0.8\%)$ $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ Highest qualification $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ None $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC ³ $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing ² $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ $Very low$ $198 (33.5\%)$ $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing ² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Mith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Mitsing ² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		ex		
Male $264 (44.7\%)$ $99864 (45.1\%)$ $128982 (46.0\%)$ Ethnicity V White $572 (96.8\%)$ $210119 (94.9\%)$ $261977 (93.4\%)$ Non-White $14 (2.4\%)$ $10322 (4.7\%)$ $16695 (6.0\%)$ Missing ² $5 (0.8\%)$ $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ Highest qualification V V $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ None $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC ³ $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing ² $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ V V $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ $High / Very high$ $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing ² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ $Cohabitation$ With partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing ² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$ Smoking status $202 (40.6\%)$ $10000 (40.6\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		Female	121618 (54.9%)	151420 (54.0%)
EthnicityWhite $572 (96.8\%)$ $210119 (94.9\%)$ $261977 (93.4\%)$ Non-White $14 (2.4\%)$ $10322 (4.7\%)$ $16695 (6.0\%)$ Missing ² $5 (0.8\%)$ $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ Highest qualificationNone $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC ³ $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing ² $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ $Very$ low $198 (33.5\%)$ $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing ² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Mith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing ² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		Male	99864 (45.1%)	128982 (46.0%)
White $572 (96.8\%)$ $210119 (94.9\%)$ $261977 (93.4\%)$ Non-White $14 (2.4\%)$ $10322 (4.7\%)$ $16695 (6.0\%)$ Missing² $5 (0.8\%)$ $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ Highest qualification $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC³ $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing² $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ $Very low$ $198 (33.5\%)$ $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation W $177 (29.9\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		Ethnicity		
Non-White $14 (2.4\%)$ $10322 (4.7\%)$ $16695 (6.0\%)$ Missing2 $5 (0.8\%)$ $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ Highest qualification $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ None $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC ³ $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing2 $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ $Very low$ $198 (33.5\%)$ $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing2 $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $241446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation W $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing2 $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		White	210119 (94.9%)	261977 (93.4%)
Missing2 $5 (0.8\%)$ $1041 (0.5\%)$ $1731 (0.6\%)$ Highest qualificationNone $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC3 $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing2 $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income4 V Very low $198 (33.5\%)$ $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing2 $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation V $177 (29.9\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing2 $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		Non-White	10322 (4.7%)	16695 (6.0%)
Highest qualificationNone119 (20.1%) $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs125 (21.2%) $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC3118 (20.0%) $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree222 (37.6%) $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing²7 (1.2%) $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ $Very low$ 198 (33.5%) $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low132 (22.3%) $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium95 (16.1%) $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high72 (12.2%) $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing²94 (15.9\%) $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation $With partner$ $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing²177 (29.9\%) $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		Missing ²	1041 (0.5%)	1731 (0.6%)
None $119 (20.1\%)$ $39882 (18.0\%)$ $45265 (16.1\%)$ O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125 (21.2\%)$ $58292 (26.3\%)$ $73662 (26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC3 $118 (20.0\%)$ $50521 (22.8\%)$ $63207 (22.5\%)$ Degree $222 (37.6\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ Missing² $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income ⁴ $Very low$ $198 (33.5\%)$ $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation $With partner$ $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		lighest qualification		
O levels/GCSEs/CSEs $125(21.2\%)$ $58292(26.3\%)$ $73662(26.3\%)$ A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC3 $118(20.0\%)$ $50521(22.8\%)$ $63207(22.5\%)$ Degree $222(37.6\%)$ $69916(31.6\%)$ $91014(32.5\%)$ Missing2 $7(1.2\%)$ $2871(1.3\%)$ $7255(2.6\%)$ Household income4 $198(33.5\%)$ $45278(20.4\%)$ $51717(18.4\%)$ Low $132(22.3\%)$ $49247(22.2\%)$ $58794(21.0\%)$ Medium $95(16.1\%)$ $49037(22.1\%)$ $61637(22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72(12.2\%)$ $45305(20.5\%)$ $63809(22.8\%)$ Missing2 $94(15.9\%)$ $32615(14.7\%)$ $44446(15.9\%)$ Cohabitation $55(9.3\%)$ $17885(8.1\%)$ $24172(8.6\%)$ Missing2 $177(29.9\%)$ $42862(19.4\%)$ $54270(19.4\%)$		None	39882 (18.0%)	45265 (16.1%)
A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC3118 (20.0%) 50521 (22.8%) 63207 (22.5%Degree222 (37.6%) 69916 (31.6%) 91014 (32.5%Missing27 (1.2%) 2871 (1.3%) 7255 (2.6%)Household income4 198 (33.5%) 45278 (20.4%) 51717 (18.4%Low132 (22.3%) 49247 (22.2%) 58794 (21.0%Medium95 (16.1%) 49037 (22.1%) 61637 (22.0%High / Very high72 (12.2%) 45305 (20.5%) 63809 (22.8%Missing294 (15.9%) 32615 (14.7%) 44446 (15.9%Cohabitation 359 (60.7%) 160735 (72.6%) 201961 (72.0%Single 55 (9.3%) 17885 (8.1%) 24172 (8.6%)Missing2 177 (29.9%) 42862 (19.4%) 54270 (19.4%		O levels/GCSEs/CSEs	58292 (26.3%)	73662 (26.3%)
Degree Missing2 $222 (37.6\%)$ $7 (1.2\%)$ $69916 (31.6\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $91014 (32.5\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income4 $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Wery low Low $198 (33.5\%)$ $132 (22.3\%)$ $45278 (20.4\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ $28794 (21.0\%)$ Medium High / Very high $95 (16.1\%)$ $72 (12.2\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing2 $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single Missing2 $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing2 $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		A levels/NVQ/HND/HNC ³	50521 (22.8%)	63207 (22.5%)
Missing2 $7 (1.2\%)$ $2871 (1.3\%)$ $7255 (2.6\%)$ Household income4198 (33.5\%) $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Very low132 (22.3\%) $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium95 (16.1\%) $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing294 (15.9\%) $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ With partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing2 $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$ Smoking status $202 (40.6\%)$ $10000 (41.6\%)$ $10000 (41.6\%)$		Degree	69916 (31.6%)	91014 (32.5%)
Household income4Very low198 (33.5%) $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low132 (22.3%) $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium95 (16.1%) $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high72 (12.2%) $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing ² 94 (15.9%) $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ CohabitationWith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing ² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$ Smoking status		Missing ²	2871 (1.3%)	7255 (2.6%)
Very low198 (33.5%) $45278 (20.4\%)$ $51717 (18.4\%)$ Low132 (22.3%) $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium95 (16.1%) $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high72 (12.2%) $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing ² 94 (15.9\%) $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ CohabitationWith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing ² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$ Smoking status		Iousehold income ⁴		
Low $132 (22.3\%)$ $49247 (22.2\%)$ $58794 (21.0\%)$ Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing ² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ CohabitationWith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing ² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		Very low	45278 (20.4%)	51717 (18.4%)
Medium $95 (16.1\%)$ $49037 (22.1\%)$ $61637 (22.0\%)$ High / Very high $72 (12.2\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ Missing² $94 (15.9\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ CohabitationWith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$		Low	49247 (22.2%)	58794 (21.0%)
High / Very high Missing2 $72 (12.2\%)$ $94 (15.9\%)$ $45305 (20.5\%)$ $32615 (14.7\%)$ $63809 (22.8\%)$ $44446 (15.9\%)$ Cohabitation With partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $55 (9.3\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing2Missing2 $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$ Smoking status $202 (40.6\%)$ $101002 (14.6\%)$		Medium	49037 (22.1%)	61637 (22.0%)
Missing ² 94 (15.9%) 32615 (14.7%) 44446 (15.9%) Cohabitation 359 (60.7%) 160735 (72.6%) 201961 (72.0%) Single 55 (9.3%) 17885 (8.1%) 24172 (8.6%) Missing ² 177 (29.9%) 42862 (19.4%) 54270 (19.4%) Smoking status 202 (40.6%) 101000 (11.6%) 101000 (11.6%)		High / Very high	45305 (20.5%)	63809 (22.8%)
CohabitationWith partner $359 (60.7\%)$ $160735 (72.6\%)$ $201961 (72.0\%)$ Single $55 (9.3\%)$ $17885 (8.1\%)$ $24172 (8.6\%)$ Missing ² $177 (29.9\%)$ $42862 (19.4\%)$ $54270 (19.4\%)$ Smoking status $202 (40.6\%)$ $101002 (11.6\%)$		Missing ²	32615 (14.7%)	44446 (15.9%)
With partner 359 (60.7%) 160735 (72.6%) 201961 (72.0%) Single 55 (9.3%) 17885 (8.1%) 24172 (8.6%) Missing ² 177 (29.9%) 42862 (19.4%) 54270 (19.4%) Smoking status 202 (40.6%) 101002 (11.6%) 101002 (11.6%)		Cohabitation		
Single 55 (9.3%) 17885 (8.1%) 24172 (8.6%) Missing ² 177 (29.9%) 42862 (19.4%) 54270 (19.4%) Smoking status 202 (40.6%) 121022 (11.6%) 121022 (11.6%)		With partner	160735 (72.6%)	201961 (72.0%)
Missing ² 177 (29.9%) 42862 (19.4%) 54270 (19.4%) Smoking status 202 (49.6%) 121022 (21.6%) 54270 (19.4%)		Single	17885 (8.1%)	24172 (8.6%)
Smoking status		Missing ²	42862 (19.4%)	54270 (19.4%)
		moking status		
Never $293 (49.6\%) 121023 (54.6\%) 152188 (54.3\%)$		Never	121023 (54.6%)	152188 (54.3%)
Former 186 (31.5%) 76153 (34.4%) 96711 (34.5%)		Former	76153 (34.4%)	96711 (34.5%)
Current 106 (17.9%) 23143 (10.4%) 29724 (10.6%)		Current	23143 (10.4%)	29724 (10.6%)
Missing ² 6 (1.0%) 1163 (0.5%) 1780 (0.6%)		Missing ²	1163 (0.5%)	1780 (0.6%)
Morbidity count		Aorbidity count		
None / One 119 (20.1%) 108494 (49.0%) 140930 (50.3%		None / One	108494 (49.0%)	140930 (50.3%)
Two 150 (25.4%) 44962 (20.3%) 55724 (19.9%		Two	44962 (20.3%)	55724 (19.9%)

Table 1 Sample characteristics

Three	116 (19.6%)	29465 (13.3%)	36037 (12.9%)
Four	77 (13.0%)	17297 (7.8%)	20903 (7.5%)
Five+	126 (21.3%)	20903 (9.4%)	26310 (9.4%)
Missing ²	3 (0.5%)	361 (0.2%)	499 (0.2%)
Baseline lithium Rx⁵			
No	296 (50.1%)	204499 (92.3%)	252446 (90.0%)
Yes	261 (44.2%)	83 (0.0%)	417 (0.1%)
Missing ²	34 (5.8%)	16900 (7.6%)	27540 (9.8%)
Baseline cholesterol Rx⁵	. ,		
No	425 (71.9%)	171354 (77.4%)	217473 (77.6%)
Yes	161 (27.2%)	48000 (21.7%)	57335 (20.4%)
Missing ²	5 (0.8%)	2128 (1.0%)	5595 (2.0%)
Fasting time			
Less than 8 hours	563 (95.3%)	211768 (95.6%)	267565 (95.4%)
At least 8 hours	24 (4.1%)	9179 (4.1%)	12143 (4.3%)
Missing ²	4 (0.7%)	535 (0.2%)	695 (0.2%)
Body mass index ; mean (SD) ⁶	28.70 (5.34)	27.54 (4.83)	27.34 (4.78)

Note: Numbers shown are counts and percentages unless indicated otherwise. SD = standard deviation; GCSEs = general certificate of secondary education; CSE = certificate of secondary education; NVO = national vocational qualification; HND = higher national diploma; HNC = higher national certificate; Rx = prescription. ¹Information on age and sex was missing for one participant in the sample without linked primary care data. ²Missing data also includes "do not know", "prefer not to answer" or "not applicable". ³ Also includes 'other professional qualifications'. ⁴ Annual household income groups: very low (<£18,000), low (£18,000-£30,999), middle (£31,000-£51,999), high (£52,000-£100,000) and very high (>£100,000). ⁵ Prescriptions refer to *current* medication use at the time of the baseline assessment. ⁶Missing data for body mass index: n = 10, n = 1344 and n = 1751.

196

197 Duration of lithium use and telomere length

198 In the model adjusted for chronological age and sex, there was no evidence that the number of lithium prescriptions (N = 569, $\beta = -0.022$, 95% CI -0.081 to 0.037, p = 0.47), the total duration 199 of use (N = 569, $\beta = -0.005$, 95% CI -0.023 to 0.013, p = 0.57) or the duration of the first 200 prescription period (N = 569, $\beta = -0.018$, 95% CI -0.051 to 0.015, p = 0.29) were associated 201 202 with telomere length. Additional adjustment for body mass index, morbidity count, household 203 income, highest qualification and cohabitation status had no discernible impact on these results (Table 1). Individuals with a higher prescription count or longer duration of lithium use were 204 205 more likely to use lithium at the time of the baseline assessment (Figure 1). 206





208 Figure 1. Scatter plots of telomere length (T/S ratio log_e transformed and Z standardised) by 209 lithium prescription count, total duration of use, and duration of the first prescription period. 210 The lines were estimated using ordinary least squares regression, and the shaded areas 211 correspond to 95% confidence intervals. Lithium use (yes/no) at the time of the baseline 212 assessment when telomere length was measured is shown in different colours. Individuals 213 without baseline data on current lithium use are not shown. Tx = treatment; Rx = prescription. 214

215 Duration of lithium use, frailty and metabolomic age

216 There was no evidence that the duration of lithium use was associated with the frailty index (N

217 = 585, β = -0.012, 95% CI -0.030 to 0.006, p = 0.21) or the metabolomic ageing clock (N =

 $120, \beta = 0.030, 95\%$ CI -0.133 to 0.194, p = 0.72) (Figure 2). This finding was consistent across 218

- all measures of the duration of lithium use and adjustment for additional covariates (Table 1). 219
- 220



222

Figure 2. Scatter plots of telomere length (T/S ratio loge transformed and Z standardised), the 223 224 frailty index, and the metabolomic ageing clock delta by total duration of lithium use. The lines 225 were estimated using ordinary least squares regression, and the shaded areas correspond to 95% 226 confidence intervals. Tx = treatment.

	Model 1 (ad)							
	n Beta	95% CI	-	р	п	Beta	95% C	[р
Telomere length									
Rx count	569-0.022	-0.081	0.037	0.47	56'	7-0.017	-0.076	0.043	0.58
Total duration	569-0.005	-0.023	0.013	0.57	56′	7-0.004	-0.022	0.015	0.71
Duration first Rx	569-0.018	-0.051	0.015	0.29	56'	7-0.014	-0.048	0.019	0.40
Frailty index									
Rx count	585-0.045	-0.104	0.014	0.13	580	0-0.043	-0.091	0.004	0.08
Total duration	585-0.012	-0.030	0.006	0.21	580	0-0.013	-0.028	0.001	0.07
Duration first Rx	585-0.027	-0.060	0.007	0.12	580	0-0.021	-0.048	0.007	0.14
Metabolomic age									
Rx count	120-0.036	-0.590	0.518	0.90	120	0-0.022	-0.583	0.540	0.94
Total duration	1200.030	-0.133	0.194	0.72	120	0-0.009	-0.180	0.161	0.91
Duration first Rx	1200.248	-0.079	0.576	0.14	120	00.208	-0.128	0.543	0.22
Pulse rate									
Rx count	586-0.061	-0.119	-0.002	0.04	583	3-0.058	-0.116	0.0001	0.05
Total duration	586-0.026	-0.044	-0.008	0.005	5 583	3-0.024	-0.042	-0.006	0.01
Duration first Rx	586-0.021	-0.055	0.012	0.21	583	3-0.022	-0.056	0.011	0.18

Table 2. Associations between the duration of lithium use and biological ageing markers

Note: The measurement units have been rescaled. The number of prescriptions were analysed in units of 50 prescriptions; the total duration of use and the duration of the first prescription period were expressed in years. Model 1 was adjusted for age and sex; Model 2 was adjusted for age, sex, body mass index, morbidity count, household income, highest qualification and cohabitation status. Rx = prescription; CI = confidence interval.

227

228 Duration of lithium use and pulse rate

229 To ensure that the lack of statistically significant associations was not due to how we defined

230 the duration of lithium use, we further tested associations between the duration of lithium use

and pulse rate (Figure S2). The number of lithium prescriptions (N = 586, $\beta = -0.061$, 95% CI 231

-0.119 to -0.002, p = 0.04) and the total duration of lithium use (N = 586, $\beta = -0.026$, 95% CI -232

233 0.044 to -0.008, p = 0.005) were both associated with a lower pulse rate (Table 1).

234

235 Duration of lithium use and all-cause mortality

The median duration of follow-up of censored individuals was 13.71 years (IQR = 1.35 years), 236 237 with more than 7686 person-years of follow-up. During this period, 94 deaths were observed. 238 There was no evidence that the duration of lithium use predicted all-cause mortality. 239 Comparing individuals in the second to fifth quintile of the distribution of the duration of 240 lithium use to individuals in the first quintile resulted in no statistically significant differences in all-cause mortality (lowest p = 0.08) (Figure 3). 241

242





Figure 3. Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals from Cox proportional hazards models for all-cause mortality. Age (in years) was used as the underlying time axis. The model was adjusted for age and sex. Reference group: individuals in the lowest quintile of the distribution of the duration of lithium use (prescription count, total duration and duration of the first prescription period). Tx = treatment; Rx = prescription.

250

Table 3. Associations between the duration of lithium use and all-cause mortality

		i. for age and sex)				Model 2 (full adjustment)							
		N _{total}	N _{died}	HR	95%	CI	р	N _{total}	N _{died}	HR	95%	CI	р
Rx count													
1st	≤ 7	119	19	Refe	rence			118	19	Refer	ence		
2nd	8-23	118	16	0.68	0.34	1.36	0.28	116	15	0.53	0.26	1.09	0.08
3rd	24-60	118	19	0.88	0.46	1.69	0.70	117	19	0.74	0.37	1.48	0.40
4th	61-114	118	18	0.71	0.37	1.38	0.32	118	18	0.68	0.34	1.35	0.27
5th	≥115	118	25	1.05	0.57	1.93	0.88	116	25	0.91	0.48	1.74	0.79
Tota	l duration												
1st	≤ 22	119	19	Refe	rence			118	19	Refer	ence		
2nd	23-83	118	14	0.77	0.38	1.54	0.45	117	13	0.61	0.29	1.26	0.18
3rd	84-187	118	19	0.83	0.43	1.62	0.59	115	19	0.74	0.37	1.49	0.40
4th	188-426	118	21	1.15	0.61	2.17	0.66	118	21	0.95	0.50	1.83	0.88
5th	\geq 427	118	24	1.01	0.55	1.86	0.98	117	24	0.91	0.48	1.73	0.78
Dura	ation first	Rx											
1st	≤4	119	21	Refe	rence			117	20	Refer	ence		
2nd	5-16	118	17	1.04	0.54	2.00	0.90	118	17	0.96	0.49	1.92	0.92
3rd	17-49	118	13	0.74	0.36	1.53	0.42	117	13	0.71	0.34	1.50	0.37
4th	50-130	118	19	0.95	0.51	1.79	0.88	117	19	1.05	0.54	2.03	0.90
5th	≥131	118	27	1.48	0.82	2.66	0.19	116	27	1.46	0.80	2.68	0.22

Note: Hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals from Cox proportional hazards models for all-cause mortality. Age (in years) was used as the underlying time axis. Model 1 was adjusted for age and sex; Model 2 was adjusted for age, sex, body mass index, morbidity count, household income, highest qualification and cohabitation status. Rx = prescription; HR = hazard ratio; CI = confidence interval.

Modelling the mortality hazard as a spline function of the duration of lithium use, instead of by quintiles of the distribution, provided little evidence of a statistically significant association between the duration of lithium use and all-cause mortality (Figure 4 and Figure S3). There was, however, some evidence that a prescription count greater than about 300 was associated with a higher mortality risk.

257





Figure 4. Log hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals from Cox proportional hazards models for all-cause mortality. Age (in years) was used as the underlying time axis. The model was adjusted for age and sex. Vertical lines indicate the median of the distribution. Tx =treatment; Rx = prescription.

264

265 Sensitivity analyses

Excluding participants with a total duration of lithium use of less than 1 year or less than 4.5 years provided little evidence that the duration of lithium use was associated with biological ageing (Table S1 and Table S2). There was some evidence that a longer duration of the first lithium prescription period was associated with a higher MileAge delta, although this finding did not survive multiple testing correction in the fully adjusted model. The duration of lithium use was also not associated with pulse rate in these analyses.

272

The relationship between telomere length and the duration of lithium use stratified by current antidepressant use at the time of the baseline assessment is shown in Figure S4. Additional adjustment for current antidepressant use had no discernible impact on the analyses of the relationship between the duration of lithium use and biological ageing (Table S3). However, the association between a higher prescription count and a longer total duration of lithium use and pulse rate was stronger in these analyses.

279 DISCUSSION

We examined the relationship between the duration of lithium use and multiple markers of 280 281 biological ageing, including telomere length, frailty, metabolomic age, and all-cause mortality. 282 Both cross-sectional and prospective analyses provided little evidence of an association 283 between the duration of lithium use and biological ageing or mortality.

284

285 Our findings are inconsistent with most prior studies of the duration of lithium use and telomere length, several of which identified a positive association between lithium and telomere length. 286 287 Martinsson et al. found that lithium-treated bipolar disorder patients had on average 35% longer telomeres than healthy controls.¹⁷ In the same study, the duration of lithium treatment was 288 positively correlated with telomere length, particularly in patients who had been treated for 289 more than 2.5 years. Pisanu et al.³⁴ and Coutts et al.¹⁹ corroborated these observations, 290 291 identifying statistically significant associations between chronic lithium treatment and 292 telomere length in patients with bipolar disorder. Squassina et al. also reported a positive 293 correlation between the duration of lithium use and telomere length in 150 bipolar disorder patients who had been treated for more than two years.³⁵ A mechanistic *in vitro* study provided 294 295 further evidence supporting lithium's putative effect on telomeres by demonstrating that 296 lithium administration to lymphoblastoid cell lines from bipolar disorder patients increased telomere length.¹⁸ Nevertheless, there is some precedent for our findings. Ferensztajn-297 298 Rochowiak et al. reported that in a sample of 41 patients with bipolar disorder, the duration of lithium treatment did not correlate with telomere length in peripheral blood leukocytes.³⁶ 299 300 Another *in vitro* study found that administration of lithium to lymphoblastoid cell lines from bipolar disorder patients had no effect on telomere length,³⁷ though it is worth noting that these 301 302 patients had previously been treated with lithium.

303

304 There are several potential explanations for the observed differences between our findings and 305 those of most prior studies. For example, most clinical studies determined the duration of lithium treatment retrospectively during the study visit, while we derived the duration of 306 307 lithium use in our study from prescription records. Furthermore, there is some evidence that 308 clinical factors such as bipolar disorder diagnosis, number of episodes, chronicity and severity 309 of illness impact telomere length. The participants in our study likely represent a healthier subset of the population than the patients included in prior clinical studies. Moreover, genetic 310 factors can moderate the effect of lithium on telomere length.¹⁹ Although, we adjusted for 311 several confounders in our analyses, we also found little evidence of any statistical associations 312

313 in the model adjusted only for chronological age and sex. The sample size of our study (n =314 569) is one of the largest in the field, and we used three definitions of the duration of lithium 315 use to increase the robustness of our findings. In addition, we conducted a sensitivity analysis of pulse rate, which we expected to differ with longer duration of lithium use.³⁸ The observed 316 317 correlation between the duration of lithium use and a lower pulse rate supports the validity of 318 our measures of the duration of lithium use.

319

320 There has been little prior research on the relationship between lithium use and the other 321 biological ageing markers explored in this study. Okazaki et al. found that bipolar disorder 322 patients who were taking mood stabilisers had a younger epigenetic age, according to Horvath's epigenetic ageing clock, than patients who were not taking mood stabilisers.³⁹ However, an *in* 323 vitro study of lymphoblastoid cell lines did not find that administration of lithium impacted the 324 Horvath clock.¹⁸ We found no evidence of an association between the duration of lithium use 325 326 and metabolomic age in our study. However, it is worth noting that epigenetic and metabolomic age are not strongly correlated.⁴⁰ We also explored the relationship between the duration of 327 328 lithium use and frailty, which is a measure of age-related health deficit accumulation. While some evidence suggests that frailty and telomere length are not strongly linked,⁴¹ frailty is a 329 key marker of biological ageing and physical ill-health.^{42,43} Our study provided no evidence of 330 331 a statistically significant association between the duration of lithium use and frailty. Taken 332 together, these findings suggest that the lack of association between the duration of lithium use 333 and biological ageing – at least in our sample – was not specific to telomere length.

334

The duration of lithium use was not linked to all-cause mortality in our study. Multiple 335 336 observational studies have previously shown that lithium use is associated with a lower 337 mortality risk. For example, a cohort study of 826 patients in Finland found that lithium 338 treatment, compared to no lithium use, was associated with a lower all-cause mortality risk.⁴⁴ 339 Another cohort study in Taiwan found that lithium was associated with the lowest all-cause mortality risk in bipolar disorder patients, relative to other mood stabiliser treatments.⁴⁵ A 340 341 recent study in the UK Biobank also found that lithium treatment was associated with a lower all-cause mortality risk than treatment with antipsychotics.⁴⁶ However, it is important to note 342 343 that we examined the duration of lithium use, not whether patients were treated versus not treated with lithium, which prior studies examined. As such, our findings suggest that there 344 may not be a link between longer duration of lithium use and all-cause mortality in a 345 346 community-based, real-world sample. These findings do not imply that lithium use (yes/no) is

not linked to all-cause mortality, and they do not invalidate findings from clinical trials wherelithium adherence is more controlled and all-cause mortality.

349

350 Limitations

351 We acknowledge certain limitations to our study. The UK Biobank primarily recruited 352 individuals between the ages of 40 to 69 years, limiting the conclusions drawn from our 353 findings to middle-aged and older adults. There is evidence of a healthy volunteer participation 354 bias in the UK Biobank,^{47,48} which could mean that the participants in our study were healthier than the patients included in prior clinical studies. The observational nature of our study 355 356 precludes any causal inferences, and residual confounding factors may exist despite our efforts 357 to account for relevant covariates. The duration of lithium use was derived from primary care prescription records. Prescriptions may not perfectly reflect medication use and there is some 358 evidence that, despite the need for regular blood tests, adherence to lithium is poor in clinical 359 practice;⁴⁹ furthermore, prescription dates are a proxy of date of use. Nonetheless, we derived 360 361 and tested three different definitions of the duration of lithium use to be as robust as possible 362 within these constraints. Telomere length was measured using leukocyte DNA, and findings 363 might differ from telomere length measured in other tissues. However, prior evidence suggests 364 that leukocyte telomere length correlates well with telomere length in other tissues.⁵⁰ Finally, 365 we could only examine average telomere length and were unable to evaluate whether the 366 duration of lithium use was associated with variability in telomere length, which may be more 367 important for telomere dysfunction and biological ageing.²⁶

368

369 Conclusion

Our findings, in a larger sample, challenge prior research on the relationship between the duration of lithium use and telomere length. Given that we also did not observe statistically significant associations with other biological ageing markers such as frailty and metabolomic age, nor with all-cause mortality, our findings suggest that the potential anti-ageing effects of lithium do not differ by duration of use. Our findings encourage further scientific inquiry into the complex interplay between lithium medication, biological ageing and lifespan.

376 ETHICS

377 Ethical approval for the UK Biobank study has been granted by the National Information378 Governance Board for Health and Social Care and the NHS North West Multicentre Research

- 379 Ethics Committee (11/NW/0382). No project-specific ethical approval is needed.
- 380

381 AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS

JM conceived the idea of the study, acquired the data, carried out the statistical analysis, interpreted the findings and co-wrote the manuscript. WLEW identified the lithium medication codes, pre-processed the data to define duration of lithium use, interpreted the findings and cowrote the manuscript. TRP, AHY, GSD and CML interpreted the findings and reviewed the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

387

388 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

389 This study was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) 390 Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust 391 and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily 392 those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. WLEW is supported 393 by the National University of Singapore President's Graduate Fellowship. TRP is supported by the MRC (UKRI) as part of a New Investigator Research Grant [MR/W028018/1]. GSD is 394 supported by the Ministry of Education, Singapore, under its Academic Research Fund Tier 3 395 396 Award (MOE2017-T3-1-002). This research has been conducted using data from UK Biobank, 397 a major biomedical database. Data access permission has been granted under UK Biobank application 45514. All analyses were supported by: King's College London. (2023). King's 398 399 Computational Research, Engineering and Technology Environment (CREATE). Retrieved 400 May 24, 2023, from https://doi.org/10.18742/rnvf-m076

401

402 FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES

AHY declares the following: paid lectures and advisory boards for companies with drugs used
in affective and related disorders (Flow Neuroscience, Novartis, Roche, Janssen, Takeda,
Noema pharma, Compass, Astrazenaca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Eli Lilly, LivaNova, Lundbeck,
Sunovion, Servier, Livanova, Janssen, Allegan, Bionomics, Sumitomo Dainippon Pharma,
Sage and Neurocentrx); principal investigator in the Restore-Life VNS registry study funded
by LivaNova; principal investigator on "ESKETINTRD3004: An Open-label, Long-term,
Safety and Efficacy Study of Intranasal Esketamine in Treatment-resistant Depression";

410 principal investigator on "The Effects of Psilocybin on Cognitive Function in Healthy 411 Participants"; principal investigator on "The Safety and Efficacy of Psilocybin in Participants with Treatment-Resistant Depression (P-TRD)"; principal investigator on "A Double-Blind, 412 413 Randomized, Parallel-Group Study with Quetiapine Extended Release as Comparator to 414 Evaluate the Efficacy and Safety of Seltorexant 20 mg as Adjunctive Therapy to 415 Antidepressants in Adult and Elderly Patients with Major Depressive Disorder with Insomnia 416 Symptoms Who Have Responded Inadequately to Antidepressant Therapy" (Janssen); 417 principal investigator on "An Open-label, Long-term, Safety and Efficacy Study of Aticaprant 418 as Adjunctive Therapy in Adult and Elderly Participants with Major Depressive Disorder 419 (MDD)" (Janssen); principal investigator on "A Randomized, Double-blind, Multicentre, 420 Parallel-group, Placebo-controlled Study to Evaluate the Efficacy, Safety, and Tolerability of 421 Aticaprant 10 mg as Adjunctive Therapy in Adult Participants with Major Depressive Disorder 422 (MDD) with Moderate-to-severe Anhedonia and Inadequate Response to Current 423 Antidepressant Therapy"; principal investigator on "A Study of Disease Characteristics and 424 Real-life Standard of Care Effectiveness in Patients with Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) 425 With Anhedonia and Inadequate Response to Current Antidepressant Therapy Including an 426 SSRI or SNR" (Janssen); UK chief investigator for Compass COMP006 & COMP007 studies; 427 UK chief investigator for Novartis MDD study MIJ821A12201; grant funding (past and 428 present) from NIMH (USA), CIHR (Canada), NARSAD (USA), Stanley Medical Research 429 Institute (USA), MRC (UK), Wellcome Trust (UK), Royal College of Physicians (Edin), BMA 430 (UK), UBC-VGH Foundation (Canada), WEDC (Canada), CCS Depression Research Fund 431 (Canada), MSFHR (Canada), NIHR (UK), Janssen (UK) and EU Horizon 2020. No 432 shareholdings in pharmaceutical companies. CML sits on the scientific advisory board for 433 Myriad Neuroscience, has received speaker fees from SYNLAB, and consultancy fees from 434 UCB. JM, WLEW, TRP and GSD declare no financial conflict of interest.

435

436 DATA SHARING STATEMENT

437 UK Biobank data used are available to all *bona fide* researchers for health-related research that
438 is in the public interest, subject to an application process and approval criteria. Study materials
439 are publicly available online at http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk.

440 **REFERENCES**

1. National Institute for Health Care Excellence. Bipolar disorder: assessment andmanagement. 2020.

Cleare A, Pariante C, Young A, et al. Evidence-based guidelines for treating depressive
disorders with antidepressants: A revision of the 2008 British Association for
Psychopharmacology guidelines. *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 2015; 29(5): 459-525.

Gadelrab R, Hampsey E, Strawbridge R, Taylor RH, Ulrichsen A, Young AH.
Comparing measurements of lithium treatment efficacy in people with bipolar disorder:
systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJPsych Open* 2023; 9(3): e98.

449 4. Malhi GS, Tanious M, Das P, Coulston CM, Berk M. Potential Mechanisms of Action
450 of Lithium in Bipolar Disorder. *CNS Drugs* 2013; 27(2): 135-53.

451 5. Salarda EM, Zhao NO, Lima CNNC, Fries GR. Mini-review: The anti-aging effects of
452 lithium in bipolar disorder. *Neuroscience Letters* 2021; **759**: 136051.

453 6. López-Otín C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G. Hallmarks of aging:
454 An expanding universe. *Cell* 2023; 186(2): 243-78.

- 455 7. Maurer IC, Schippel P, Volz H-P. Lithium-induced enhancement of mitochondrial
 456 oxidative phosphorylation in human brain tissue. *Bipolar Disorders* 2009; 11(5): 515-22.
- 457 8. de Sousa RT, Streck EL, Zanetti MV, et al. Lithium increases leukocyte mitochondrial
 458 complex I activity in bipolar disorder during depressive episodes. *Psychopharmacology* 2015;
 459 232(1): 245-50.
- 460 9. Machado-Vieira R, Andreazza AC, Viale CI, et al. Oxidative stress parameters in
 461 unmedicated and treated bipolar subjects during initial manic episode: A possible role for
 462 lithium antioxidant effects. *Neuroscience Letters* 2007; 421(1): 33-6.
- 463 10. Khairova R, Pawar R, Salvadore G, et al. Effects of lithium on oxidative stress
 464 parameters in healthy subjects. *Mol Med Rep* 2012; 5(3): 680-2.

465 11. McColl G, Killilea DW, Hubbard AE, Vantipalli MC, Melov S, Lithgow GJ.
466 Pharmacogenetic Analysis of Lithium-induced Delayed Aging in Caenorhabditis elegans.
467 Journal of Biological Chemistry 2008; 283(1): 350-7.

- 468 12. Castillo-Quan Jorge I, Li L, Kinghorn Kerri J, et al. Lithium Promotes Longevity
 469 through GSK3/NRF2-Dependent Hormesis. *Cell Reports* 2016; 15(3): 638-50.
- 470 13. Rossiello F, Jurk D, Passos JF, d'Adda di Fagagna F. Telomere dysfunction in ageing
 471 and age-related diseases. *Nature Cell Biology* 2022; 24(2): 135-47.

472 14. Colpo GD, Leffa DD, Köhler CA, Kapczinski F, Quevedo J, Carvalho AF. Is bipolar
473 disorder associated with accelerating aging? A meta-analysis of telomere length studies.
474 *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2015; **186**: 241-8.

475 15. Darrow SM, Verhoeven JE, Révész D, et al. The Association Between Psychiatric
476 Disorders and Telomere Length: A Meta-Analysis Involving 14,827 Persons. *Psychosomatic*477 *Medicine* 2016; **78**(7): 776-87.

Huang Y-C, Wang L-J, Tseng P-T, Hung C-F, Lin P-Y. Leukocyte telomere length in
patients with bipolar disorder: An updated meta-analysis and subgroup analysis by mood status. *Psychiatry Research* 2018; 270: 41-9.

481 17. Martinsson L, Wei Y, Xu D, et al. Long-term lithium treatment in bipolar disorder is
482 associated with longer leukocyte telomeres. *Translational Psychiatry* 2013; 3(5): e261-e.

483 18. Fries GR, Zamzow MJ, Colpo GD, et al. The anti-aging effects of lithium in
484 lymphoblastoid cell lines from patients with bipolar disorder and controls. *Journal of*485 *Psychiatric Research* 2020; **128**: 38-42.

486 19. Coutts F, Palmos AB, Duarte RRR, et al. The polygenic nature of telomere length and
487 the anti-ageing properties of lithium. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2019; 44(4): 757-65.

488 20. Mutz J, Lewis CM. Telomere Length Associations With Clinical Diagnosis, Age, and
489 Polygenic Risk Scores for Anxiety Disorder, Depression, and Bipolar Disorder. *Biological*490 *Psychiatry Global Open Science* 2023; 3(4): 1012-20.

491 21. Bountziouka V, Musicha C, Allara E, et al. Modifiable traits, healthy behaviours, and
492 leukocyte telomere length: a population-based study in UK Biobank. *The Lancet Healthy*493 *Longevity* 2022; 3(5): e321-e31.

Luo S, Wong ICK, Chui CSL, et al. Effects of putative metformin targets on phenotypic
age and leukocyte telomere length: a mendelian randomisation study using data from the UK
Biobank. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity* 2023; 4(7): e337-e44.

497 23. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep
498 phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature* 2018; 562(7726): 203-9.

499 24. Wong WL, Fabbri C, Laplace B, et al. The Effects of CYP2C19 Genotype on Proxies
500 of SSRI Antidepressant Response in the UK Biobank. *Pharmaceuticals*, 2023. (accessed.)

501 25. Codd V, Denniff M, Swinfield C, et al. Measurement and initial characterization of
502 leukocyte telomere length in 474,074 participants in UK Biobank. *Nature Aging* 2022; 2(2):
503 170-9.

504 26. Lai T-P, Wright WE, Shay JW. Comparison of telomere length measurement methods.

- 505 Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 2018; 373(1741):
 506 20160451.
- 507 27. Williams DM, Jylhävä J, Pedersen NL, Hägg S. A Frailty Index for UK Biobank
 508 Participants. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A* 2018; 74(4): 582-7.
- 509 28. Mutz J, Choudhury U, Zhao J, Dregan A. Frailty in individuals with depression, bipolar
 510 disorder and anxiety disorders: longitudinal analyses of all-cause mortality. *BMC Medicine*511 2022; 20(1): 274.
- 512 29. Würtz P, Kangas AJ, Soininen P, Lawlor DA, Davey Smith G, Ala-Korpela M.
 513 Quantitative Serum Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Metabolomics in Large-Scale Epidemiology:
 514 A Primer on -Omic Technologies. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2017; 186(9): 1084-96.

515 30. Quinlan JR. Learning with continuous classes. 5th Australian joint conference on artificial intelligence; 1992: World Scientific; 1992. p. 343-8.

- 517 31. Kuhn M, Johnson K. Regression Trees and Rule-Based Models. In: Kuhn M, Johnson
 518 K, eds. Applied Predictive Modeling. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2013: 173-220.
- 519 32. Mutz J, Lewis CM. Lifetime depression and age-related changes in body composition,
 520 cardiovascular function, grip strength and lung function: sex-specific analyses in the UK
 521 Biobank. *Aging* 2021; 13(13): 17038-79.
- 522 33. Mutz J, Young AH, Lewis CM. Age-related changes in physiology in individuals with
 523 bipolar disorder. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2022; 296: 157-68.
- 524 34. Pisanu C, Congiu D, Manchia M, et al. Differences in telomere length between patients
 525 with bipolar disorder and controls are influenced by lithium treatment. *Pharmacogenomics*526 2020; 21(8): 533-40.
- 527 35. Squassina A, Pisanu C, Congiu D, et al. Leukocyte telomere length positively correlates 528 lithium in bipolar with duration of treatment disorder patients. European 529 Neuropsychopharmacology 2016; 26(7): 1241-7.
- 530 36. Ferensztajn-Rochowiak E, Hołysz H, Kurczewska E, et al. Decreased leucocyte
 531 telomere length in male patients with chronic bipolar disorder: lack of effect of long-term
 532 lithium treatment. *Acta Neuropsychiatrica* 2021; **33**(6): 299-306.
- 533 37. Squassina A, Meloni A, Congiu D, et al. Analysis on in vitro effect of lithium on
 telomere length in lymphoblastoid cell lines from bipolar disorder patients with different
 clinical response to long-term lithium treatment. *Human Genomics* 2022; 16(1): 45.
- 536 38. Mehta N, Vannozzi R. Lithium-induced electrocardiographic changes: A complete
 537 review. *Clinical Cardiology* 2017; 40(12): 1363-7.

39. Okazaki S, Numata S, Otsuka I, et al. Decelerated epigenetic aging associated with
mood stabilizers in the blood of patients with bipolar disorder. *Translational Psychiatry* 2020;
10(1): 129.

541 40. Robinson O, Chadeau Hyam M, Karaman I, et al. Determinants of accelerated 542 metabolomic and epigenetic aging in a UK cohort. *Aging Cell* 2020; **19**(6): e13149.

41. Araújo Carvalho AC, Tavares Mendes ML, da Silva Reis MC, Santos VS, Tanajura
DM, Martins-Filho PRS. Telomere length and frailty in older adults—A systematic review and
meta-analysis. *Ageing Research Reviews* 2019; 54: 100914.

546 42. Ji L, Jazwinski SM, Kim S. Frailty and Biological Age. *Ann Geriatr Med Res* 2021;
547 25(3): 141-9.

548 43. Mitnitski A, Collerton J, Martin-Ruiz C, et al. Age-related frailty and its association
549 with biological markers of ageing. *BMC Medicine* 2015; 13(1): 161.

550 44. Toffol E, Hätönen T, Tanskanen A, et al. Lithium is associated with decrease in all551 cause and suicide mortality in high-risk bipolar patients: A nationwide registry-based
552 prospective cohort study. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2015; 183: 159-65.

553 45. Chen P-H, Tsai S-Y, Chen P-Y, et al. Mood stabilizers and risk of all-cause, natural,
and suicide mortality in bipolar disorder: A nationwide cohort study. *Acta Psychiatrica*555 *Scandinavica* 2023; 147(3): 234-47.

46. Araldi E, Jutzeler CR, Ristow M. Lithium treatment extends human lifespan: findings
from the UK Biobank. *Aging (Albany NY)* 2023; 15(2): 421-40.

558 47. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, et al. Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-

Related Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants With Those of the General Population. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2017; **186**(9): 1026-34.

561 48. Schoeler T, Speed D, Porcu E, Pirastu N, Pingault J-B, Kutalik Z. Participation bias in
562 the UK Biobank distorts genetic associations and downstream analyses. *Nature Human*563 *Behaviour* 2023; 7(7): 1216-27.

Johnson R, McFarland B. Lithium use and discontinuation in a health maintenance
organization. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1996; 153(8): 993-1000.

566 50. Demanelis K, Jasmine F, Chen LS, et al. Determinants of telomere length across human
567 tissues. *Science* 2020; **369**(6509): eaaz6876.