

Leveraging large-scale biobank EHRs to enhance pharmacogenetics of cardiometabolic disease medications

Marie C. Sadler^{1,2,3}, Alexander Apostolov³, Caterina Cevallos⁴,
Diogo M. Ribeiro³, Russ B. Altman⁵, Zoltán Kutalik^{1,2,3,*}

¹University Center for Primary Care and Public Health, Lausanne, Switzerland

²Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Lausanne, Switzerland

³Department of Computational Biology, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

⁴ Center for Integrative Genomics, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

⁵ Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

*Corresponding author: zoltan.kutalik@unil.ch

Abstract

Electronic health records (EHRs) coupled with large-scale biobanks offer great promises to unravel the genetic underpinnings of treatment efficacy. However, medication-induced biomarker trajectories stemming from such records remain poorly studied. Here, we extract clinical and medication prescription data from EHRs and conduct GWAS and rare variant burden tests in the UK Biobank (discovery) and the All of Us program (replication) on ten cardiometabolic drug response outcomes including lipid response to statins, HbA1c response to metformin and blood pressure response to antihypertensives (N = 740-26,669). Our findings at genome-wide significance level recover previously reported pharmacogenetic signals and also include novel associations for lipid response to statins (N = 26,669) near *LDLR* and *ZNF800*. Importantly, these associations are treatment-specific and not associated with biomarker progression in medication-naive individuals. Furthermore, we demonstrate that individuals with higher genetically determined low-density and total cholesterol baseline levels experience increased absolute, albeit lower relative biomarker reduction following statin treatment. In summary, we systematically investigated the common and rare pharmacogenetic contribution to cardiometabolic drug response phenotypes in over 50,000 UK Biobank and All of Us participants with EHR and identified clinically relevant genetic predictors for improved personalized treatment strategies.

1 Introduction

2 Genetic factors can contribute to inter-individual variability in drug response. However, despite the im-
3 mense progress of genome-wide association studies (GWAS) for complex traits and diseases, the scale
4 of pharmacogenetics (PGx) studies to find genetic predictors of drug efficacy remains limited. PGx
5 GWAS represent less than 10% of all entries in the GWAS Catalog with median sample sizes of 1,220
6 for PGx GWAS published between 2016 and 2020 [1]. As a result of low sample size and lack of cohorts
7 suitable for pharmacogenomic studies, relatively few PGx associations determining drug efficacy have
8 been identified in a genome-wide approach [1, 2, 3].

9
10 Several PGx GWAS consortia have formed over the years to study the genetics of drug efficacy in
11 larger sample sizes. For instance, the Genomic Investigation of Statin Therapy (GIST) consortium has
12 identified variants in the *LPA*, *APOE*, *SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1* and *SLCO1B1* regions as modulators of
13 low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) response to statins by combining randomized controlled trials
14 (RCTs) and observational studies [4]. Similarly, the Metformin Genetics (MetGen) consortium has iden-
15 tified *SLC2A2* as influencing haemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) response to metformin [5], and more recently
16 a meta-GWAS on HbA1c response to GLP-1 receptor agonists found variants in *ARRB1* to influence
17 drug efficacy [6]. Furthermore, the International Consortium for Antihypertensive Pharmacogenomics
18 Studies (ICAPS) has published multiple GWAS investigating blood pressure response to several antihy-
19 pertensive drug classes (beta blockers, calcium channel blockers (CCBs), thiazide/thiazide-like diuretics
20 and ACE-inhibitors (ACEi)/angiotensin receptor blockers (ARB)) [7, 8, 9].

21
22 Biobanks coupled with electronic health records (EHRs) that comprise medication data provide new
23 opportunities to discover PGx associations [10, 1, 11]. These massive datasets have already contributed
24 to the replication of known PGx interactions as well as the discovery of new putative associations in na-
25 tional biobanks such as the Estonian [12] and UK Biobank (UKBB) [13, 14]. More recently, GWAS on
26 longitudinal medication patterns extracted from the Finnish nationwide drug purchase registry in the
27 FinnGen study identified tens of cardiometabolic risk loci specific to medication use and not associ-

28 ated with the underlying indication [15]. Yet, PGx biobank studies so far have either focused on known
29 pharmacogenes and their associations with adverse drug reactions, drug dosage and drug prescribing
30 behaviour or analyzed the genetics of temporal medication use in isolation of disease phenotypes. What
31 remains largely unexplored is the integration of longitudinal medication and phenotypic data to screen
32 for genetic determinants of drug efficacy at a biobank scale.

33

34 Here, we extracted clinical and medication prescription data from EHRs and conducted PGx as-
35 sociation analyses on the change in biomarker levels following drug therapy to treat cardiometabolic
36 diseases (Figure 1a). We assessed associations with both common and rare variants by performing
37 GWAS and rare variant burden tests on sequencing data. Discovery analyses were conducted in the
38 UK Biobank (UKBB) [16] and replication analyses in the All of Us (AoU) research program [17] (Figure
39 1b). In follow-up analyses, we compared drug response genetics to the genetics of baseline and lon-
40 gitudinal biomarker changes in medication-naïve individuals to dissect medication- and disease-specific
41 components while also highlighting common pitfalls in the analysis of longitudinal (response) pheno-
42 types (Figure 1c). Finally, we demonstrated that polygenic risk scores (PRS) of the underlying condition
43 can predict drug response. In summary, we present a comprehensive resource on the genetic architec-
44 ture of cardiometabolic drug response, introduce a more reliable model for studying genetic associations
45 with drug response, and showcase the value of analyzing EHR-coupled biobanks with longitudinal data
46 to study inter-individual variability in drug response.




Figure 1: Study design. **a** Drug response study design using electronic health records (EHRs) from the UK and All of Us biobanks. Baseline and post-treatment phenotypes were extracted from EHRs or biobank assessment visits before and after the first recorded prescription, respectively. Different timings relative to the first prescription were tested as well as the use of single and average values over multiple baseline and post-treatment measures if available. Drug response phenotypes defined by the 1) absolute and 2) relative logarithmic difference in post-treatment and baseline biomarker measures were tested for ten cardiometabolic medication-phenotype pairs. **b** Discovery genetic association analyses were conducted in the UK Biobank and replicated in the All of Us research program on common variants (GWAS analysis) and rare variants through burden tests. **c** Follow-up analyses compared the genetics of baseline, longitudinal change and drug response genetics.

47 Results

48 Overview of the analysis

49 In the drug response discovery analyses, we extracted longitudinal prescription and response biomarker
50 data from the UKBB primary care records which we combined with phenotypic data from the as-
51 sessment visits. We then emulated EHR-derived drug response cohorts for the following medication-
52 biomarker pairs: statin-lipids (LDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), total cholesterol
53 (TC)), metformin-HbA1c, antihypertensive-systolic blood pressure (SBP; by antihypertensive class (ACEi,
54 CCB, thiazide diuretics) and all classes combined), beta blocker-SBP and beta blocker-heart rate (HR).
55 Individuals were only part of a drug response cohort if a phenotype measurement was available before
56 and after treatment initiation in addition to passing several other quality control (QC) steps (Method sec-
57 tion: Study design and phenotype definitions, Figure S1, Table S3). For each drug response phenotype,
58 we derived an absolute and logarithmic relative biomarker difference as outcome traits. Furthermore,
59 we considered two filtering scenarios, a stringent and a lenient one. More stringent QC should result
60 in a cleaner phenotype definition, with the trade-off of reduced sample size (and thus potentially lower
61 statistical power). Given the sharp drop in sample size with more stringent criteria, the lenient filtering
62 strategy constitutes the default setting throughout this study. In both stringent and lenient scenarios, we
63 tested single and average baseline and post-treatment values over multiple measures, if available, with
64 average values being the default (Figure 1).


65
66 In each drug response cohort, we first conducted GWAS to discover common genetic predictors
67 (minor allele frequency (MAF) ≥ 0.05) of drug efficacy. In a second step, we performed genome-wide
68 burden tests using whole exome sequencing (WES) data to assess associations with rare variants (MAF
69 < 0.01). Replication analyses of identified PGx variants in the discovery analyses and across the lit-
70 erature were conducted in $\sim 250,000$ participants of the AoU research program with available whole
71 genome sequencing data (WGS). We also showcased the biases emerging from the popular approach
72 of regression-based baseline adjustment to derive drug response outcomes. Finally, we assessed base-
73 line trait PRS as predictors of drug response.

74 Drug response GWAS using EHRs from the UKBB

75 Following cardiometabolic drug treatment, biomarker levels significantly dropped except for HDL-C which
76 moderately increased after statin initiation (Δ HDL-C = 0.014 mmol/L, two-sided paired t-test p-value =
77 1.49e-24; Figure 2a; Table S4). In comparison, biomarker levels measured during an equivalent time
78 window as baseline and post-treatment levels remained stable for control individuals who did not take
79 any related medications (Figure 2a; Table S5). In the LDL-C response to statin GWAS, *LDLR* was found
80 to influence absolute biomarker change (rs6511720 G>T, beta = -0.103, p-value = 1.29e-09), while the
81 *SLC22A3/LPA* (rs10455872 A>G, beta = -0.148, p-value = 5.07e-16) locus and *APOE* loci (rs7412 C>T,
82 beta = 0.254, p-value = 2.08e-31) were found to influence relative (logarithmic) biomarker change (Table
83 1; Figure 2b; lenient filtering with average values if available, N = 17,063). TC response to statins, for
84 which we had a larger sample size (more TC than LDL-C measures are available in the primary care
85 data, N = 26,669) confirmed the identified loci at *LDLR*, *SLC22A3/LPA*, and *APOE*, while also identifying
86 a significant signal nearby *ZNF800* (rs7803925 C>T, beta = -0.078, p-value = 4.09e-08) for TC relative
87 change. The SNP rs4149056 T>C in the *SLCO1B1* locus, also known as Val174Ala or SLCO1B1*5,
88 which has previously been associated with LDL-C statin response [18] as well as clinical myopathy [19]
89 barely missed genome-wide significance level (beta = -0.063, p-value = 5.33e-08). No genome-wide
90 significant hits were found in the HDL-C response to statin GWAS (N = 23,306), HbA1c response to
91 metformin GWAS (N = 4,119), HR (N = 1,784)/SBP (N = 1,454) response to beta blockers, and SBP
92 response to antihypertensives (N = 740-6,933; Figures S4-5).

93
94 The impact of single vs average baseline/post-treatment measures was minimal, and a difference
95 was only observed for TC response to statin, with *ZNF800* reaching genome-wide significance only
96 with average values (Figure S6-7; Table S6). The difference between stringent and lenient filtering was
97 more pronounced, as sample sizes almost doubled with more lenient settings. For statins, this rise
98 was largely due to the extended baseline period. For metformin and antihypertensives, we excluded
99 individuals taking any related medication in the stringent filtering setting, whereas, in the lenient setting,
100 sample size largely increased by allowing metformin and antihypertensives to act as add-on therapy

101 to sulfonylureas and second-line antihypertensives, respectively, if consistently taken during pre- and
 102 post-treatment periods of the studied medication (Figures S2-3). As a consequence of lower statistical
 103 power, only 4 out of the 7 signals found in the lipid-statin GWAS were detected in the stringent filtering
 104 scenarios (Figures S6-7; Table S6). On the other hand, *APOB* was found to be significant (rs6544366
 105 G>T, beta = -0.069, p-value = 3.22e-9) in the stringent filtering setting of TC response to statins while
 106 missing the genome-wide significance threshold in the lenient filtering setting (p-value = 8.90e-08).



b Lipid response to statins




Figure 2: EHR drug response phenotypes and PGx GWAS results derived from the UKBB. **a** Baseline and post-treatment biomarker levels of statin (blue), metformin (orange), first-line antihypertensives (green) and beta blocker (purple) medication users as well as first and second measures of controls who do not take any related medications. **b** Manhattan plots of LDL-C and TC response to statins. GWAS association results of the top and bottom show the absolute and logarithmic relative biomarker differences, respectively. Loci with genome-wide significant signals (p -value $< 5e-8$) for either the absolute or relative difference are highlighted in red. Loci with genome-wide significant signals in other settings and with p -values $< 1e-7$ are highlighted in brown. All loci are annotated with the closest gene and the horizontal line denotes genome-wide significance (p -value $< 5e-8$). Results in **a** and **b** correspond to the lenient filtering setting with average values over multiple measures, if available.

107 **Replication analysis in the All of Us research program**

108 We conducted replication analyses in the AoU program ($v7$; $N \approx 250,000$ with available short-read
109 WGS data). As in the UKBB, longitudinal prescription and phenotypic data were extracted from EHRs
110 and used to construct drug response cohorts by following the same methodology as in the UKBB (Meth-
111 ods; Table S7). Cohort characteristics were similar to those in the UKBB (Table S7; Figure S8). The
112 mean statin starting age was 58 years compared to 61 years in the UKBB and as in the UKBB post-
113 treatment lipid levels were on average measured a year after the first prescription. The main difference
114 was observed in the regularity of statin prescriptions. Whereas in the UKBB, participants had on aver-
115 age a prescription every two months 88% of the time, this number dropped to 42% in the AoU. There
116 were slightly fewer statin users than in the UKBB, but similar to the UKBB, the main reasons for being
117 excluded in the PGx cohort were missing baseline and/or post-treatment measures in the considered
118 time windows leaving 9,944 and 6,713 individuals in the LDL-C and TC response to statins, respectively.
119 Among the 7 signals, 2 replicated at the Bonferroni-corrected replication threshold of $0.05/7 = 0.00714$
120 and 4 at a nominal p -value of 0.05 (all directionally concordant; Table 1). Signals not replicating nom-
121 inally include the *LDLR* locus in the LDL-C and TC-response to statin GWAS as well as the *ZNF800*
122 locus in the TC response to statin GWAS.

Table 1: Genome-wide significant loci in discovery analyses (UK Biobank) across all assessed cardiometabolic drug response traits together with replication results (All of Us).
Chr, chromosome; EAF, frequency of effect allele; post-base, absolute biomarker difference; log(post/base), logarithmic (relative) biomarker difference.

Pharmacogenetics trait	Response definition	Chr	Position (GRCh37)	Lead SNP	Gene	Effect allele	Other allele	EAF (discovery)	N (discovery)	beta (discovery)	p-value (discovery)	EAF (replication)	N (replication)	beta (replication)	p-value (replication)
LDL-C response to statin	post-base	19	11202306	rs6511720	LDLR	G	T	0.894	17063	-0.103	1.29E-09	0.893	9944	0.023	0.30
LDL-C response to statin	log(post/base)	6	161010118	rs10455872	SLC22A3, LPA	A	G	0.910	17063	-0.148	5.07E-16	0.950	9943	-0.078	9.35E-03
LDL-C response to statin	log(post/base)	19	45412079	rs7412	APOE	C	T	0.940	17063	0.254	2.08E-31	0.938	9944	0.205	4.01E-14
TC response to statin	post-base	19	11190481	rs77265569	LDLR	G	T	0.901	26669	-0.085	1.95E-09	0.887	6565	-0.002	0.95
TC response to statin	log(post/base)	6	160985526	rs118039278	SLC22A3, LPA	G	A	0.910	26669	-0.122	9.08E-17	0.948	6713	-0.070	4.98E-02
TC response to statin	log(post/base)	7	127101187	rs7803925	ZNF800	C	T	0.905	26669	-0.078	4.09E-08	0.918	6713	-0.019	0.49
TC response to statin	log(post/base)	19	45412079	rs7412	APOE	C	T	0.941	26669	0.169	4.30E-22	0.942	6713	0.129	1.15E-04

124 **EHR-derived PGx GWAS recover known PGx loci**

125 From the literature, we extracted genetic predictors reported for the assessed cardiometabolic
126 medication-biomarker pairs. We adopted the criteria from Nelson *et al.*, 2016 [2] that provide a curated
127 list up to July 2015 by querying the GWAS Catalog [20]. Briefly, genetic variants were required to pass
128 the genome-wide significance threshold of $5e-8$ and show evidence of replication. Reported GWAS
129 stem either from randomized controlled trials or observational studies often meta-analyzed together.

130

131 As we will elaborate in the longitudinal phenotype model later on (Figure 3a), adjusting biomarker
132 changes for baseline levels induces spurious associations for genetic variants that are also associated
133 with baseline levels. However, 4 of the 6 studies reporting significant PGx variants have adjusted for
134 baseline levels [4, 21, 22, 23]. Thus, these reported loci could represent either baseline genetic or
135 pharmacogenetic effects. To be concordant with these studies, we report literature replication p-values
136 for baseline-adjusted and unadjusted biomarker change. Five independent loci were reported for LDL-C
137 response to statins of which three (*APOE*, *LPA*, and *SORT1*) and two (*APOE* and *SORT1*) passed
138 genome-wide significance in the (baseline adjusted) discovery (UKBB) and replication (AoU) cohort,
139 respectively (Table 2). *SLCO1B1* locus was nominally significant in the UKBB (p-value = $8.89e-03$)
140 and genome-wide significant in the baseline adjusted TC response GWAS for which sample size was
141 larger (p-value = $2.17e-08$). *ABCG2* associated with LDL-C reduction following rosuvastatin therapy in
142 the JUPITER trial [24] was found to be insignificant in the UKBB and AoU (p-values of > 0.05) and did
143 also not reach genome-wide significance in a later, larger GWAS meta-analysis of all statins combined
144 [4]. HDL-C response GWAS to statins (baseline adjusted) identified *CETP* as a single genome-wide
145 significant locus, which replicated at a genome-wide significance level in the UKBB [21]. Overall,
146 EHR-derived PGx signals on lipids agree well with those reported in cohort studies, although, baseline
147 adjustment can lead to spurious associations for variants that associate with the baseline levels of the
148 biomarker. For instance, rs247616 (*CETP*) was strongly associated with HDL-C change when adjusting
149 for baseline in the UKBB (p-value = $7.77e-10$), but no longer in the unadjusted analysis (p-value > 0.50).
150 Similar associations of these spurious hits found in our negative control analysis (involving longitudinal

151 change in drug-naive participants; Figure S13) confirms our suspicion that baseline adjustment leads to
152 biased results (see Section on *Modelling drug response and longitudinal change phenotypes*).

153

154 GWAS of HbA1c-response to metformin identified *ATM* [22], *SLC2A2* [5] and *PRPF31* [23], none of
155 which replicated in the EHR PGx GWAS (p-values > 0.05). While this could be a power issue given the
156 lower sample sizes (4,119 and 3,641 in the UKBB and AoU, respectively), it should also be noted that
157 none of the studies have reported the same locus twice and the *ATM* and *SLC2A2* loci were insignificant
158 in the ACCORD clinical trial GWAS that was conducted later (p-value > 0.1) [23]. Although several loci
159 have been found to influence blood pressure response to anti-hypertensives at a suggestive p-value
160 threshold, no genome-wide significant hits have been reported [25].

Table 2: Genetic predictors of cardiometabolic drug response reported in the literature that were discovered or reproduced via genome-wide association study and passed a genome-wide significance threshold of 5e-8. Corresponding effect sizes and significance levels were retrieved from the EHR-derived genetic analyses in the discovery (UK Biobank) and replication (All of Us) cohort.
 baseline adj., absolute biomarker difference adjusted for baseline; post-base, absolute biomarker difference; log(post/base), logarithmic (relative) biomarker difference; UKBB, UK Biobank; AoU, All of Us.

*results for baseline adjusted analysis

¹results for LD-proxy rs45499402 ($r^2 = 1$)

²all statins combined

³ r^2 with rs7412 = 0.64

⁴results for LD-proxy rs4149056 ($r^2 = 0.87$) and total cholesterol

Medication	Phenotype	Gene	SNP	p-value literature	N literature	Reference	p-value, baseline adj. (UKBB)	p-value, post-base (UKBB)	p-value, log(post/base) (UKBB)	p-value, baseline adj. (AoU)	p-value, post-base (AoU)	p-value, log(post/base) (AoU)
Rosuvastatin	LDL-C	ABCG2	rs2199936	2.1E-12	3,523	[24]	0.44 ^{1,2}	0.93 ^{1,2}	0.70 ^{1,2}	0.20 ²	0.29 ²	0.21 ²
Statins	LDL-C	APOE	rs4459253	8.52E-29*	17,522	[4]	1.20E-25	0.99	2.76E-19	2.28E-09	0.15	6.28E-05
	LDL-C	LPA	rs10455872	7.41E-44*	31,056	[4]	1.50E-17	8.41E-04	5.07E-16	1.17E-03	0.22	9.35E-03
	LDL-C	SORT1	rs646776	1.05E-09*	38,599	[4]	5.03E-11	8.63E-02	1.05E-05	8.44E-11	3.26E-02	2.78E-06
	LDL-C	SLCO1B1	rs2900478	1.22E-09*	24,253	[4]	6.89E-03 (2.17E-08 ⁴)	6.59E-02 (8.49E-05 ⁴)	7.22E-03 (5.33E-08 ⁴)	0.14	0.22	0.24
HDL-C		CETP	rs247616	8.52E-13*	27,720	[21]	7.77E-10	0.80	0.51	1.96E-06	0.27	0.42
Metformin	HbA1c below 7%	ATM	rs11212617	2.9E-09*	3,920	[22]	0.74	0.55	0.61	0.70	0.95	0.69
	HbA1c	SLC2A2	rs8192675	6.6E-14	10,577	[5]	0.23	9.11E-02	0.10	0.86	0.77	0.72
	HbA1c	PRPF31	rs254271	1.2E-08*	8,273	[23]	0.59	0.35	0.48	0.17	0.62	0.62

161 **Rare variants have a modest impact**

162 While common genetic variants have been assessed as predictors of drug response phenotypes in
163 multiple studies, the impact of rare variation is less well known. Making use of sequencing data (WES
164 and WGS in the UKBB and AoU, respectively), we conducted rare variant burden tests for all ten drug
165 response phenotypes (Figure 1). We included missense and putative loss-of-function (LoF) variants
166 with $MAF < 1\%$ in optimal kernel association tests (SKATO) [26]. After correcting for multiple testing
167 ($p\text{-value} < 0.05/18,983 = 2.63e-06$), no gene passed the genome-wide significance threshold. When
168 restricting the analysis to known pharmacogenes (66 very important (VIP) autosomal pharmacogenes
169 defined by PharmGKB [27]), we found a significant association of rare variants in the *HLA-B* gene to
170 influence relative LDL-C reduction following statin treatment ($p\text{-value} = 4.62e-04$). This association could
171 not be replicated in the AoU biobank ($p\text{-value} = 0.24$) indicating either a false positive association given
172 the complexity of the *HLA* region and its sequencing difficulties, or a statistical power issue due to the
173 lower sample size and the inclusion of different rare variants in the AoU.

174 **Modelling drug response and longitudinal change phenotypes**

175 In the following, we will propose a longitudinal phenotype model to analyze drug response and longitudi-
176 nal change phenotypes in an unbiased manner. Biomarker levels Y at time t can be modelled as follows
177 (Figure 3a):

$$Y_t = \beta_0 \cdot G_0 + \beta_E \cdot E_t + \gamma_E \cdot G_E \cdot E_t + \beta_D \cdot D_t + \gamma_D \cdot G_D \cdot D_t + \epsilon_t$$

178 where β_0 is the baseline genetic effect, G the genetics, β_E the environmental effect, E the environment,
179 γ_E the gene-environment interaction effect, D the indicator of drug use, β_D the drug effect and γ_D the
180 pharmacogenetic effect.

181

182 When modelling the drug response as the difference of post-treatment levels Y_{t_1} and baseline levels Y_{t_0} ,
183 where the drug status is 1 and 0 at t_1 and t_0 , respectively, the drug response phenotype simplifies to

184 (Note S1):

$$\Delta Y = Y_{t_1} - Y_{t_0} = \beta_D + \gamma_D \cdot G_D + \delta_{01}$$

185 Thus, the pharmacogenetic effect can be estimated from genetic regression analyses on the biomarker
186 difference. This expression also holds when modelling the logarithm of the biomarker level. However,
187 adjusting biomarker differences for baseline levels induces a bias when genetic variants are also
188 associated with baseline levels ($\beta_0 \neq 0$). It can be shown that this bias is proportional to β_0^2 (Note S1).

189

190 In Figure 3b-d, we depict genetic variants that either have a significant pharmacogenetic effect γ_D ,
191 baseline effect β_0 or both, and showcase how baseline adjustment can introduce a bias in genetic effect
192 estimation. To this end, we compare genetic effect sizes of biomarker differences in medication-naive
193 controls to those in statin users (simvastatin 40mg users who represent the largest starting statin type-
194 dose group). The SNP rs7412 in the *APOE* region which is strongly associated to baseline levels ($\beta_0 =$
195 0.636, p-value $< 1e-300$) also exhibits a pharmacogenetic effect ($\gamma_D = 0.294$, p-value = $1.03e-18$) while
196 not being associated to longitudinal change in statin-free controls (p-value = 0.59; Figure 3b; Table S8-
197 9). However, upon baseline adjustment, a significant genetic effect with longitudinal change is observed
198 in drug naive individuals (b = 0.256, p-value = $4.83e-102$) as well as a stronger association in statin
199 users due to the β_0^2 bias (b = 0.421, p-value = $4.12e-38$). On the other hand, as rs4149056 (*SLCO1B1*)
200 was not associated with total cholesterol baseline levels (p-value = 0.094), genetic effects remained
201 similar between baseline adjusted and unadjusted results, evidencing the sole implication of *SLCO1B1*
202 in pharmacokinetics (no significant association with longitudinal change and $\gamma_D = 0.094$, p-value =
203 $1.46e-07$; Figure 3c). In contrast, the SNP rs11076175 in the *CETP* locus is strongly associated with
204 HDL-C baseline levels ($\beta_0 = 0.263$, p-value = $1.33e-307$), but had no significant pharmacogenetic effect
205 in the unbiased model ($\gamma_D = -0.007$, p-value = 0.67). Upon baseline adjustment, strong associations
206 with both longitudinal change and drug response were observed (p-values of $4.85e-33$ and $3.2e-05$,
207 respectively; Figure 3d).

208 More generally, no genome-wide significant associations were found in (the correct) longitudinal
209 biomarker progression GWAS in medication-naive individuals (Figures S9-10). However, upon base-

210 line adjustment, striking similarities could be observed between drug response and longitudinal change
 211 GWAS (Figures S11-13; Tables S10-11). Additional genome-wide significant loci found in the baseline-
 212 adjusted GWAS included the *SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1* locus in the LDL-C response as well as *CETP* in
 213 the HDL-C response to statin GWAS which also reached genome-wide significance in the longitudinal
 214 change GWAS in drug-naive participants.




Figure 3: Modelling longitudinal changes of biomarker levels with (or without) treatment effect. **a** Biomarker levels Y at time t can be influenced by genetics G_0 , environment E , gene-environment interactions ($G_E \cdot E$), drug status D and pharmacogenetic interactions ($G_D \cdot D$). Drug response phenotypes modelled as the difference of post-treatment (t_1) and baseline (t_0) levels allow the estimation of the pharmacogenetic effect γ_D through genetic regression analyses (Note S1). **b-d** Stratification at genetic variants that harbour pharmacogenetic γ_D (**b, c**) and/or baseline β_0 (**b, d**) genetic effects. Adjusting drug response or longitudinal change phenotypes for baseline induces a bias that scales with β_0 (Note S1). Thus, variants with significant baseline effects spuriously associate with drug response phenotypes even if γ_D is zero (**d**). Such measure of change, however, shows association in drug-naive individuals too. The baseline panel (t_0) groups statin-free controls and statin users (simvastatin 40mg corresponding to the largest starting statin type-dose group), and shows their sex and age-adjusted standardized baseline level stratified by genotype. The following four panels (t_1) show standardized longitudinal change (drug-naive individuals) and drug response phenotypes (statin users) adjusted for sex and age, once unadjusted (correct model) and adjusted (biased model) for baseline levels. Genotype regression coefficients (denoted with b) with baseline lipid levels, longitudinal change and drug response phenotypes were derived through regression of the standardized outcome measures on the genotype dosage adjusted for sex and age as well as baseline levels if indicated. The significance level of the slope (b) is indicated by colour and stars where grey indicates a p-value > 0.05 , blue a p-value ≤ 0.05 , 2 stars a p-value $< 1e-3$ and 3 stars a p-value $< 5e-8$. Dots correspond to the mean and error bars to the standard deviation of covariate-adjusted baseline levels and drug response/longitudinal change phenotypes in each stratified group.

215 Polygenic risk scores as predictors of drug response

216 We assessed whether high PRS of the underlying biomarker contribute to better or worse drug
217 response outcomes. High LDL-C PRS resulted in an increased absolute, albeit lower relative LDL-C
218 reduction following statin treatment ($b_{\text{abs}} = -0.085$ mmol/L/SD PRS, p-value = $2.70e-36$ and $b_{\text{rel}} =$
219 2.7% , p-value = $4.28e-36$; Figure 4a; Table S12). These opposing effects of high PRS on absolute
220 and relative drug efficacy were also reflected in the genetic correlations of drug response traits with
221 baseline traits. While the absolute LDL-C genetic difference was negatively correlated to LDL-C
222 baseline levels ($r_g = -1.08$, 95%CI = $[-1.52, -0.65]$), the genetic correlation with the relative LDL-C
223 difference was positive, although not significant ($r_g = 0.195$, 95%CI = $[-0.02, 0.42]$; Figure S14;
224 Table S13). Association results between TC PRS and TC response to statins were highly significant
225 (p-value $< 5.39e-19$) and directionally concordant with LDL-C results. Nominally significant results
226 between biomarker PRS and drug response phenotypes were found for high HDL-C PRS and in-
227 creased HDL-C levels following statin treatment ($b_{\text{abs}} = 0.003$ mmol/L/SD PRS, p-value = 0.019),
228 high HbA1c PRS decreasing relative change following metformin treatment ($b_{\text{rel}} = 1.02\%/SD$ PRS,

229 p-value = 6.79e-03) and high SBP PRS increasing SBP reduction following ACEi treatment ($b_{\text{abs}} =$
230 -0.53 mmHg/SD PRS, p-value = 0.035; Table S12). As for genetic association analyses, care has to
231 be taken not to adjust for baseline levels as this can reverse directionality due to PRS affecting both
232 baseline and biomarker reduction: adjusting the LDL-C reduction for LDL-C baseline levels suggests
233 that high PRS decreases treatment efficacy ($b_{\text{abs}} = 0.14$ mmol/L/SD PRS, p-value = 2.74e-141).
234 As a control experiment, a high PRS led to a nominally significant increase in LDL-C in statin-free
235 controls at the second measure ($b_{\text{abs}} = 0.006$ mmol/L/SD PRS, p-value = 0.045), which upon baseline
236 adjustment inflated to the same value as in statin users ($b_{\text{abs}} = 0.14$ mmol/L/SD PRS, p-value < 1e-300).

237

238 Although PRS can serve as a predictor of drug response, starting baseline levels remain the best
239 predictor of post-treatment levels (Figure 4b-c). To disentangle the effect of genetics and environment
240 on drug response, we adjusted baseline levels for PRS as the resulting PRS-adjusted baseline levels
241 should more closely reflect the environmental component. PRS-adjusted baseline levels explained
242 42.2% and 11.3% of the variance of absolute and relative LDL-C difference, respectively. Increased
243 LDL-C PRS increased LDL-C reduction which was most pronounced at high PRS-adjusted baseline
244 levels (Figure 4b). Conversely, high LDL-C PRS decreased relative LDL-C reduction which was more
245 apparent at low PRS-adjusted baseline levels. By integrating the PRS, the explained variance increased
246 from 42.2 to 43.3% and from 11.3 to 12.1% for absolute and relative LDL-C differences, respectively.

247

248 In Figure 4c, we highlight how additional stratification by drug response genetic signals can improve
249 prediction accuracy for post-treatment LDL-C levels following statin initiation (Table S14). Additional
250 stratification by the *APOE* genotype, the top signal in the LDL-C response GWAS, increased the ex-
251 plained variance of the relative reduction to 12.4% compared to 12.1% for adjusted baseline and LDL-C
252 PRS predictors alone. Post-treatment levels remain higher for individuals with high PRS despite greater
253 absolute LDL-C reductions.




Figure 4: Drug response phenotype associations with PRS. **a** Drug response associations with PRS calculated for the absolute (post-base) and logarithmic relative ($\log(\text{post})-\log(\text{base})$) biomarker difference colour-coded by the drug. Standardized effect sizes (biomarker/PRS effect) correspond to an SD change for 1SD increase in PRS. A negative sign means that increased PRS increases treatment efficacy (i.e., larger biomarker difference compared to low PRS). All associations are adjusted for sex, age and drug-specific covariates. **b** Statin users stratified by 1) LDL-C baseline levels adjusted for LDL-C PRS and 2) LDL-C PRS quintiles with each tile showing the average LDL-C biomarker response (top: absolute, bottom: relative difference). Darker blue values correspond to stronger biomarker reductions. **c** Statin users stratified by 1) LDL-C baseline levels, 2) LDL-C PRS and 3) rs7412 genotype (individuals with the TT genotype are omitted as their sample size was too low). Boxes bound the 25th, 50th (median, centre), and the 75th quantile of LDL-C post-treatment measures. Whiskers range from minima ($Q1 - 1.5 \cdot IQR$) to maxima ($Q3 + 1.5 \cdot IQR$) with points above or below representing potential outliers.

254 Discussion

255 In this study, we demonstrate the value of biobanks coupled with EHRs to study the genetics of
256 cardiometabolic disease medications. We conducted discovery in the UKBB and replication analyses
257 in the AoU, and assessed the impact of common and rare variations on drug efficacy. We show that
258 signals from EHR-derived PGx GWAS are concordant with those observed in the literature and present
259 a theoretical framework to model drug response and longitudinal phenotypes.

260
261 Overall, we found only a few genetic variants to influence cardiometabolic drug response in line with
262 other studies that often identified only a few or even no genome-wide significant signals [6, 8, 28]. A re-
263 view on drug efficacy GWAS reported that only 15% of drugs exhibit robust gene-treatment interactions
264 [2], the extent of which largely depends on the drug's mode of action. While we could identify *LDLR* and
265 *ZNF800* as novel loci, sample sizes remain too low to have a definite answer on whether low numbers
266 of genetic predictors are a consequence of limited statistical power or a lack of genetic influence on
267 drug response which would be corroborated by low and often insignificant heritability estimates (Table
268 S13). While inter-individual variability in drug response could also depend on rare variants, we could
269 not identify robust rare variant associations in this study.

270
271 As similar study designs have used differing GWAS models to estimate pharmacogenetic effects, we
272 elucidated the theory of modelling biomarker differences and showed how baseline adjustment can

273 induce biases for genetic variants associated with baseline levels. For unbiased pharmacogenetic effect
274 estimation, both absolute and logarithmic relative biomarker differences can be assessed. Whether
275 absolute or relative reductions are most determining in lowering the risk of associated clinical diseases
276 may be dependent on the studied medication-biomarker pair. If biomarker levels are linearly associated
277 with the disease risk, absolute change is more relevant; however, if this relationship is exponential or
278 quadratic, then relative change is of more importance. As to pharmacogenetic interactions, it is a priori
279 unknown on which scale genetic variants act linearly, evidencing the usefulness of testing both absolute
280 and relative biomarker changes.

281

282 In line with other studies, we found that high PRS of the underlying biomarker can lead to increased ab-
283 solute, although lower relative biomarker reductions. A recent study showed that sulfonylureas therapy
284 was more effective in participants with higher T2D PRS with findings replicated in a separate cohort
285 [29]. Using RCT data, high coronary heart disease (CHD) genetic risk was found to be associated
286 with increased CHD risk, although the comparison between controls and treated participants revealed
287 that relative risk reductions were higher among individuals with a high PRS, suggesting that this group
288 benefited the most from lipid-lowering therapy [30, 31, 32, 33]. Given the complexity of genetics affecting
289 both baseline biomarker levels and disease risk as well as reductions thereof, disentangling whether
290 genetic or environmental factors can be easier alleviated by medication requires careful considerations
291 as adjusting for baseline levels induces genetic biases. While we found strong evidence for a higher ge-
292 netic burden to increase low-density and total cholesterol reductions, this effect artificially reverses when
293 adjusting for baseline levels. While RCT data with a control arm remains the gold standard for studying
294 such complex interactions, large biobank data also allow the construction of (non-randomized) control
295 groups. Both for variant-level and PRS association analyses, we demonstrate how drug response and
296 disease progression genetics seemingly overlap when adjusting for baseline and how these base-
297 line genetics signals disappear in the control group upon applying the correct longitudinal change model.

298

299 Our study has several limitations. First, we rely on data from EHRs to derive before and after treatment

300 biomarker levels, and thus cannot exclude the possibility that individuals were already on medication
301 before the first recorded prescription. Second, despite a large fraction of individuals with medication
302 records in the biobanks, final PGx cohort sample sizes are limited by the number of participants on a
303 certain medication and further reduced due to incomplete or missing data. Of the ~65,000 participants
304 with a statin prescription in the UKBB, 63% could not be considered for the LDL-C response analysis
305 because of missing baseline and/or post-treatment measures. Third, polypharmacy has only been taken
306 into account within and not across medication groups. Even within, especially for antihypertensives
307 where frequent changes in medication regimen occur, it can be difficult to determine appropriate filtering
308 and covariate strategies to study individual drug classes as sample sizes are too low when restricting
309 the analysis to individuals taking antihypertensives from a single class (i.e., stringent filtering strategy).
310 Fourth, our analysis focused on continuous biomarkers and not on clinical events. LDL-C, SBP, HR and
311 HBA1c merely serve as surrogate endpoints of CHD and T2D events, and the genetic interplay with
312 drug efficacy may be different when assessing hard clinical endpoints. Finally, we rely on observational
313 data to draw conclusions about drug efficacy. Although, we contrast the results with control analyses
314 on longitudinal biomarker change, control and medication groups were not defined randomly and by
315 definition have markedly different disease profiles.

316

317 To conclude, we show that EHRs enable new opportunities to study drug response and reveal the
318 complex contribution of genetic and environmental components to drug efficacy. While we find that the
319 influence of common and rare genetic variants on drug response is relatively low, larger sample sizes
320 will be needed to capture the full extent.

321 **Methods**

322 **Study population**

323 The UK Biobank is a prospective study of ~500,000 participants of whom 45% ($N \approx 230,000$) are
324 linked to the primary care data of the United Kingdom's National Health System [16]. The primary
325 care resource contains longitudinal data of GP prescription records (datafield #42039) and GP clinical
326 event records (datafield #42040) encoded through the British National Formulary (BNF), National Health
327 Service (NHS) dictionary of medicines and devices (DM+D), Read V2 and Clinical Terms Version 3
328 (CTV3) codes and are available up to 2016 or 2017 (depending on the data supplier). Analyses were
329 conducted on individuals of white British ancestry, with no excessive number of relatives and differing
330 reported and inferred gender, excluding participants who have withdrawn their consent (UKBB Sample-
331 QC #531; $N \approx 200,000$).

332 **Study design and drug response phenotypes**

333 We derived drug response phenotypes for the following cardiometabolic medication-phenotype pairs:
334 statin-lipids (LDL-C, HDL-C, TC), metformin-HbA1c, antihypertensive-SBP (by antihypertensive class
335 and all classes combined), beta blocker-SBP and beta blocker-HR. For each drug response phenotype,
336 we considered stringent and lenient filtering scenarios which differed by regularity in prescription
337 pattern, pre-treatment and post-treatment time windows as well as handling of treatment changes (e.g.
338 dose change) and concomitant medication (e.g. add-on therapy). In Figure S1 and Table S3, we outline
339 the different QC filters applied to each scenario. To further increase the number of available clinical
340 measures, we added measures from the initial and repeated assessment visits with their respective
341 time stamps to the pool of longitudinal data (LDL-C: #30780, HDL-C: #30760, TC: #30690, HbA1c:
342 #30750, SBP: #4080, HR: #102). Read V2 and CTV3 codes encoding these variables in the primary
343 care data are listed in Table S1 (see Note S2 for HbA1c unit conversion). Baseline measures were
344 taken three months (stringent filtering) or up to a year (lenient filtering) before treatment initiation and
345 7 days after, either as the closest measure to treatment start or an average of all available measures
346 during the pre-treatment period. The post-treatment period was defined as 6 months after medication

347 start up to 1.5 (stringent) and 2 (lenient) years after, and either the closest measure to treatment start
348 or an average of all available measures during the post-treatment period were taken. Consequently,
349 we derived drug response phenotypes for four scenarios: stringent filtering-single measure, stringent
350 filtering-average measures, lenient filtering-single measure, and lenient filtering-average measures.

351

352 To determine medication regimens (medication start, treatment changes, prescription regularity), we
353 first extracted all available prescriptions for each broader medication class (lipid-regulating, antidiabetic
354 including insulin, and antihypertensives; BNF and Read V2 codes in Table S2). We then selected
355 individuals with entries of the medication of interest (primary medication) and omitted individuals taking
356 medications other than the primary medication of the same class within a year of initiating the primary
357 medication. Note that in the analysis of beta blockers for SBP we excluded individuals taking other
358 antihypertensives, whereas such individuals were not excluded for HR since their effect on HR is
359 much weaker than for beta blockers [34]. In the lenient filtering scenarios, we considered exceptions
360 to this rule such as metformin being an add-on therapy to sulfonylureas, with sulfonylureas treatment
361 being a covariate. Allowed scenarios for add-on therapy for antihypertensive are shown in Figure
362 S2. Individuals taking primary medications in combination with a medication of the same class (e.g.
363 statins in combination with ezetimibe) were filtered out (Note S3). If multiple drugs corresponded to
364 a medication class (e.g. different statin types), we included all drugs taken by at least 20 individuals.
365 When BNF codes were truncated to miss the drug ingredient, we extracted them by matching drug
366 names and brand names in the drug description. Likewise, dosage information was retrieved from the
367 description using regular expressions [13].

368

369 In Table S4, we show the study characteristics of the individuals in each drug response phenotype
370 cohort. Furthermore, bar plots in Figure S3 show the number of individuals after each QC step. The
371 different QC steps were as follows: i) available baseline and post-treatment measures, ii) presence of
372 a primary care record other than baseline/primary medication at least two years before the medication
373 start to avoid falsely considering a change to a new health care provider as a first prescription, iii)

374 presence of a prescription part of the broader medication class after post-treatment measure, iv) drug
375 change between medication start and post-treatment measure, v) regular prescriptions proxying drug
376 adherence and vi) minimum baseline level (e.g. $\text{LDL-C} \geq 2 \text{ mmol/L}$). We only considered cohorts with
377 more than 500 individuals for GWAS analyses.

378 **GWAS**

379 In the genetic association analyses, we define the drug response phenotype as either the absolute
380 ($Y_{t_1} - Y_{t_0}$) or the logarithmic relative ($\log(Y_{t_1}) - \log(Y_{t_0}) = \log(Y_{t_1}/Y_{t_0})$) difference of post-treatment Y_{t_1}
381 and baseline Y_{t_0} levels. This difference was then adjusted for study-specific covariates including sex,
382 age at the time of medication start, time between medication start and post-treatment measure, drug
383 type and dose if applicable and the first 20 principal components (Table S3). Importantly, the difference
384 was not adjusted for baseline levels as this can induce a bias for genetic variants that are associated
385 with baseline (Note S1).

386
387 GWAS analyses were conducted using REGENIE (v3.2.6) which accounts for sample relatedness [35].
388 REGENIE first fits a whole-genome regression model (step 1) before testing each SNP in a leave-
389 one-chromosome-out (LOCO) scheme (step 2). In step 1, genotyped SNPs were filtered as follows
390 using PLINK2 [36]: minor allele frequency (MAF) ≥ 0.01 , Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium p-value $\geq 1e-15$,
391 genotyping rate ≥ 0.99 , not present in high linkage disequilibrium (LD) regions [37], not involved in inter-
392 chromosomal LD [35] and passing LD pruning at $r^2 < 0.9$ with a window size of 1,000 markers and a
393 step size of 100 markers which resulted in 424,544 SNPs included in step 1. In step 2, variants imputed
394 by the Haplotype Reference Consortium panel with a MAF ≥ 0.05 were tested (up to 5.5 million markers
395 depending on phenotype sample size). Individuals with missing genetic data and/or not passing genetic
396 QC were excluded from the analysis. Independent signals were defined as $r^2 < 0.001$ and clumping
397 was performed using PLINK and the UK10K reference panel [38].

398 **Rare variant analysis**

399 Rare variant analyses were conducted using REGENIE (v3.2.9). Phenotype definitions and covariates
400 (Table S3) were the same as in the GWAS analyses, except that biomarker differences were transformed
401 by inverse quantile normalization to decrease the chance of false positives. Following step 1 whole
402 genome regression (Method section: GWAS), we performed rare variant burden tests using optimal
403 kernel association tests (SKATO) in step 2 [26]. Masks were constructed from rare variants ($MAF < 0.01$)
404 including missense and putative LoF variants, and REGENIE SKATO tests were computed with default
405 parameters. Variant annotations and gene set definitions were derived following the original quality
406 functionally equivalent (OQFE) protocol and provided on the UK Biobank DNAnexus research analysis
407 platform [39]. Burden tests were then conducted on OQFE WES data (#23158) [39]. Genes classified as
408 very important pharmacogenes (VIPs) were downloaded from the PharmGKB gene annotations (April
409 5, 2023 version)[27].

410 **Replication in the All of Us biobank**

411 The All of Us research program is a prospective cohort recruiting up to 1 million participants [17].
412 Replication analyses were conducted in the current release (v7) in which genotype data were available
413 for ~310,000 and WGS data for ~250,000 individuals. In the AoU database, the Observational Medical
414 Outcomes Partnership (OMOP) Common Data Model (CDM) is used for standardized vocabularies
415 and harmonized data representations. Medication records were retrieved based on concept ID codes
416 from the RxNorm vocabulary and phenotypes from the SNOMED vocabulary. Replication analyses
417 were restricted to lipid response to statins and HbA1c response to metformin for which genome-wide
418 significant signals were obtained either in the UKBB analyses or reported in the literature.

419

420 Similarly to the UKBB, we extracted medication records by starting from the broader medication class
421 (lipid modifying agents (concept id 21601853) and drugs used in diabetes (concept id 21600712)) which
422 were then classified into primary medications (statins (concept id 21601855) and metformin (concept id
423 1503297)), combination therapies (lipid modifying agents, combinations (concept id 21601898), blood

424 glucose lowering drugs, combination (concept id 21600765) and sulfonylureas (concept id 21600749))
425 and related medication from the same class. Dose information was extracted from the drug concept
426 entries using regular expression or imputed by the median dose of the drug in question when not
427 available. Phenotypes were extracted based on the following ancestor concept IDs: LDL-C (3028437),
428 HDL-C (3007070), TC (3027114) and HbA1c (3004410). Only measures with available units and
429 values in the plausible range were retained (Table S1). While lipid measures were recorded as mmol/L
430 and primarily as mmol/mol for HbA1c in the UKBB (Note S2), units were mg/dL and % for lipids and
431 HbA1c, respectively, which we left unconverted. Following the extraction of longitudinal medication
432 and biomarker measures, we followed the same QC steps as in the UKBB by applying the lenient
433 filtering strategy with average baseline and post-treatment measures (Figure S1). Drug prescription
434 regularity was found to be lower in the AoU, likely because drug prescriptions are only recorded from
435 participating EHR sites. As a consequence, we lowered the drug regularity QC parameter and required
436 a single prescription between medication start and post-treatment measures (QC9, Figure S1). Cohort
437 characteristics and reason for removal are reported in Table S7 and Figure S8, respectively.

438

439 **GWAS:** GWAS analyses were conducted using REGENIE (v3.2.4). For step 1, we used genotyped
440 SNPs and filtered them as follows using PLINK2: autosomal SNPs, $MAF \geq 0.01$, Hardy-Weinberg
441 equilibrium p -value $\geq 1e-15$, genotyping rate ≥ 0.99 , not present in high linkage disequilibrium (LD)
442 regions [37] and passing LD pruning at $r^2 < 0.9$ with a window size of 1,000 markers and a step size
443 of 100 markers which resulted in 238,888 SNPs. The first 20 PCs were computed on the same set of
444 SNPs using the FastPCA algorithm implemented in PLINK2 [40]. In step 2, we used WGS data from
445 the Allele Count/Allele Frequency (ACAF) threshold callset to test associations between the genotypes
446 of interest and drug response phenotypes.

447

448 **Rare variant analysis:** We conducted SKATO analyses on rare variants from the exon regions using
449 REGENIE (v3.2.4) with step 1 being the same as in the GWAS. Variant annotations and gene set defi-
450 nitions were extracted from the Variant Annotation Table (VAT) provided by the AoU. Missense variants

451 and putative LoF variants defined as stop gained, frameshift, splice donor and splice acceptor with MAF
452 < 0.01 were included in the burden tests.

453 **PRS and genetic correlations**

454 We calculated PRS for UKBB participants with the PGS Catalog Calculator [41, 42] using pre-calculated
455 genetic effect sizes from the PGS Catalog [43]: LDL-C, PGS002150; HDL-C, PGS002172; TC,
456 PGS002108; HbA1c, PGS002171; SBP, PGS002228; HR, PGS002193. We then calculated the
457 associations between PRS and the absolute and (logarithmic) relative biomarker difference adjusted for
458 sex, age and drug-specific covariates (Table S3).

459
460 We calculated genetic correlations between traits using the GenomicSEM R package (v0.0.5c) [44]. Trait
461 GWAS summary statistics were obtained from the following consortia: LDL-C, HDL-C and TC from the
462 Global Lipids Genetics Consortium [45] (N up to 1,320,016; European ancestry), HbA1c from the UKBB
463 (#30750, N = 344,182), SBP from a meta-analysis of the UKBB and the International Consortium of
464 Blood Pressure [46] (N up to 757,601) and HR from the UKBB (#102, N = 340,162) where the UKBB
465 GWAS summary statistics came from Neale's lab (<http://www.nealelab.is/uk-biobank>).

466 **Longitudinal biomarker change GWAS**

467 We conducted biomarker change GWAS in individuals part of the primary care data that did not have any
468 drug prescription indicated for the investigated disease/surrogate endpoint (i.e., broad medication class,
469 Table S2). All participants in this set with two available measures spaced between 6 months and 3 years
470 which corresponds to the minimum and maximum allowed time interval between baseline and post-
471 treatment measures were included. GWAS analyses were conducted analogous to the drug response
472 GWAS, replacing baseline with first and post-treatment with second phenotype measure. We used the
473 same covariates as in the corresponding drug response cohorts omitting drug-specific variables (Table
474 S3).

475 **Data availability**

476 Genetic and phenotypic data from the UK Biobank and All of Us Resource are available to approved
477 researchers.

478 British National Formulary (BNF), National Health Service (NHS) dictionary of medicines and devices
479 (DM+D), Read V2 and Clinical Terms Version 3 (CTV3) vocabularies encoding the UK Biobank primary
480 care records, <https://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/refer.cgi?id=592>.

481 ATHENA – OHDSI vocabulary repository for RxNorm (drug) and SNOMED (phenotype) concept IDs,
482 <https://athena.ohdsi.org/>.

483 Polygenic risk score genetic effect sizes (UK Biobank), [https://www.pgscatalog.org/publication/](https://www.pgscatalog.org/publication/PGP000263/)
484 [PGP000263/](https://www.pgscatalog.org/publication/PGP000263/).

485 Lipid GWAS summary statistics from the Global Lipids Genetics Consortium, [https://csg.sph.umich.](https://csg.sph.umich.edu/willer/public/glgc-lipids2021/)
486 [edu/willer/public/glgc-lipids2021/](https://csg.sph.umich.edu/willer/public/glgc-lipids2021/).

487 Systolic blood pressure GWAS summary statistics from the UK Biobank and the International Consor-
488 tium of Blood Pressure meta-analysis, <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/publications/30224653>.

489 Neale's lab GWAS summary statistics (UK Biobank), <http://www.nealelab.is/uk-biobank>.

490 UK10K individual-level data are available upon request, https://www.uk10k.org/data_access.html.

491 All GWAS and rare variant burden test summary statistics will be available in the GWAS Catalog upon
492 publication.

493 **Code availability**

494 GWAS calculations were performed with REGENIE (v3.2.6) which is available at [https://github.com/](https://github.com/rgcgithub/regenie)
495 [rgcgithub/regenie](https://github.com/rgcgithub/regenie). PLINK2 is available at <https://www.cog-genomics.org/plink/2.0/>. PRS were
496 calculated with the PGS Catalog Calculator (v2.0) available at https://github.com/PGScatalog/pgsc_
497 [calc](https://github.com/PGScatalog/pgsc_calc). Genetic correlations were calculated with the GenomicSEM R package (v0.0.5c) available at
498 <https://github.com/GenomicSEM/GenomicSEM>. All codes used in this analysis are available on GitHub
499 (<https://github.com/masadler/PGxEHR>).

500 **Competing interests**

501 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

502 **Authors' contributions**

503 MCS and ZK conceived and designed the study. MCS performed statistical analyses in the UK Biobank.
504 AA conducted replication analyses in the All of Us research program under the supervision of MCS
505 and RBA. CCB computed PRS on UK Biobank participants. DMR provided guidance on analyzing rare
506 variants from sequencing data. ZK supervised all statistical analyses. All the authors contributed by
507 providing advice on the interpretation of results. MCS and ZK drafted the manuscript. All authors read,
508 approved, and provided feedback on the final manuscript.

509 **Acknowledgements**

510 This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (310030_189147) to ZK. RBA is
511 supported by NIH HG010615, Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, and Burroughs Wellcome Fund. MCS would
512 like to thank the Fulbright Program for funding her research stay at Stanford University where this re-
513 search work has started under the co-supervision of RBA. This research has been conducted using the
514 UK Biobank Resource under Application Number 16389. LD was calculated based on the UK10K data
515 resource (EGAD00001000740, EGAD00001000741). Computations were performed on the Urblaua
516 cluster of the University of Lausanne. We also would like to acknowledge the participants and inves-
517 tigators of the UK Biobank and All of Us study. We thank Greg McInnes for his help and support in
518 analyzing medication prescription data in the UK Biobank and Ewan Pearson for his advice in defining
519 drug response phenotypes from the UK Biobank primary care data.

References

- [1] Gregory McInnes, Sook Wah Yee, Yash Pershad, and Russ B Altman. Genomewide association studies in pharmacogenomics. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 110(3):637–648, 2021.

- [2] Matthew R Nelson, Toby Johnson, Liling Warren, Arlene R Hughes, Stephanie L Chissoe, Chun-Fang Xu, and Dawn M Waterworth. The genetics of drug efficacy: opportunities and challenges. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 17(4):197–206, 2016.
- [3] Munir Pirmohamed. Pharmacogenomics: Current status and future perspectives. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, pages 1–13, 2023.
- [4] Iris Postmus, Stella Trompet, Harshal A Deshmukh, Michael R Barnes, Xiaohui Li, Helen R Warren, Daniel I Chasman, Kaixin Zhou, Benoit J Arsenault, Louise A Donnelly, et al. Pharmacogenetic meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies of ldl cholesterol response to statins. *Nature communications*, 5(1):5068, 2014.
- [5] Kaixin Zhou, Sook Wah Yee, Eric L Seiser, Nienke Van Leeuwen, Roger Tavendale, Amanda J Bennett, Christopher J Groves, Ruth L Coleman, Amber A Van Der Heijden, Joline W Beulens, et al. Variation in the glucose transporter gene *slc2a2* is associated with glycemic response to metformin. *Nature genetics*, 48(9):1055–1059, 2016.
- [6] Adem Y Dawed, Andrea Mari, Andrew Brown, Timothy J McDonald, Lin Li, Shuaicheng Wang, Mun-Gwan Hong, Sapna Sharma, Neil R Robertson, Anubha Mahajan, et al. Pharmacogenomics of glp-1 receptor agonists: a genome-wide analysis of observational data and large randomised controlled trials. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, 11(1):33–41, 2023.
- [7] Erika Salvi, Zhiying Wang, Federica Rizzi, Yan Gong, Caitrin W McDonough, Sandosh Padmanabhan, Timo P Hiltunen, Chiara Lanzani, Roberta Zaninello, Martina Chittani, et al. Genome-wide and gene-based meta-analyses identify novel loci influencing blood pressure response to hydrochlorothiazide. *Hypertension*, 69(1):51–59, 2017.
- [8] Sonal Singh, Helen R Warren, Timo P Hiltunen, Caitrin W McDonough, Nihal El Rouby, Erika Salvi, Zhiying Wang, Tatiana Garofalidou, Frej Fyhrquist, Kimmo K Kontula, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis of blood pressure response to β 1-blockers: results from icaps (international consortium of antihypertensive pharmacogenomics studies). *Journal of the American Heart Association*, 8(16):e013115, 2019.

- [9] Caitrin W McDonough, Helen R Warren, John R Jack, Alison A Motsinger-Reif, Nicole D Armstrong, Joshua C Bis, John S House, Sonal Singh, Nihal M El Rouby, Yan Gong, et al. Adverse cardiovascular outcomes and antihypertensive treatment: A genome-wide interaction meta-analysis in the international consortium for antihypertensive pharmacogenomics studies. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 110(3):723–732, 2021.
- [10] William S Bush, David R Crosslin, A Owusu-Obeng, John Wallace, Berta Almoguera, Melissa A Basford, Suzette J Bielinski, David S Carrell, John J Connolly, Dana Crawford, et al. Genetic variation among 82 pharmacogenes: The PGRNseq data from the eMERGE network. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 100(2):160–169, 2016.
- [11] Chiara Auwerx, Marie C Sadler, Alexandre Reymond, and Zoltán Kutalik. From pharmacogenetics to pharmaco-omics: Milestones and future directions. *Human Genetics and Genomics Advances*, 2022.
- [12] Tõnis Tasa, Kristi Krebs, Mart Kals, Reedik Mägi, Volker M Lauschke, Toomas Haller, Tarmo Puurand, Mairo Remm, Tõnu Esko, Andres Metspalu, et al. Genetic variation in the Estonian population: pharmacogenomics study of adverse drug effects using electronic health records. *European Journal of Human Genetics*, 27(3):442–454, 2019.
- [13] Gregory McInnes and Russ B Altman. Drug response pharmacogenetics for 200,000 uk biobank participants. In *BIOCOMPUTING 2021: Proceedings of the Pacific Symposium*, pages 184–195. World Scientific, 2020.
- [14] Mustafa Adnan Malki, Adem Y Dawed, Caroline Hayward, Alex Doney, and Ewan R Pearson. Utilizing large electronic medical record data sets to identify novel drug–gene interactions for commonly used drugs. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 110(3):816–825, 2021.
- [15] Tuomo Kiiskinen, Pyy Helkkula, Kristi Krebs, Juha Karjalainen, Elmo Saarentaus, Nina Mars, Arto Lehisto, Wei Zhou, Mattia Cordioli, Sakari Jukarainen, et al. Genetic predictors of lifelong medication-use patterns in cardiometabolic diseases. *Nature Medicine*, 29(1):209–218, 2023.

- [16] Clare Bycroft, Colin Freeman, Desislava Petkova, Gavin Band, Lloyd T Elliott, Kevin Sharp, Allan Motyer, Damjan Vukcevic, Olivier Delaneau, Jared O'Connell, et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature*, 562(7726):203–209, 2018.
- [17] The All of Us Research Program Investigators. The “All of Us” research program. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 381(7):668–676, 2019.
- [18] Jemma C Hopewell, Sarah Parish, Alison Offer, Emma Link, Robert Clarke, Mark Lathrop, Jane Armitage, Rory Collins, and MRC/BHF Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group. Impact of common genetic variation on response to simvastatin therapy among 18 705 participants in the heart protection study. *European heart journal*, 34(13):982–992, 2013.
- [19] Jaideep Patel, H Robert Superko, Seth S Martin, Roger S Blumenthal, and Lisa Christopher-Stine. Genetic and immunologic susceptibility to statin-related myopathy. *Atherosclerosis*, 240(1):260–271, 2015.
- [20] Elliot Sollis, Abayomi Mosaku, Ala Abid, Annalisa Buniello, Maria Cerezo, Laurent Gil, Tudor Groza, Osman Güneş, Peggy Hall, James Hayhurst, et al. The NHGRI-EBI GWAS Catalog: knowledge-base and deposition resource. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 51(D1):D977–D985, 2023.
- [21] Iris Postmus, Helen R Warren, Stella Trompet, Benoit J Arsenault, Christy L Avery, Joshua C Bis, Daniel I Chasman, Catherine E de Keyser, Harshal A Deshmukh, Daniel S Evans, et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies of HDL cholesterol response to statins. *Journal of medical genetics*, 53(12):835–845, 2016.
- [22] Lorna W Harries, Andrew T Hattersley, Alex SF Doney, Helen Colhoun, Andrew D Morris, Calum Sutherland, D Grahame Hardie, Leena Peltonen, Mark I McCarthy, et al. Common variants near ATM are associated with glycemic response to metformin in type 2 diabetes. *Nature genetics*, 43(2):117–120, 2011.
- [23] Daniel M Rotroff, Sook Wah Yee, Kaixin Zhou, Skylar W Marvel, Hetal S Shah, John R Jack, Tammy M Havener, Monique M Hedderson, Michiaki Kubo, Mark A Herman, et al. Genetic variants

- in CPA6 and PRPF31 are associated with variation in response to metformin in individuals with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes*, 67(7):1428–1440, 2018.
- [24] Daniel I Chasman, Franco Giulianini, Jean MacFadyen, Bryan J Barratt, Fredrik Nyberg, and Paul M Ridker. Genetic determinants of statin-induced low-density lipoprotein cholesterol reduction: the Justification for the Use of Statins in Prevention: an Intervention Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin (JUPITER) trial. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Genetics*, 5(2):257–264, 2012.
- [25] Gustavo H Oliveira-Paula, Sherliane C Pereira, Jose E Tanus-Santos, and Riccardo Lacchini. Pharmacogenomics and hypertension: current insights. *Pharmacogenomics and personalized medicine*, pages 341–359, 2020.
- [26] Seunggeun Lee, Michael C Wu, and Xihong Lin. Optimal tests for rare variant effects in sequencing association studies. *Biostatistics*, 13(4):762–775, 2012.
- [27] Michelle Whirl-Carrillo, Rachel Huddart, Li Gong, Katrin Sangkuhl, Caroline F Thorn, Ryan Whaley, and Teri E Klein. An evidence-based framework for evaluating pharmacogenomics knowledge for personalized medicine. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 110(3):563–572, 2021.
- [28] Cong Zhang, Konstantin Shestopaloff, Benjamin Hollis, Chun Hei Kwok, Claudia Hon, Nicole Hartmann, Chengeng Tian, Magdalena Wozniak, Luis Santos, Dominique West, et al. Response to anti-IL17 therapy in inflammatory disease is not strongly impacted by genetic background. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 2023.
- [29] Josephine H Li, Lukasz Szczerbinski, Adem Y Dawed, Varinderpal Kaur, Jennifer N Todd, Ewan R Pearson, and Jose C Florez. A polygenic score for type 2 diabetes risk is associated with both the acute and sustained response to sulfonylureas. *Diabetes*, 70(1):293–300, 2021.
- [30] Jessica L Mega, Nathan O Stitzel, J Gustav Smith, Daniel I Chasman, Mark J Caulfield, James J Devlin, Francesco Nordio, Craig L Hyde, Christopher P Cannon, Frank M Sacks, et al. Genetic risk, coronary heart disease events, and the clinical benefit of statin therapy: an analysis of primary and secondary prevention trials. *The Lancet*, 385(9984):2264–2271, 2015.


- [31] Pradeep Natarajan, Robin Young, Nathan O Stitziel, Sandosh Padmanabhan, Usman Baber, Roxana Mehran, Samantha Sartori, Valentin Fuster, Dermot F Reilly, Adam Butterworth, et al. Polygenic risk score identifies subgroup with higher burden of atherosclerosis and greater relative benefit from statin therapy in the primary prevention setting. *Circulation*, 135(22):2091–2101, 2017.
- [32] Amy Damask, P Gabriel Steg, Gregory G Schwartz, Michael Szarek, Emil Hagström, Lina Badimon, M John Chapman, Catherine Boileau, Sotirios Tsimikas, Henry N Ginsberg, et al. Patients with high genome-wide polygenic risk scores for coronary artery disease may receive greater clinical benefit from alirocumab treatment in the ODYSSEY OUTCOMES trial. *Circulation*, 141(8):624–636, 2020.
- [33] Nicholas A Marston, Frederick K Kamanu, Francesco Nordio, Yared Gurmu, Carolina Roselli, Peter S Sever, Terje R Pedersen, Anthony C Keech, Hwei Wang, Armando Lira Pineda, et al. Predicting benefit from evolocumab therapy in patients with atherosclerotic disease using a genetic risk score: results from the fourier trial. *Circulation*, 141(8):616–623, 2020.
- [34] Barry J Materson, Domenic J Reda, and David W Williams. Comparison of effects of antihypertensive drugs on heart rate: changes from baseline by baseline group and over time. *American journal of hypertension*, 11(5):597–601, 1998.
- [35] Joelle Mbatchou, Leland Barnard, Joshua Backman, Anthony Marcketta, Jack A Kosmicki, Andrey Ziyatdinov, Christian Benner, Colm O'Dushlaine, Mathew Barber, Boris Boutkov, et al. Computationally efficient whole-genome regression for quantitative and binary traits. *Nature genetics*, 53(7):1097–1103, 2021.
- [36] Christopher C Chang, Carson C Chow, Laurent CAM Tellier, Shashaank Vattikuti, Shaun M Purcell, and James J Lee. Second-generation plink: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *Gigascience*, 4(1):s13742–015, 2015.
- [37] Hannah V Meyer. plinkQC: genotype quality control in genetic association studies, 2022. meyerlab-cshl/plinkQC, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3934294>.

- [38] UK10K et al. The UK10K project identifies rare variants in health and disease. *Nature*, 526(7571):82, 2015.
- [39] Olga Krasheninina, Yih-Chii Hwang, Xiaodong Bai, Aleksandra Zalcmán, Evan Maxwell, Jeffrey G Reid, and William J Salerno Jr. Open-source mapping and variant calling for large-scale ngs data from original base-quality scores. *bioRxiv*, pages 2020–12, 2020.
- [40] Kevin J Galinsky, Gaurav Bhatia, Po-Ru Loh, Stoyan Georgiev, Sayan Mukherjee, Nick J Patterson, and Alkes L Price. Fast principal-component analysis reveals convergent evolution of *adh1b* in europe and east asia. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 98(3):456–472, 2016.
- [41] PGS Catalog Team. PGS Catalog Calculator v2.0, 2023. https://github.com/PGScatalog/pgsc_calc.
- [42] Samuel A Lambert, Laurent Gil, Simon Jupp, Scott C Ritchie, Yu Xu, Annalisa Buniello, Aoife McMahon, Gad Abraham, Michael Chapman, Helen Parkinson, et al. The polygenic score catalog as an open database for reproducibility and systematic evaluation. *Nature Genetics*, 53(4):420–425, 2021.
- [43] Florian Privé, Hugues Aschard, Shai Carmi, Lasse Folkersen, Clive Hoggart, Paul F O'Reilly, and Bjarni J Vilhjálmsson. Portability of 245 polygenic scores when derived from the uk biobank and applied to 9 ancestry groups from the same cohort. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 109(1):12–23, 2022.
- [44] Andrew D Grotzinger, Mijke Rhemtulla, Ronald de Vlaming, Stuart J Ritchie, Travis T Mallard, W David Hill, Hill F Ip, Riccardo E Marioni, Andrew M McIntosh, Ian J Deary, et al. Genomic structural equation modelling provides insights into the multivariate genetic architecture of complex traits. *Nature human behaviour*, 3(5):513–525, 2019.
- [45] Sarah E Graham, Shoa L Clarke, Kuan-Han H Wu, Stavroula Kanoni, Greg JM Zajac, Shweta Ramdas, Ida Surakka, Ioanna Ntalla, Sailaja Vedantam, Thomas W Winkler, et al. The power of genetic diversity in genome-wide association studies of lipids. *Nature*, 600(7890):675–679, 2021.

[46] Evangelos Evangelou, Helen R Warren, David Mosen-Ansorena, Borbala Mifsud, Raha Pazoki, He Gao, Georgios Ntritsos, Niki Dimou, Claudia P Cabrera, Ibrahim Karaman, et al. Genetic analysis of over 1 million people identifies 535 new loci associated with blood pressure traits. *Nature genetics*, 50(10):1412–1425, 2018.


a

Study design




Drug response: 1) $\text{Post-treatment phenotype} - \text{baseline phenotype}$ 2) $\log\left(\frac{\text{Post-treatment phenotype}}{\text{baseline phenotype}}\right)$

Cardiometabolic medication-phenotype pairs:


**b**

Drug response genetic association analyses


GWAS




Rare variant burden tests

**c**



Dissecting drug response genetics








b Lipid response to statins

LDL-C (N = 17,063)



TC (N = 26,669)



aBiomarker level Y at time t :




$$Y_t = \beta_0 \cdot G_0 +$$



$$\beta_E \cdot E_t + \gamma_E \cdot G_E \cdot E_t +$$

$$\beta_D \cdot D_t + \gamma_D \cdot G_D \cdot D_t + \varepsilon_t$$

Drug response phenotype:

$$\Delta Y = Y_{t_1} - Y_{t_0} = \beta_D + \gamma_D \cdot G_D + \delta_{01}$$

post-treatment
levelbaseline
level**b****c****d**

a**b****c**