Genome-wide Mendelian Randomization Identifies Potential Drug Targets for Dorsopathies

1 **Yu Cui**^{1,2,†}, Jiarui Guo^{1,2,†}, Yuanxi Lu^{1,2,†}, Mengting Hu^{1,2}, He Zhou^{1,2}, Wancong Zhang^{2,3,4,*}, **Shijie Tang2,3,4,*** 2

3 †These authors contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

4

- ¹ 5 Shantou University Medical College, Shantou, Guangdong 515041, China
- ² Department of Plastic Surgery and Burns Center, Second Affiliated Hospital, Shantou University
- 7 Medical College, Shantou, Guangdong 515051, China
- ³ Plastic Surgery Institute of Shantou University Medical College, Shantou, Guangdong 515051,
- 9 China
- ⁴ Shantou Plastic surgery Clinical Research Center, Shantou, Guangdong 515051, China

11 *** Correspondence:**

- 12 Wancong Zhang, Shijie Tang
- 13 Martine2007@sina.com , sjtang3@stu.edu.cn
- 14 **Keywords: Mendelian randomization, Genetics, Drug target, Dorsopathies, Colocalization**
- 15 **analysis, Genome-wide association studies, Expression quantitative trait locus.**
- 16 **Abstract**
- 17 **Background** Dorsopathies are a group of musculoskeletal disorders affecting the spinal column and

18 related structures, contributing significantly to global disability rates and healthcare costs. Despite

19 their prevalence, the genetic and biological mechanisms underlying dorsopathies are not fully

- 20 understood.
- 21 **Method** Summary-data-based Mendelian Randomization (SMR) and colocalization analysis were
- 22 employed, using data from genome-wide association studies (GWAS) and cis-expression quantitative
- 23 trait loci (cis-eQTLs) databases. Genes with a colocalization posterior probability (PP.H4) above 0.7
- 24 in SMR results were selected for additional analysis. These selected genes underwent MR analysis to
- 25 examine possible causal connections with dorsopathies, and sensitivity analyses were carried out to
- 26 ensure robustness. Additionally, two transcriptome-wide association studies (TWAS) were utilized to
- 27 confirm and screen for potential drug targets.
- 28 **Result** We identified four essential genes linked to dorsopathies: *NLRC4*, *CGREF1*, *KHK*, and
- 29 *RNF212*. Mendelian randomization (MR) analysis revealed a potential causal link between these
- 30 genes and dorsopathies. Elevated transcription levels of *NLRC4*, *CGREF1*, and *KHK* correlated with
- 31 reduced dorsopathies risk, while increased levels of *RNF212* were associated with heightened risk of
- 32 dorsopathies. Regarding methylation sites, an increase in *cg04686953* fully mediated the decreased
- 33 risk of dorsopathies by *RNF212*. Similarly, the risk effect of *cg26638505* and *cg18948125* was
- 34 entirely mediated by *NLRC4*, while *CGREF1* predominantly mediated the risk-increasing effect of
- 35 *cg06112415* and the decrease effect of *cg22740783*.

36 **Conclusion** Dorsopathies were associated with four pivotal genes: *NLRC4*, *CGREF1*, *KHK*, and

37 *RNF212*. Methylation analysis identified cg04686953 and *cg22740783* as protective against

38 dorsopathies risk, while *cg26638505*, *cg18948125*, and *cg06112415* exhibited a risk-increasing

40

41 **1 Introduction**

42 Dorsopathies encompass a broad spectrum of musculoskeletal issues that impact the spinal column

43 and its related structures[1]. These conditions are prevalent among individuals across various age 44 groups and socioeconomic backgrounds, leading affected individuals to seek medical assistance.

45 They significantly contribute to the burden of illness, disability, and distress. Since 1990, there has

46 been a notable rise in the prevalence of these disorders, rendering them one of the primary causes of

47 global disability-adjusted life years [2]. However, the pathogenic genes and biological mechanisms

48 of the disease remain largely unknown. Research conducted on the general population has indicated a

49 potential link between certain dorsopathies and lifestyle choices including smoking [3], a higher body

50 mass index[4,5], and lack of physical activity [6]. Additionally, these dorsopathies have been found

51 to coincide with various other health complications such as anxiety, depression, diabetes,

52 cardiovascular, respiratory, and gastrointestinal ailments[7,8]. Furthermore, specific dorsopathies like

53 osteopenia, osteomalacia, and tuberculosis can be influenced by factors such as diet, living

54 environment, and psychological aspects. These particular disorders often occur alongside systemic

55 comorbidities such as endocrine dysfunction and infection [8]. Relevant limitations in observational

56 epidemiological studies include the potential for confounding, reverse causation, and diverse biases,

57 which hinder comprehensive understanding of disease pathogenesis and identification of treatment

58 targets.

59 However, the utilization of Mendelian randomization (MR) techniques, which rely on the random

60 allocation of genetic variations, allows for the simulation of randomized controlled trials and can

61 effectively mitigate the impact of confounding variables. In relation to research on dorsopathies, this

62 implies a more precise evaluation of the causal association between drug targets and disease while

- 63 excluding any factors that may potentially disrupt the findings [9]. MR utilizes genetic variants as
- 64 instrumental variables to assess the causal impact of an exposure on outcomes. This approach has

65 been extensively utilized in other research studies related to diseases and has effectively facilitated

66 the identification of potential therapeutic targets for diverse medical conditions.[10] However, there

67 is limited research on employing MR methods to explore potential drug targets for dorsopathies.

68 Therefore, to gain a deeper understanding of the pathogenesis of dorsopathies and identify more

69 effective treatment approaches, further MR studies are needed to evaluate the drug targets for 70 dorsopathies. This will help eliminate factors that could interfere with the results and offer new

71 perspectives and methods for the treatment of dorsopathies. In theory, single nucleotide

72 polymorphisms (SNPs) are distributed randomly and not impacted by environmental factors, making

73 them an ideal tool for establishing causality. MR is a type of instrumental variable analysis that

74 primarily employs SNPs as genetic instruments to determine the causal impact of an exposure (in this

75 instance, circulatory proteins) on outcomes.[11]. Previous studies have successfully utilized MR to

76 identify biomarkers and treatment targets for various diseases, such as aortic aneurysms [12],

77 multiple sclerosis [13], and breast cancer [14].

78 However, in previous studies, the use of MR To analyze drug targets for dorsopathies is very rare. To 79 address this research gap, our study focuses on utilizing genes as factors of exposure in drug target

³⁹ impact.

- 80 research, investigating the role of genes in dorsopathies development and their potential as viable
- 81 drug targets. Genes have stable genetic characteristics, and they are unaffected by environmental
- 82 factors, allowing for a more accurate assessment of the causal relationship between genes and
- 83 dorsopathies [15]. By exploring dorsopathies' potential drug targets through genes as the exposure
- 84 factor, we aim to offer new perspectives and methods for the treatment and prevention of
- 85 dorsopathies.
- 86 To investigate potential pathogenic genes related to dorsopathies, we employed a comprehensive
- 87 analytical approach including summary-data-based Mendelian randomization (SMR) analysis,
- 88 colocalization analysis, genome-wide association study (GWAS), and transcriptome-wide association
- 89 study (TWAS). We utilized a meta-analysis dataset of cis-expression quantitative trait loci (cis-
- 90 eQTLs) from peripheral blood samples as exposure data, along with results from the extensive
- 91 FinnGen database. Following preliminary analysis, we identified candidate genes and established
- 92 causal inference using MR methods. Additionally, we conducted mediation analysis of gene-
- 93 mediated methylation sites to explore disease related methylation sites.

94 **2 Method**

95 **2.1 Datasets**

96 Summary-level data for the GWAS on dorsopathies were obtained from the FinnGen consortium,

- 97 comprising 117,411 cases and 294,770 controls. This dataset represents the most recent GWAS
- 98 findings and comprises the largest cohort of dorsopathies cases documented to date. The primary
- 99 objective of FinnGen is to accumulate and rigorously analyze genomic and national health register
- 100 data from 500,000 Finnish individuals.[16] In the context of drug development studies, we prioritized
- 101 cis-eQTLs that were in closer proximity to the target gene. These cis-eQTLs used for SMR analyses
- 102 were sourced from the eQTLGen Consortium [17] and the eQTL meta-analyses conducted on
- 103 peripheral blood samples from a cohort of 31,684 individuals. For the TWAS analyses of eQTL data,
104 we utilized the GTEx v8 European whole blood dataset. Given our specific emphasis on dorsopathies we utilized the GTEx v8 European whole blood dataset. Given our specific emphasis on dorsopathies,
- 105 we meticulously extracted comprehensive eQTL results exclusively from the whole blood samples
- 106 within the GTEx dataset [18].
- 107

108 **2.2 SMR analyses**

109 We conducted SMR and heterogeneity in dependent instruments (HEIDI) tests analyses on cis

- 110 regions using the SMR software (version 1.03) [19]. The methodologies for SMR analyses are
- 111 detailed in the original work. In brief, SMR analyses employs a well-established MR approach. This
- 112 technique employs a SNP at a prominent cis-eQTL as an instrumental variable (IV). The summary-
- 113 level eQTL data serve as the exposure variable, and the GWAS data for a specific trait serve as the
- 114 outcome variable. The primary objective is to explore a potential causal or pleiotropic association, 115 wherein the same causal variant influences both gene expression and the trait. It is crucial to
- 116 acknowledge that the SMR method lacks the ability to distinguish between a causal association, in
- 117 which gene expression causally influences the trait, and a pleiotropic association, in which the same
- 118 SNP affects both gene expression and the trait. This limitation arises because of the single
- 119 instrumental variable (IV) in the MR method, which cannot differentiate between causality and
- 120 pleiotropy. Nevertheless, the HEIDI test can make this distinction by discerning causality and
- 121 pleiotropy from linkage. Linkage refers to cases in which two different SNPs in linkage
- 122 disequilibrium (LD) independently influence gene expression and the trait. Although less biologically

- 123 intriguing than causality and pleiotropy, the HEIDI test provides clarity in such scenarios. For the
- 124 HEIDI test, a p-value below 0.05 was considered significant, suggesting that the observed association
- 125 was attributable to linkage.
- 126

127 **2.3 GWAS analyses**

128 Multimarker analyses of genomic annotation (MAGMA) employs a multiple regression model to

- 129 assess the cumulative effect of multiple SNPs within a specific gene region $(\pm 10 \text{ kb})$ [20]. The reference panel for calculating LD was derived from Phase 3 of the 1000 Genomes European
- reference panel for calculating LD was derived from Phase 3 of the 1000 Genomes European
- 131 population. Significance thresholds for GWAS analyses using both SMR and MAGMA were set at a
- 132 false discovery rate (FDR) below 0.05, corrected using the Benjamini-Hochberg method.[21]
- 133

134 **2.4 TWAS analyses**

135 We conducted validations to integrate dorsopathies GWAS and eQTL data of whole blood from

136 GTEx using the FUSION and UTMOST, widely utilized tools in prior TWAS investigations [22,23].

137 FUSION constructs predictive models using various penalized linear models, such as GBLUP,

138 LASSO, Elastic Net, for the significant cis-heritability genes estimated from SNPs within 500 kb on

- 139 either side of the gene boundary. Subsequently, it selects the optimal model based on the coefficient
- 140 of determination (R2) calculated through a fivefold cross-validation. For UTMOST, we performed
- 141 repeated 49 single-tissue association tests for each tissue. TWAS significance for both single-tissue
- 142 analyses was determined with a Benjamini-Hochberg corrected FDR value below 0.05.
- 143

144 **2.5 MR analyses**

145 In conducting the two-sample MR analyses [24], we utilized the TwoSampleMR R package. The

146 utilization of the two-sample MR framework requires employing two distinct datasets. In this study,

147 genetic instruments, specifically cis-eQTL, served as exposures, while GWAS were utilized to

148 determine outcome traits. The MR methodology investigates the relationship between gene

149 expression and diseases or traits by employing genetic variants associated with gene expression as

150 instrumental variables (exposure) and GWAS for the outcome measures. Mendelian Randomization

- 151 facilitates exploration into whether alterations in gene expression causally impact diseases or traits.
- 152 For instruments represented by a single SNP, we employed the Wald ratio. In cases where
153 instruments consisted of multiple SNPs, we implemented the inverse-variance-weighted M
- instruments consisted of multiple SNPs, we implemented the inverse-variance-weighted MR
- 154 approach. When selecting SNPs, the significance thresholds were defined as $P < 5 \times 10^{\circ}$ (-8) for genome-wide significance, with a linkage disequilibrium parameter (r^o2) set to 0.1, and a genetic
- genome-wide significance, with a linkage disequilibrium parameter (r^2) set to 0.1, and a genetic
- 156 distance set to 10 MB.
- 157

158 **2.6 Colocalization analyses**

159 Conducted colocalization analyses using the coloc package in the R software environment (version

- 160 4.0.3). Colocalization analyses aims to assess the potential shared causality between SNPs associated
- 161 with both gene expression and phenotype at a specific locus, thereby indicating the "colocalization"

- 162 of these genetic signals. The analyses calculates posterior probabilities (PPs) for five hypotheses: H0
- 163 denotes no association with either gene expression or phenotype; H1 signifies an association solely
- 164 with gene expression; H2 indicates an association exclusively with the phenotype; H3 suggests an
- 165 association with both gene expression and phenotype through independent SNPs; and H4 implies an 166 association with both gene expression and phenotype through shared causal SNPs. A substantial PP
- 167 for H4 (PP.H4 above 0.70) strongly suggests the presence of shared causal variants influencing both
- 168 gene expression and phenotype [25].
- 169

170 **2.7 Methylation & Mediation analysis**

171 We hypothesize that methylation sites exert influence on the pathogenic risk of dorsopathies through

- 172 three primary pathways: a) they indirectly modulate the pathogenic risk by influencing gene
- 173 expression; b) the methylation sites themselves have a direct impact on the pathogenic risk of
- 174 dorsopathies; and c) methylation sites may affect the pathogenic risk of dorsopathies by influencing
- 175 other confounders. It is crucial to underscore that the overall impact of methylation on the pathogenic
- 176 risk of dorsopathies can be conceptualized as the combined action of these three pathways, expressed
- 177 as T=a+b+c, where a denotes the indirect modulation of pathogenic risk by influencing gene
- 178 expression, b denotes the direct effect of methylation sites on pathogenic risk, and c represents their
179 influence on pathogenic risk through impacting confounding factors. Significance tests are conducted influence on pathogenic risk through impacting confounding factors. Significance tests are conducted
- 180 separately for T, x, y, and a. If all these parameters show significance, it can be inferred that the gene
- 181 plays a role in the intermediate pathway, thereby substantiating the existence of the a) pathway.
- 182

183 **3 Result**

184 **3.1 SMR analyses and colocalization for Preliminary Identifying Potential Genes**

185 In our initial analyses phase, we utilized the eQTLGen dataset for SMR analyses to pinpoint genes

- 186 significantly linked to dorsopathies. Employing the FDR method set our p-value significance
- 187 threshold. The eQTLGen dataset provided extensive data, yielding 15,633 candidate genes.
- 188 We identified 269 genes significantly associated with dorsopathies (FDR_P < 0.05). Subsequent scrutiny uncovered four potential drug targets (*NLRC4, CGREF1, KHK, RNF212*) affecting
- 189 scrutiny uncovered four potential drug targets (*NLRC4*, *CGREF1*, *KHK*, *RNF212*) affecting
- 190 dorsopathies through various intersecting methods. For clarity, Manhattan plots illustrated SMR
- 191 results. Following gene identification, the HEIDI heterogeneity test (p_HEIDI > 0.05) sifted out
- 192 genes lacking horizontal pleiotropy. SMR locus plots further elucidated gene outcomes.
- 193 We proceeded with colocalization analyses to merge GWAS and blood eQTL data for genes passing
- 194 the SMR test. This aimed to determine if these genes colocalized with the dorsopathies trait. The
- 195 colocalization test results robustly supported colocalization between the trait and all four genes
- 196 (*NLRC4*: PP.H4 = 0.993, *CGREF1*: PP.H4 = 0.905, *KHK*: PP.H4 = 0.773, *RNF212*: PP.H4 = 0.923)
- 197 meeting both SMR and HEIDI test criteria. Consequently, we identify these genes as top-priority
- 198 candidates for subsequent functional studies.
- 199

200 **3.2 MR analyses Validates Potential Gene Causal Relationships**

- 201 Using cis-eQTL data from the eQTLGen Consortium, we conducted two-sample MR analyses on
- 202 European summary statistics of individuals with dorsopathies. The discovery cohort, consisting of
- 203 117,411 cases and 294,770 controls from the FinnGen cohort, underwent inverse variance weighted
- 204 (IVW) MR analyses to combine effect estimates from each genetic instrument. The analysis revealed
- 205 associations between the genetically predicted expression of 956 genes and dorsopathies risk 206 following multiple testing adjustments (FDR correction). Notably, *NLRC4* (OR = 0.886, 95%CI =
- 207 0.855-0.917, FDR_P = 1.09e-11), *CGREF1* (OR = 0.682, 95%CI = 0.585-0.794, FDR_P = 8.74e-07),
- 208 *KHK* (OR = 0.936, 95%CI = 0.921-0.951, FDR P = 3.67e-16), and *RNF212* (OR = 1.145, 95%CI =
- 209 1.056-1.241, FDR $P = 1.01e-03$) were among the genes identified. To ensure the reliability of our
- 210 findings, we conducted tests for horizontal pleiotropy, which did not reveal any evidence of its
- 211 presence in the dataset. These additional analyses confirmed the absence of horizontal pleiotropy,
- 212 bolstering the robustness and validity of our MR genetics findings.
- 213

214 **3.3 Validation**

215 **3.3.1 TWAS & UTMOST Validates Transcriptome-level Causal Relationships**

- 216 In our quest to enhance causal inference and gain deeper insights into genetic associations with
- 217 dorsopathies, we conducted a TWAS analyses on the four genes identified in previous analyses,
- 218 utilizing Fusion and UTMOST software. This comprehensive approach aimed to elucidate the
- 219 transcriptional associations of these genes with dorsopathies and bolster the evidence supporting their
- 220 potential causal role.
- 221 The results revealed significant transcriptional associations for the four genes with dorsopathies, with
- 222 all colocalization probabilities (PP.H4) exceeding 0.7. Specifically, elevated transcription levels of
- 223 *NLRC4* (Z score = -5.33068, P = 9.78E-08), *CGREF1* (Z score = -4.7644, P = 1.89E-06), and *KHK*
- 224 (Z score = -4.72939, P = 2.25E-06) were significantly correlated with a decreased risk of
- 225 dorsopathies, whereas an increased transcription level of *RNF212* (Z score = 3.751506, P =
- 226 0.000176) was significantly associated with an increased risk of dorsopathies. Notably, these TWAS
- 227 findings were consistent with those from the SMR analyses, providing robust support for the
- 228 transcriptional associations of these genes with dorsopathies.

229 **3.3.2 MAGMA Validates Genome-level Causal Relationships**

- 230 We also conducted a GWAS analyses using MAGMA software on the quartet of genes highlighted in
- 231 preceding studies. This approach aimed to illuminate the associations of these genes with
- 232 dorsopathies at the genome level, thereby reinforcing the evidence underpinning their potential causal
- 233 involvement.
- 234 Based on the MAGMA analyses, we identified 855 significant genes that passed the FDR test. The
- 235 outcomes unveiled noteworthy genome-level associations for the aforementioned genes with
- 236 dorsopathies. Specifically, heightened transcription levels of *NLRC4* (FDR_P = 0.01851868),
- 237 *CGREF1* (P = 0.002068503), and *KHK* (P = 0.009814817) exhibited significant correlations with
- 238 reduced risk of dorsopathies, whereas increased transcription levels of *RNF212* (P = 0.00202954)
- 239 were significantly linked with elevated risk of dorsopathies. Importantly, these GWAS findings
- 240 corroborated those from the SMR analyses, thereby fortifying the robustness of the transcriptional
- 241 associations of these genes with dorsopathies.
- 242

243 **3.4 Methylation analysis & Mediation analysis**

244 We evaluated the influence of *cg23387401* on *RNF212* expression (β = -0.52, P = 2.08e-14) and its 145 link to dorsopathies risk (β = 0.19, P = 1.20E-07). From these findings, we identified how gene-

245 link to dorsopathies risk ($\beta = 0.19$, P = 1.20E-07). From these findings, we identified how gene-
246 mediated methylation impacts dorsopathies risk ($\beta = -0.10$, P = 1.35E-05), with an observed over

246 mediated methylation impacts dorsopathies risk (β = -0.10, P = 1.35E-05), with an observed overall effect (β = -0.10, P = 2.68E-06) indicating a 93.79% intermediate effect proportion. This suggests 247 effect (β = -0.10, P = 2.68E-06) indicating a 93.79% intermediate effect proportion. This suggests
248 that the rise in *ce23387401* is wholly mediated by *RNF212*, leading to reduced dorsopathies risk.

248 that the rise in *cg23387401* is wholly mediated by *RNF212*, leading to reduced dorsopathies risk.

249 Likewise, we assessed *cg26638505*'s impact on *NLRC4* expression ($β = -0.81$, $P = 1.25E-09$) and its association with dorsopathies risk ($β = -0.13$, $P = 7.87E-09$). These calculations revealed the

250 association with dorsopathies risk (β = -0.13, P = 7.87E-09). These calculations revealed the influence of gene-mediated methylation sites on dorsopathies risk (β = 0.11, P = 2.87E-05), v

- 251 influence of gene-mediated methylation sites on dorsopathies risk ($\beta = 0.11$, P = 2.87E-05), with an
252 overall effect ($\beta = 0.09$, P = 1.43E-03) and an intermediate effect proportion of approximately
- 252 overall effect ($\beta = 0.09$, P = 1.43E-03) and an intermediate effect proportion of approximately
253 120.00%. This suggests that cg26638505 elevation is entirely mediated by NLRC4, reducing
- 253 120.00%. This suggests that cg26638505 elevation is entirely mediated by NLRC4, reducing
- 254 dorsopathies risk.

255 We also analyzed *cg18948125*'s effect on *NLRC4* expression (β = -0.93, P = 1.72E-08) and its association with dorsopathies risk (β = -0.13, P = 7.87E-09). From this, we derived the impact

- 256 association with dorsopathies risk (β = -0.13, P = 7.87E-09). From this, we derived the impact of gene-mediated methylation sites on dorsopathies risk (β = 0.12, P = 5.50E-05), with an overall
- 257 gene-mediated methylation sites on dorsopathies risk ($\beta = 0.12$, P = 5.50E-05), with an overall
258 effect ($\beta = 0.12$, P = 5.59E-04) and an intermediate effect proportion of 104.41%. This suggest
- 258 effect ($\beta = 0.12$, P = 5.59E-04) and an intermediate effect proportion of 104.41%. This suggests that cg18948125 elevation primarily contributes to increased dorsopathies risk, mediated by *NLRC4*.
- 259 *cg18948125* elevation primarily contributes to increased dorsopathies risk, mediated by *NLRC4*.
- 260 Similarly, *cg*22740783's influence on *CGREF1* expression ($β = 0.32$, $P = 7.71E-07$) and its association with dorsopathies risk ($β = -0.38$, $P = 2.12E-05$) was calculated. This allowed us
- 261 association with dorsopathies risk (β = -0.38, P = 2.12E-05) was calculated. This allowed us to identify the impact of gene-mediated methylation sites on dorsopathies risk (β = -0.12, P = 1.27
- 262 identify the impact of gene-mediated methylation sites on dorsopathies risk (β = -0.12, P = 1.27E-
263 03), with an overall effect (β = -0.13, P = 1.63E-04) and an intermediate effect proportion of
- 263 03), with an overall effect (β = -0.13, P = 1.63E-04) and an intermediate effect proportion of 264 92.24%. Hence, we propose that the elevation in $c g 22740783$ is fully mediated by *CGREF1*, log
- 264 92.24%. Hence, we propose that the elevation in *cg22740783* is fully mediated by *CGREF1*, leading
- 265 to decreased dorsopathies risk.

266 Lastly, we evaluated *cg06112415's* impact on *CGREF1* expression ($β = -0.34$, $P = 1.75E-06$) and its association with dorsopathies risk ($β = -0.38$, $P = 2.12E-05$). Through these assessments, we

- 267 association with dorsopathies risk (β = -0.38, P = 2.12E-05). Through these assessments, we identified the effect of gene-mediated methylation sites on dorsopathies risk (β = 0.13, P = 1.
- 268 identified the effect of gene-mediated methylation sites on dorsopathies risk ($\beta = 0.13$, P = 1.49E-
269 03), with an overall effect ($\beta = 0.12$, P = 5.59E-04) and an intermediate effect proportion of
- 269 03), with an overall effect ($\beta = 0.12$, P = 5.59E-04) and an intermediate effect proportion of 270 110.63%. This suggests that $c\varrho 06112415$ elevation primarily contributes to increased dorsonal
- 270 110.63%. This suggests that *cg06112415* elevation primarily contributes to increased dorsopathies
- 271 risk, mediated by *CGREF1*.
- 272

273 **4 Discussion**

274 This study aimed to offer new perspectives and methods for the treatment and prevention of

275 dorsopathies. In our research, the identification of candidate genes and the establishment of causal

276 inference were conducted via MR methods, while the mediation analysis was used to explore disease

- 277 related gene-mediated methylation sites. As a result, our study revealed four genes as potential
278 therapeutic targets for dorsopathies, including *NLRC4*, *CGREF1*, *KHK* and *RNF212*. Among the
- 278 therapeutic targets for dorsopathies, including *NLRC4*, *CGREF1*, *KHK* and *RNF212*. Among these
- 279 genes, elevated transcription levels of the *NLRC4*, *CGREF1* and *KHK* were significantly associated
- 280 with a decreased risk of dorsopathies, whereas a raised transcription level of *RNF212* was
- 281 significantly related a higher risk of dorsopathies.

282 In order to find the novel drug targets for dorsopathies, we employed an integrative analysis that

283 combined colocalization with MR to assess causal genes for dorsopathies. Later, we conducted tests 284 for horizontal pleiotropy to ensure the reliability of our MR genetics findings. In addition, TWAS

285 analyses on *NLRC4*, *CGREF1*, *KHK* and *RNF212* was conducted through Fusion and UTMOST

286 software, which further illuminated the transcriptional associations of these genes with dorsopathies

287 and bolstered the evidence supporting their potential causal role. Moreover, we conducted a GWAS

288 analyses whose results were consistent with those from the SMR analyses, which reinforcing the

289 evidence underpinning the potential causal association between these four genes with dorsopathies.

290 Finally, we evaluated the influence of methylation sites on those genes expression and their links to

291 dorsopathies. The results exhibited that the rise in *cg23387401* was entirely mediated by *RNF212*, the

292 elevations of *cg26638505* and *cg18948125* were primarily mediated by *NLRC4*, and the up-
293 regulation of *cg06112415* was fully mediated by *CGREF1*, leading to increased dorsopathies

293 regulation of *cg06112415* was fully mediated by *CGREF1*, leading to increased dorsopathies risk; 294 while the rise of *cg22740783* was totally mediated by *CGREF1*, resulting in decreased dorsopathies

295 risk.

296 NOD-like receptors (NLRs) family caspase activation and recruitment domain-containing protein 4
297 (NLRC4) gene encodes NLRC4, which is mainly expressed in macrophages, neutrophils, dendritic

(*NLRC4*) gene encodes NLRC4, which is mainly expressed in macrophages, neutrophils, dendritic

298 cells and glial cells[26]. As a member of the caspase recruitment domain-containing *NLR* family,

299 NLRC4 partners with NLR family of apoptosis inhibitory proteins (NAIP) to assemble

300 inflammasome complexes, which termed NAIP/NLRC4 inflammasomes[27]. Inflammasomes
301 function as intracellular multi-protein platforms that are activated by pathogen-associated mole

function as intracellular multi-protein platforms that are activated by pathogen-associated molecular

302 patterns or damage-associated molecular patterns, triggering innate immune reactions and

303 inflammatory caspase-activation to defense pathogens and danger signals and maintain the

304 homeostasis[27–29]. The activation of caspases results in the proteolytic activation of the pro-

305 inflammatory cytokines interleukin-1 β (IL-1 β) and/or interleukin-18 (IL-18)[27]. Meanwhile, activated caspase-1 also cleaves gasdermin D, whose N-terminal fragments become inserted in

activated caspase-1 also cleaves gasdermin D, whose N-terminal fragments become inserted into cell

307 membranes, thereby facilitating the release of more IL-1 β and IL-18[28,29]. In particular,
308 inflammasomes were classified into canonical inflammasomes, which activating caspase-1

inflammasomes were classified into canonical inflammasomes, which activating caspase-1, and non-

309 canonical inflammasomes, which primarily activate caspase-4 and/or caspase-5 in human cells[29].

310 Specifically, the NAIP/NLRC4 inflammasome serves as a as part of the innate immune response and 311 senses a range of intracellular bacteria and bacterial components in the host cell cytosol, such as *S.*

312 *typhimurium*, *Legionella pneumophila*, *flagellin* and components of the virulence-associated type III

313 secretion apparatus, thereby to mediate host defense against bacterial pathogens[26,27,30]. NAIP

314 proteins function as specific cytosolic receptors for a variety of bacterial protein ligands[31], while

315 NLRC4 interacts directly with caspase-1 to induce cell death, such as the pyroptosis of macrophage,

316 and to cause rapidly initiate inflammation and vascular fluid loss[26]. The localized effects of

317 NAIP/NLRC4 inflammasome could defend against bacterial pathogens. However, the aberrant

318 activity of this cluster also leads to multiple clinical manifestations, including macrophage activation

319 syndrome, neonatal enterocolitis and autoimmune disorders[28,31], and promotes the process of
320 some diseases, such as gliomas[29], premature rupture of membranes[26], ulcerative colitis[28]. some diseases, such as gliomas[29], premature rupture of membranes[26], ulcerative colitis[28],

321 rheumatoid arthritis[30] and so on. Sim et al. found that non-canonical pathway molecules of

322 NAIP/NLRC4 inflammasomes, including caspase-4, caspase-5, and N-cleaved GSDMD, were

323 significantly increased with each glioma grade[29]. Additionally, Zhu et al. reported that NLRC4 was

324 upregulated in the membranes of patients with premature rupture of fetal membranes and recruited

325 more caspase-1, which promotes the process of rupture of fetal membranes by inducing apoptosis

326 and degrading extracellular matrix[26]. The study of An et al. presented that the persistent activation

327 of NAIP/NLRC4 inflammasome induces macrophage pyroptosis mediated by caspase1-dependent

328 cleavage of GSDMD and releases proinflammatory cytokines including IL-1b and IL-18, facilitating

329 the occurrence and progression of UC[28]. In addition, research conducted by Delgado-Arévalo et al.

330 indicated that NLRC4 as an inflammasome sensor differentially upregulated in CD1c+ cDC from

331 patients with rheumatoid arthritis, and this sensor seems to be nonredundantly involved in the

332 detection of intracellular dsDNA[30]. Nevertheless, our research observed the significantly inhibitory

333 effect of up-regulated *NLRC4* expression on dorsopathies. Thus, further research on the roles and mechanisms of *NLRC4* and inflammatsome in the progress of dorsopathies is needed.

mechanisms of *NLRC4* and inflammatsome in the progress of dorsopathies is needed.

335 Cell growth regulator with EF-hand domain 1 (*CGREF1*) gene encodes a novel secretory protein 336 with 2 Ca2+-binding EF-hand domains which plays an important role in eukaryotic cellular 337 signaling[32]. *CGREF1* mRNA has high expressions in HCT116, H1299 and HepG2 cells while 338 expressing at low levels in other cell lines including Raji, Jurkat, BT325, PC12[32]. Mechanistically, 339 *CGREF1* is regulated by p53[33], and the overexpression of *CGREF1* significantly inhibits the 340 transcriptional activity of AP-1, reduces the phosphorylation of ERK (extracellular signal-regulated 341 kinases) and p38 MAPK (mitogen-activated protein kinases), and suppresses the proliferation of 342 HEK293T and HCT116 cells[32]. Furthermore, *CGREF1* can decrease the percent of G2/M and S 343 phase and repress cell proliferation while overexpressing[32]. We found that the increased expression
344 of *CGREF1* is significantly related to the decreased risk of dorsopathies. In the research of Xiang et 344 of *CGREF1* is significantly related to the decreased risk of dorsopathies. In the research of Xiang et 345 al., the colorectal cancer patients with higher expression of *CGREF1* were found to have significantly 346 better overall survival than patients with lower expression, and the role of *CGREF1* in the prognosis 347 of Early-onset colorectal cancer was reported[33]. Furthermore, Xie et al. observed that *CGREF1* 348 expression were high in the tissue of osteosarcoma patients while it were lowly expressed in normal 349 tissue, and speculated that *CGREF1* can predict drug resistance to osteosarcoma[34]. However, the 350 biological function of *CGREF1* is poorly explored, and further study for its mechanisms and roles in 351 these diseases is warranted.

352 Ketohexokinase (*KHK*) is an enzyme that phosphorylates fructose to produce fructose-1-phosphate

353 (F-1-P) at the first rate-limiting step in fructose metabolism[35,36]. The gene *KHK* encodes two

354 isoforms, KHK-C and KHK-A. Considered as the primary enzyme in fructose metabolism, KHK-C is

355 exclusively expressed in a few tissues, especially in the liver, and drives the aforementioned reaction

356 rapidly, resulting in the accumulation of uric acid and transient depletion of intracellular phosphate

357 and ATP[35–38]. In the contrary, KHK-A has a much weaker affinity and a higher Michaelis

358 constant for fructose[38]. However, KHK-A can directly phosphorylate phosphoribosyl
359 vrophosphate synthetase 1 (PRPS1) by prevention of inhibitory nucleotide binding and

pyrophosphate synthetase 1 (PRPS1) by prevention of inhibitory nucleotide binding and facilitation

360 of ATP binding[37]. As a result, KHK-A improves nucleic acid synthesis and promotes the G1/S

361 phase transition in the cell cycle, accelerating cell proliferation[36,38].

362 Recent studies have highlighted the importance of *KHK* as the key mechanism stimulating the

363 various adverse metabolic effects of fructose, such as impaired insulin sensitivity,

364 hypertriglyceridemia, and oxidative stress[35]. In addition, fructose metabolism seems to provide

365 cancer cells with the supplementary fuel required for proliferation and metastasis in colon cancer, and

366 glioma[36,38]. Moreover, alternated expression of *KHK* is also related to several diseases. For

367 instance, knocked down the expression of *KHK* dramatically reduced fructose-induced production of

368 reactive oxidative species (ROS) in proximal tubular cells[35], indicating the association between

369 KHK and ROS. Furthermore, KHK-A activates and upregulates PRPS1, which could lead to

370 enhanced nucleic acid synthesis for tumourigenesis[38]. Kim et al. reported that most cancer cell

371 lines predominantly expressed KHK-A rather than KHK-C, and KHK-A overexpression could

372 augment cell invasion[36]. Moreover, in their study, upon fructose stimulation, KHK-A acted as a 373 nuclear protein kinase and triggered Epithelial-mesenchymal transition in breast cancer, promoting

374 breast cancer metastasis[36]. Besides, loss-of-function variants in *KHK* can cause essential

375 fructosuria, an autosomal recessive disease characterized by intermittent appearance of fructose in the

- 376 urine[39]. Yang et al. found the the overexpression of KHK-A in cell lines of oesophageal squamous
- 377 cell carcinoma, which may finally promote the proliferation, tumourigenicity and motility of ESCC
- 378 cells[38]. Similarly, KHK-A was considered to play an instrumental role in promoting de novo
- 379 nucleic acid synthesis and hepatocellular carcinoma development[37]. In our study, the raised 380 expression of *KHK* is found to be positively related to decreased risk of dorsopathies. In oder to
- 381 understand the mechanism of changed expression level of *KHK* in dorsopathies, further research are
- 382 needed.

383 Regulatory factor X2 (*RFX2*) gene is essential for maintaining normal spermatogenesis and involved 384 in spermatogenesis impairment and male infertility in mice[40]. In particular, Ring finger protein 212 385 (*RNF212*) gene is important for crossing over and chiasma formation during meiosis[41]. Mouse 386 *Rnf212* has a central role in designating crossover sites and coupling chromosome synapsis to the 387 formation of crossover-specific recombination complexes. In humans, *RNF212* has been associated 388 with variation in the genome-wide recombination rate[41]. The protein encoded by *RNF212* has 389 homology to two meiotic procrossover factors: Zip3 and ZHP-3[42]. It functions to couple
390 chromosome synapsis to the formation of crossover-specific recombination complexes[43]. 390 chromosome synapsis to the formation of crossover-specific recombination complexes[43]. 391 Moreover, with the symbolic RING-finger domains, *RNF212* protein is a RING-family E3-ligase for 392 Small ubiquitin-like protein (SUMO), and the latter plays an important role in assembly and 393 disassembly of synaptonemal complex by regulating protein–protein inter action during
394 meiosis^[42,43,43]. In addition, *RNF212* stabilizes association of a subset of MutSy com 394 meiosis[42,43,43]. In addition, *RNF212* stabilizes association of a subset of MutSγ complexes with 395 recombination sites[42,44]. MutSγ complex is a kind of meiosis-specific recombination factors,
396 working as an attractive target for non-crossover/crossover differentiation[42]. It binds and stabi working as an attractive target for non-crossover/crossover differentiation[42]. It binds and stabilizes 397 DNA strand-exchange intermediates to promote both homolog synapsis and crossingover[44]. In 398 mammals, every pair of chromosomes obtains at least one crossover, while the majority of 399 recombination sites yield non-crossovers. Non-crossovers are inferred to arise from the disassembly 400 of D-loops and annealing of DNA double-strand breaks ends in a process termed synthesis dependent 401 strand annealing[42]. Designation of crossovers involves the formation of metastable joint molecules 402 and selective localization of SUMO-ligase *RNF212* to a minority of recombination sites where it 403 stabilizes pertinent factors, such as MutSγ[42,44]. Furthermore, this differential *RNF212*-dependent stabilization of key recombination proteins at precrossover sites is thought to be the basic feature of 405 crossover/non-crossover differentiation[42]. It is suggested that *RNF212*-mediated SUMOylation 406 may stabilizes the association of MutS γ with nascent crossover CO intermediates in a number of 407 wavs, such as promoting protein-protein interactions, altering ATP binding and hydrolysis (which ways, such as promoting protein-protein interactions, altering ATP binding and hydrolysis (which 408 modulate the binding and dissociation of MutSγ complexes) or antagonizing ubiquitin-dependent protein turnover[41,42]. protein turnover[41,42].

410 Insufficient RNF212 accumulating at recombination sites can lead to crossing-over stochastically 411 fails[43]. Fujiwara et al. reported that *Rnf212* knock out (KO) in mice leads to infertility of male and 412 female due to the loss of SPCs(spermatocytes) at post-anaphase stage. Moreover, crossing over is 413 diminished by ≥90% in *Rnf212*−/− mice[43]. In particular, the *Rnf212* KO spermatocytes lack 414 chiasmata and exhibit depletion of spermatids and mature spermatozoa[41]. A nonsense mutation in 415 the *Rnf212* gene was discovered in repro57 mutant mice, and this mutant mice exhibited male 416 infertility, arrest of spermatogenesis in meiosis, and defects in cytological markers of recombination 417 and chiasma formation, which is similar to the *Rnf212* KO phenotype[41]. In humans, the rate of 418 crossing-over varies significantly between individuals, and higher maternal crossover rates have been 419 associated with greater fecundity[42]. However, in the absence of RNF212, designation of crossover 420 sites fails because no MutSγ complexes are stabilized beyond early pachynema[44]. Yu et al.
421 detected that the frequencies of allele C and the genotype CC at the $rs4045481$ locus in RNF2 421 detected that the frequencies of allele C and the genotype CC at the *rs4045481* locus in *RNF212* gene

- 422 were significantly higher in patients with azoospermia in comparison with controls. Furthermore,
- 423 they reported that homozygous of allele C (genotype CC) may decrease the activity of pre-mRNA
- 424 due to the disappearance of the binding motifs of SRSF5, leading to the reduced expression of
- 425 *RNF212* and influencing normal spermatogenesis, consequently increasing ther risk of
- 426 azoospermia[40]. Nevertheless, we found that the increased expression of *RNF212* exhibited a
- 427 positive correlation with dorsopathies. The influence of raised expression of *RNF212* is poor
- 428 classified, and further researches are required to illustrate the mechanism of increased *RNF212* level
- 429 and dorsopathies.

430 To summary, our study revealed the causal associations between the genetically predicted expression

- 431 of four genes (*NLRC4*, *CGREF1*, *KHK* and *RNF212*) and dorsopathies risk, which offers new
- 432 perspectives and strategies for the improved diagnosis, treatment and prevention of dorsopathies.
- 433 Based on our results, we hypothesized that increased expression level of *NLRC4*, *CGREF1* and *KHK*
- 434 are associated with decreased risk of dorsopathies, while the increased expression level of *RNF212*
- 435 has the opposite effect. Moreover, further study focusing on the mechanism of these expression
- 436 changes in dorsopathies are needed, and future clinical studies should be conducted.
- 437

438 **5 Acknowledgements**

- 439 The authors appreciate the publicly available data of the FinnGen consortium, the eQTLGen 440 consortium, the GTEx project, and the MRC IEU OpenGWAS database.
- 441

442 **6 Conflict of interest**

- 443 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial 444 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.
- 445

446 **7 Funding**

- 447 The study and publishing of this article were not supported by any funding.
- 448

449 **8 Reference**

450 [1] L.B. Connelly, A. Woolf, P. Brooks, Cost-Effectiveness of Interventions for Musculoskeletal 451 Conditions, in: D.T. Jamison, J.G. Breman, A.R. Measham, G. Alleyne, M. Claeson, D.B. 452 Evans, P. Jha, A. Mills, P. Musgrove (Eds.), Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries, 453 2nd ed., The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 454 Washington (DC), 2006. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK11713/ (accessed April 30, 455 2024).

- 456 [2] L. March, E.U.R. Smith, D.G. Hoy, M.J. Cross, L. Sanchez-Riera, F. Blyth, R. Buchbinder, T. 457 Vos, A.D. Woolf, Burden of disability due to musculoskeletal (MSK) disorders, Best Pract Res 458 Clin Rheumatol 28 (2014) 353–366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.berh.2014.08.002.
- 459 [3] R. Shiri, J. Karppinen, P. Leino-Arjas, S. Solovieva, E. Viikari-Juntura, The association 460 between smoking and low back pain: a meta-analysis, Am J Med 123 (2010) 87.e7–35. 461 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2009.05.028.
- 462 [4] R. Shiri, J. Karppinen, P. Leino-Arjas, S. Solovieva, E. Viikari-Juntura, The association 463 between obesity and low back pain: a meta-analysis, Am J Epidemiol 171 (2010) 135–154. 464 https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwp356.
- 465 [5] A. Koyanagi, A. Stickley, N. Garin, M. Miret, J.L. Ayuso-Mateos, M. Leonardi, S. Koskinen, 466 A. Galas, J.M. Haro, The association between obesity and back pain in nine countries: a cross-467 sectional study, BMC Public Health 15 (2015) 123. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1362-9.
- 468 [6] M. Smuck, M.-C.J. Kao, N. Brar, A. Martinez-Ith, J. Choi, C.C. Tomkins-Lane, Does physical 469 activity influence the relationship between low back pain and obesity?, Spine J 14 (2014) 209– 470 216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2013.11.010.
- 471 [7] T.W. Strine, J.M. Hootman, US national prevalence and correlates of low back and neck pain 472 among adults, Arthritis Rheum 57 (2007) 656–665. https://doi.org/10.1002/art.22684.
- 473 [8] M. Scherer, H. Hansen, J. Gensichen, K. Mergenthal, S. Riedel-Heller, S. Weyerer, W. Maier, 474 A. Fuchs, H. Bickel, G. Schön, B. Wiese, H.-H. König, H. van den Bussche, I. Schäfer, 475 Association between multimorbidity patterns and chronic pain in elderly primary care patients: 476 a cross-sectional observational study, BMC Fam Pract 17 (2016) 68. 477 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-016-0468-1.
- 478 [9] G. Davey Smith, G. Hemani, Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal inference in
479 epidemiological studies. Human Molecular Genetics 23 (2014) R89-98. 479 epidemiological studies, Human Molecular Genetics 23 (2014) R89-98. 480 https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddu328.
- 481 [10] M.K. Georgakis, D. Gill, Mendelian Randomization Studies in Stroke: Exploration of Risk 482 Factors and Drug Targets With Human Genetic Data, Stroke 52 (2021) 2992–3003. 483 https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.032617.
- 484 [11] M.V. Holmes, M. Ala-Korpela, G.D. Smith, Mendelian randomization in cardiometabolic 485 disease: challenges in evaluating causality, Nature Reviews. Cardiology 14 (2017) 577–590. 486 https://doi.org/10.1038/nrcardio.2017.78.
- 487 [12] Y. Chen, X. Xu, L. Wang, K. Li, Y. Sun, L. Xiao, J. Dai, M. Huang, Y. Wang, D.W. Wang, 488 Genetic insights into therapeutic targets for aortic aneurysms: A Mendelian randomization 489 study, eBioMedicine 83 (2022) 104199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.104199.
- 490 [13] J. Lin, J. Zhou, Y. Xu, Potential drug targets for multiple sclerosis identified through Mendelian randomization analysis. Brain 146 (2023) 3364–3372. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awad070. 491 randomization analysis, Brain 146 (2023) 3364–3372. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awad070.

- 492 [14] Y. Wang, F. Liu, L. Sun, Y. Jia, P. Yang, D. Guo, M. Shi, A. Wang, G.-C. Chen, Y. Zhang, Z. 493 Zhu, Association between human blood metabolome and the risk of breast cancer, Breast 494 Cancer Res 25 (2023) 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13058-023-01609-4.
- 495 [15] S. Shah, A. Henry, C. Roselli, H. Lin, G. Sveinbjörnsson, G. Fatemifar, Å.K. Hedman, J.B. 496 Wilk, M.P. Morley, M.D. Chaffin, A. Helgadottir, N. Verweij, A. Dehghan, P. Almgren, C. 497 Andersson, K.G. Aragam, J. Ärnlöv, J.D. Backman, M.L. Biggs, H.L. Bloom, J. Brandimarto, 498 M.R. Brown, L. Buckbinder, D.J. Carey, D.I. Chasman, X. Chen, X. Chen, J. Chung, W. 499 Chutkow, J.P. Cook, G.E. Delgado, S. Denaxas, A.S. Doney, M. Dörr, S.C. Dudley, M.E. Dunn, 500 G. Engström, T. Esko, S.B. Felix, C. Finan, I. Ford, M. Ghanbari, S. Ghasemi, V. Giedraitis, F. 501 Giulianini, J.S. Gottdiener, S. Gross, D.F. Guðbjartsson, R. Gutmann, C.M. Haggerty, P. van 502 der Harst, C.L. Hyde, E. Ingelsson, J.W. Jukema, M. Kavousi, K.-T. Khaw, M.E. Kleber, L. 503 Køber, A. Koekemoer, C. Langenberg, L. Lind, C.M. Lindgren, B. London, L.A. Lotta, R.C. 504 Lovering, J. Luan, P. Magnusson, A. Mahajan, K.B. Margulies, W. März, O. Melander, I.R. 505 Mordi, T. Morgan, A.D. Morris, A.P. Morris, A.C. Morrison, M.W. Nagle, C.P. Nelson, A. 506 Niessner, T. Niiranen, M.L. O'Donoghue, A.T. Owens, C.N.A. Palmer, H.M. Parry, M. Perola, 507 E. Portilla-Fernandez, B.M. Psaty, Regeneron Genetics Center, K.M. Rice, P.M. Ridker, S.P.R. 508 Romaine, J.I. Rotter, P. Salo, V. Salomaa, J. van Setten, A.A. Shalaby, D.T. Smelser, N.L. 509 Smith, S. Stender, D.J. Stott, P. Svensson, M.-L. Tammesoo, K.D. Taylor, M. Teder-Laving, A. 510 Teumer, G. Thorgeirsson, U. Thorsteinsdottir, C. Torp-Pedersen, S. Trompet, B. Tyl, A.G. 511 Uitterlinden, A. Veluchamy, U. Völker, A.A. Voors, X. Wang, N.J. Wareham, D. Waterworth, 512 P.E. Weeke, R. Weiss, K.L. Wiggins, H. Xing, L.M. Yerges-Armstrong, B. Yu, F. Zannad, J.H. 513 Zhao, H. Hemingway, N.J. Samani, J.J.V. McMurray, J. Yang, P.M. Visscher, C. Newton-Cheh, 514 A. Malarstig, H. Holm, S.A. Lubitz, N. Sattar, M.V. Holmes, T.P. Cappola, F.W. Asselbergs, 515 A.D. Hingorani, K. Kuchenbaecker, P.T. Ellinor, C.C. Lang, K. Stefansson, J.G. Smith, R.S. 516 Vasan, D.I. Swerdlow, R.T. Lumbers, Genome-wide association and Mendelian randomisation 517 analysis provide insights into the pathogenesis of heart failure, Nature Communications 11 518 (2020) 163. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13690-5.
- 519 [16] M.I. Kurki, J. Karjalainen, P. Palta, T.P. Sipilä, K. Kristiansson, K.M. Donner, M.P. Reeve, H. 520 Laivuori, M. Aavikko, M.A. Kaunisto, A. Loukola, E. Lahtela, H. Mattsson, P. Laiho, P. Della 521 Briotta Parolo, A.A. Lehisto, M. Kanai, N. Mars, J. Rämö, T. Kiiskinen, H.O. Heyne, K. 522 Veerapen, S. Rüeger, S. Lemmelä, W. Zhou, S. Ruotsalainen, K. Pärn, T. Hiekkalinna, S. 523 Koskelainen, T. Paajanen, V. Llorens, J. Gracia-Tabuenca, H. Siirtola, K. Reis, A.G. Elnahas, 524 B. Sun, C.N. Foley, K. Aalto-Setälä, K. Alasoo, M. Arvas, K. Auro, S. Biswas, A. Bizaki-525 Vallaskangas, O. Carpen, C.-Y. Chen, O.A. Dada, Z. Ding, M.G. Ehm, K. Eklund, M. Färkkilä, 526 H. Finucane, A. Ganna, A. Ghazal, R.R. Graham, E.M. Green, A. Hakanen, M. Hautalahti, Å.K. 527 Hedman, M. Hiltunen, R. Hinttala, I. Hovatta, X. Hu, A. Huertas-Vazquez, L. Huilaja, J. 528 Hunkapiller, H. Jacob, J.-N. Jensen, H. Joensuu, S. John, V. Julkunen, M. Jung, J. Junttila, K. 529 Kaarniranta, M. Kähönen, R. Kajanne, L. Kallio, R. Kälviäinen, J. Kaprio, FinnGen, N. 530 Kerimov, J. Kettunen, E. Kilpeläinen, T. Kilpi, K. Klinger, V.-M. Kosma, T. Kuopio, V. Kurra, 531 T. Laisk, J. Laukkanen, N. Lawless, A. Liu, S. Longerich, R. Mägi, J. Mäkelä, A. Mäkitie, A. 532 Malarstig, A. Mannermaa, J. Maranville, A. Matakidou, T. Meretoja, S.V. Mozaffari, M.E.K. 533 Niemi, M. Niemi, T. Niiranen, C.J. O Donnell, M.E. Obeidat, G. Okafo, H.M. Ollila, A. 534 Palomäki, T. Palotie, J. Partanen, D.S. Paul, M. Pelkonen, R.K. Pendergrass, S. Petrovski, A. 535 Pitkäranta, A. Platt, D. Pulford, E. Punkka, P. Pussinen, N. Raghavan, F. Rahimov, D. Rajpal, 536 N.A. Renaud, B. Riley-Gillis, R. Rodosthenous, E. Saarentaus, A. Salminen, E. Salminen, V. 537 Salomaa, J. Schleutker, R. Serpi, H.-Y. Shen, R. Siegel, K. Silander, S. Siltanen, S. Soini, H. 538 Soininen, J.H. Sul, I. Tachmazidou, K. Tasanen, P. Tienari, S. Toppila-Salmi, T. Tukiainen, T.

539 Tuomi, J.A. Turunen, J.C. Ulirsch, F. Vaura, P. Virolainen, J. Waring, D. Waterworth, R. Yang, 540 M. Nelis, A. Reigo, A. Metspalu, L. Milani, T. Esko, C. Fox, A.S. Havulinna, M. Perola, S. 541 Ripatti, A. Jalanko, T. Laitinen, T.P. Mäkelä, R. Plenge, M. McCarthy, H. Runz, M.J. Daly, A. 542 Palotie, FinnGen provides genetic insights from a well-phenotyped isolated population, Nature 543 613 (2023) 508–518. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05473-8.

- 544 [17] U. Võsa, A. Claringbould, H.-J. Westra, M.J. Bonder, P. Deelen, B. Zeng, H. Kirsten, A. Saha, 545 R. Kreuzhuber, S. Yazar, H. Brugge, R. Oelen, D.H. de Vries, M.G.P. van der Wijst, S. Kasela, 546 N. Pervjakova, I. Alves, M.-J. Favé, M. Agbessi, M.W. Christiansen, R. Jansen, I. Seppälä, L. 547 Tong, A. Teumer, K. Schramm, G. Hemani, J. Verlouw, H. Yaghootkar, R. Sönmez Flitman, A. 548 Brown, V. Kukushkina, A. Kalnapenkis, S. Rüeger, E. Porcu, J. Kronberg, J. Kettunen, B. Lee, 549 F. Zhang, T. Qi, J.A. Hernandez, W. Arindrarto, F. Beutner, BIOS Consortium, i2QTL 550 Consortium, J. Dmitrieva, M. Elansary, B.P. Fairfax, M. Georges, B.T. Heijmans, A.W. Hewitt, 551 M. Kähönen, Y. Kim, J.C. Knight, P. Kovacs, K. Krohn, S. Li, M. Loeffler, U.M. Marigorta, H. 552 Mei, Y. Momozawa, M. Müller-Nurasyid, M. Nauck, M.G. Nivard, B.W.J.H. Penninx, J.K. 553 Pritchard, O.T. Raitakari, O. Rotzschke, E.P. Slagboom, C.D.A. Stehouwer, M. Stumvoll, P. 554 Sullivan, P.A.C. 't Hoen, J. Thiery, A. Tönjes, J. van Dongen, M. van Iterson, J.H. Veldink, U. 555 Völker, R. Warmerdam, C. Wijmenga, M. Swertz, A. Andiappan, G.W. Montgomery, S. 556 Ripatti, M. Perola, Z. Kutalik, E. Dermitzakis, S. Bergmann, T. Frayling, J. van Meurs, H. 557 Prokisch, H. Ahsan, B.L. Pierce, T. Lehtimäki, D.I. Boomsma, B.M. Psaty, S.A. Gharib, P. 558 Awadalla, L. Milani, W.H. Ouwehand, K. Downes, O. Stegle, A. Battle, P.M. Visscher, J. 559 Yang, M. Scholz, J. Powell, G. Gibson, T. Esko, L. Franke, Large-scale cis- and trans-eQTL 560 analyses identify thousands of genetic loci and polygenic scores that regulate blood gene 561 expression, Nature Genetics 53 (2021) 1300–1310. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-021-00913- 562 z.
- 563 [18] GTEx Consortium, The GTEx Consortium atlas of genetic regulatory effects across human 564 tissues, Science (New York, N.Y.) 369 (2020) 1318–1330. 565 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz1776.
- 566 [19] Z. Z, Z. F, H. H, B. A, R. Mr, P. Je, M. Gw, G. Me, W. Nr, V. Pm, Y. J, Integration of summary 567 data from GWAS and eQTL studies predicts complex trait gene targets, Nature Genetics 48 568 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3538.
- 569 [20] C.A. de Leeuw, J.M. Mooij, T. Heskes, D. Posthuma, MAGMA: generalized gene-set analysis 570 of GWAS data, PLoS Comput Biol 11 (2015) e1004219. 571 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004219.
- 572 [21] The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium, Corresponding authors, A. Auton, G.R. Abecasis, 573 Steering committee, D.M. Altshuler, R.M. Durbin, G.R. Abecasis, D.R. Bentley, A. 574 Chakravarti, A.G. Clark, P. Donnelly, E.E. Eichler, P. Flicek, S.B. Gabriel, R.A. Gibbs, E.D. 575 Green, M.E. Hurles, B.M. Knoppers, J.O. Korbel, E.S. Lander, C. Lee, H. Lehrach, E.R. 576 Mardis, G.T. Marth, G.A. McVean, D.A. Nickerson, J.P. Schmidt, S.T. Sherry, J. Wang, R.K. 577 Wilson, Production group, Baylor College of Medicine, R.A. Gibbs, E. Boerwinkle, H. 578 Doddapaneni, Y. Han, V. Korchina, C. Kovar, S. Lee, D. Muzny, J.G. Reid, Y. Zhu, BGI-579 Shenzhen, J. Wang, Y. Chang, Q. Feng, X. Fang, X. Guo, M. Jian, H. Jiang, X. Jin, T. Lan, G. 580 Li, J. Li, Y. Li, S. Liu, X. Liu, Y. Lu, X. Ma, M. Tang, B. Wang, G. Wang, H. Wu, R. Wu, X. 581 Xu, Y. Yin, D. Zhang, W. Zhang, J. Zhao, M. Zhao, X. Zheng, Broad Institute of MIT and

583 Research, N. Gharani, L.H. Toji, N.P. Gerry, A.M. Resch, European Molecular Biology 584 Laboratory, European Bioinformatics Institute, P. Flicek, J. Barker, L. Clarke, L. Gil, S.E. Hunt, 585 G. Kelman, E. Kulesha, R. Leinonen, W.M. McLaren, R. Radhakrishnan, A. Roa, D. Smirnov, 586 R.E. Smith, I. Streeter, A. Thormann, I. Toneva, B. Vaughan, X. Zheng-Bradley, Illumina, D.R. 587 Bentley, R. Grocock, S. Humphray, T. James, Z. Kingsbury, Max Planck Institute for Molecular 588 Genetics, H. Lehrach, R. Sudbrak, M.W. Albrecht, V.S. Amstislavskiy, T.A. Borodina, M. 589 Lienhard, F. Mertes, M. Sultan, B. Timmermann, M.-L. Yaspo, McDonnell Genome Institute at 590 Washington University, E.R. Mardis, R.K. Wilson, L. Fulton, R. Fulton, US National Institutes 591 of Health, S.T. Sherry, V. Ananiev, Z. Belaia, D. Beloslyudtsev, N. Bouk, C. Chen, D. Church, 592 R. Cohen, C. Cook, J. Garner, T. Hefferon, M. Kimelman, C. Liu, J. Lopez, P. Meric, C. 593 O'Sullivan, Y. Ostapchuk, L. Phan, S. Ponomarov, V. Schneider, E. Shekhtman, K. Sirotkin, D. 594 Slotta, H. Zhang, University of Oxford, G.A. McVean, Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, R.M. 595 Durbin, S. Balasubramaniam, J. Burton, P. Danecek, T.M. Keane, A. Kolb-Kokocinski, S. 596 McCarthy, J. Stalker, M. Quail, Analysis group, Affymetrix, J.P. Schmidt, C.J. Davies, J. 597 Gollub, T. Webster, B. Wong, Y. Zhan, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, A. Auton, C.L. 598 Campbell, Y. Kong, A. Marcketta, Baylor College of Medicine, R.A. Gibbs, F. Yu, L. Antunes, 599 M. Bainbridge, D. Muzny, A. Sabo, Z. Huang, BGI-Shenzhen, J. Wang, L.J.M. Coin, L. Fang, 600 X. Guo, X. Jin, G. Li, Q. Li, Y. Li, Z. Li, H. Lin, B. Liu, R. Luo, H. Shao, Y. Xie, C. Ye, C. Yu, 601 F. Zhang, H. Zheng, H. Zhu, Bilkent University, C. Alkan, E. Dal, F. Kahveci, Boston College, 602 G.T. Marth, E.P. Garrison, D. Kural, W.-P. Lee, W. Fung Leong, M. Stromberg, A.N. Ward, J. 603 Wu, M. Zhang, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, M.J. Daly, M.A. DePristo, R.E. Handsaker, 604 D.M. Altshuler, E. Banks, G. Bhatia, G. Del Angel, S.B. Gabriel, G. Genovese, N. Gupta, H. Li, 605 S. Kashin, E.S. Lander, S.A. McCarroll, J.C. Nemesh, R.E. Poplin, Cold Spring Harbor 606 Laboratory, S.C. Yoon, J. Lihm, V. Makarov, Cornell University, A.G. Clark, S. Gottipati, A. 607 Keinan, J.L. Rodriguez-Flores, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, J.O. Korbel, T. 608 Rausch, M.H. Fritz, A.M. Stütz, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, European 609 Bioinformatics Institute, P. Flicek, K. Beal, L. Clarke, A. Datta, J. Herrero, W.M. McLaren, 610 G.R.S. Ritchie, R.E. Smith, D. Zerbino, X. Zheng-Bradley, Harvard University, P.C. Sabeti, I. 611 Shlyakhter, S.F. Schaffner, J. Vitti, Human Gene Mutation Database, D.N. Cooper, E.V. Ball, 612 P.D. Stenson, Illumina, D.R. Bentley, B. Barnes, M. Bauer, R. Keira Cheetham, A. Cox, M. 613 Eberle, S. Humphray, S. Kahn, L. Murray, J. Peden, R. Shaw, Icahn School of Medicine at 614 Mount Sinai, E.E. Kenny, Louisiana State University, M.A. Batzer, M.K. Konkel, J.A. Walker, 615 Massachusetts General Hospital, D.G. MacArthur, M. Lek, Max Planck Institute for Molecular 616 Genetics, R. Sudbrak, V.S. Amstislavskiy, R. Herwig, McDonnell Genome Institute at 617 Washington University, E.R. Mardis, L. Ding, D.C. Koboldt, D. Larson, K. Ye, McGill 618 University, S. Gravel, National Eye Institute, NIH, A. Swaroop, E. Chew, New York Genome 619 Center, T. Lappalainen, Y. Erlich, M. Gymrek, T. Frederick Willems, Ontario Institute for 620 Cancer Research, J.T. Simpson, Pennsylvania State University, M.D. Shriver, Rutgers Cancer 621 Institute of New Jersey, J.A. Rosenfeld, Stanford University, C.D. Bustamante, S.B. 622 Montgomery, F.M. De La Vega, J.K. Byrnes, A.W. Carroll, M.K. DeGorter, P. Lacroute, B.K. 623 Maples, A.R. Martin, A. Moreno-Estrada, S.S. Shringarpure, F. Zakharia, Tel-Aviv University, 624 E. Halperin, Y. Baran, The Jackson Laboratory for Genomic Medicine, C. Lee, E. Cerveira, J. 625 Hwang, A. Malhotra, D. Plewczynski, K. Radew, M. Romanovitch, C. Zhang, Thermo Fisher 626 Scientific, F.C.L. Hyland, Translational Genomics Research Institute, D.W. Craig, A. 627 Christoforides, N. Homer, T. Izatt, A.A. Kurdoglu, S.A. Sinari, K. Squire, US National 628 Institutes of Health, S.T. Sherry, C. Xiao, University of California, San Diego, J. Sebat, D. 629 Antaki, M. Gujral, A. Noor, K. Ye, University of California, San Francisco, E.G. Burchard, 630 R.D. Hernandez, C.R. Gignoux, University of California, Santa Cruz, D. Haussler, S.J. 631 Katzman, W. James Kent, University of Chicago, B. Howie, University College London, A.

632 Ruiz-Linares, University of Geneva, E.T. Dermitzakis, University of Maryland School of 633 Medicine, S.E. Devine, University of Michigan, G.R. Abecasis, H. Min Kang, J.M. Kidd, T. 634 Blackwell, S. Caron, W. Chen, S. Emery, L. Fritsche, C. Fuchsberger, G. Jun, B. Li, R. Lyons, 635 C. Scheller, C. Sidore, S. Song, E. Sliwerska, D. Taliun, A. Tan, R. Welch, M. Kate Wing, X. 636 Zhan, University of Montréal, P. Awadalla, A. Hodgkinson, University of North Carolina at 637 Chapel Hill, Y. Li, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, X. Shi, A. Quitadamo, University 638 of Oxford, G. Lunter, G.A. McVean, J.L. Marchini, S. Myers, C. Churchhouse, O. Delaneau, A. 639 Gupta-Hinch, W. Kretzschmar, Z. Iqbal, I. Mathieson, A. Menelaou, A. Rimmer, D.K. Xifara, 640 University of Puerto Rico, T.K. Oleksyk, University of Texas Health Sciences Center at 641 Houston, Y. Fu, X. Liu, M. Xiong, University of Utah, L. Jorde, D. Witherspoon, J. Xing, 642 University of Washington, E.E. Eichler, B.L. Browning, S.R. Browning, F. Hormozdiari, P.H. 643 Sudmant, Weill Cornell Medical College, E. Khurana, Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, R.M. 644 Durbin, M.E. Hurles, C. Tyler-Smith, C.A. Albers, Q. Ayub, S. Balasubramaniam, Y. Chen, V. 645 Colonna, P. Danecek, L. Jostins, T.M. Keane, S. McCarthy, K. Walter, Y. Xue, Yale University, 646 M.B. Gerstein, A. Abyzov, S. Balasubramanian, J. Chen, D. Clarke, Y. Fu, A.O. Harmanci, M. 647 Jin, D. Lee, J. Liu, X. Jasmine Mu, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Structural variation group, BGI-648 Shenzhen, Y. Li, R. Luo, H. Zhu, Bilkent University, C. Alkan, E. Dal, F. Kahveci, Boston 649 College, G.T. Marth, E.P. Garrison, D. Kural, W.-P. Lee, A.N. Ward, J. Wu, M. Zhang, Broad 650 Institute of MIT and Harvard, S.A. McCarroll, R.E. Handsaker, D.M. Altshuler, E. Banks, G. 651 Del Angel, G. Genovese, C. Hartl, H. Li, S. Kashin, J.C. Nemesh, K. Shakir, Cold Spring 652 Harbor Laboratory, S.C. Yoon, J. Lihm, V. Makarov, Cornell University, J. Degenhardt, 653 European Molecular Biology Laboratory, J.O. Korbel, M.H. Fritz, S. Meiers, B. Raeder, T. 654 Rausch, A.M. Stütz, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, European Bioinformatics 655 Institute, P. Flicek, F. Paolo Casale, L. Clarke, R.E. Smith, O. Stegle, X. Zheng-Bradley, 656 Illumina, D.R. Bentley, B. Barnes, R. Keira Cheetham, M. Eberle, S. Humphray, S. Kahn, L. 657 Murray, R. Shaw, Leiden University Medical Center, E.-W. Lameijer, Louisiana State 658 University, M.A. Batzer, M.K. Konkel, J.A. Walker, McDonnell Genome Institute at 659 Washington University, L. Ding, I. Hall, K. Ye, Stanford University, P. Lacroute, The Jackson 660 Laboratory for Genomic Medicine, C. Lee, E. Cerveira, A. Malhotra, J. Hwang, D. 661 Plewczynski, K. Radew, M. Romanovitch, C. Zhang, Translational Genomics Research 662 Institute, D.W. Craig, N. Homer, US National Institutes of Health, D. Church, C. Xiao, 663 University of California, San Diego, J. Sebat, D. Antaki, V. Bafna, J. Michaelson, K. Ye, 664 University of Maryland School of Medicine, S.E. Devine, E.J. Gardner, University of Michigan, 665 G.R. Abecasis, J.M. Kidd, R.E. Mills, G. Dayama, S. Emery, G. Jun, University of North 666 Carolina at Charlotte, X. Shi, A. Quitadamo, University of Oxford, G. Lunter, G.A. McVean, 667 University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, K. Chen, X. Fan, Z. Chong, T. Chen, 668 University of Utah, D. Witherspoon, J. Xing, University of Washington, E.E. Eichler, M.J. 669 Chaisson, F. Hormozdiari, J. Huddleston, M. Malig, B.J. Nelson, P.H. Sudmant, Vanderbilt 670 University School of Medicine, N.F. Parrish, Weill Cornell Medical College, E. Khurana, 671 Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, M.E. Hurles, B. Blackburne, S.J. Lindsay, Z. Ning, K. Walter, 672 Y. Zhang, Yale University, M.B. Gerstein, A. Abyzov, J. Chen, D. Clarke, H. Lam, X. Jasmine 673 Mu, C. Sisu, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Exome group, Baylor College of Medicine, R.A. Gibbs, F. 674 Yu, M. Bainbridge, D. Challis, U.S. Evani, C. Kovar, J. Lu, D. Muzny, U. Nagaswamy, J.G. 675 Reid, A. Sabo, J. Yu, BGI-Shenzhen, X. Guo, W. Li, Y. Li, R. Wu, Boston College, G.T. Marth, 676 E.P. Garrison, W. Fung Leong, A.N. Ward, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, G. Del Angel, 677 M.A. DePristo, S.B. Gabriel, N. Gupta, C. Hartl, R.E. Poplin, Cornell University, A.G. Clark, 678 J.L. Rodriguez-Flores, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, European Bioinformatics 679 Institute, P. Flicek, L. Clarke, R.E. Smith, X. Zheng-Bradley, Massachusetts General Hospital, 680 D.G. MacArthur, McDonnell Genome Institute at Washington University, E.R. Mardis, R.

681 Fulton, D.C. Koboldt, McGill University, S. Gravel, Stanford University, C.D. Bustamante, 682 Translational Genomics Research Institute, D.W. Craig, A. Christoforides, N. Homer, T. Izatt, 683 US National Institutes of Health, S.T. Sherry, C. Xiao, University of Geneva, E.T. Dermitzakis, 684 University of Michigan, G.R. Abecasis, H. Min Kang, University of Oxford, G.A. McVean, 685 Yale University, M.B. Gerstein, S. Balasubramanian, L. Habegger, Functional interpretation 686 group, Cornell University, H. Yu, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, European 687 Bioinformatics Institute, P. Flicek, L. Clarke, F. Cunningham, I. Dunham, D. Zerbino, X. 688 Zheng-Bradley, Harvard University, K. Lage, J. Berg Jespersen, H. Horn, Stanford University, 689 S.B. Montgomery, M.K. DeGorter, Weill Cornell Medical College, E. Khurana, Wellcome 690 Trust Sanger Institute, C. Tyler-Smith, Y. Chen, V. Colonna, Y. Xue, Yale University, M.B. 691 Gerstein, S. Balasubramanian, Y. Fu, D. Kim, Chromosome Y group, Albert Einstein College of 692 Medicine, A. Auton, A. Marcketta, American Museum of Natural History, R. Desalle, A. 693 Narechania, Arizona State University, M.A. Wilson Sayres, Boston College, E.P. Garrison, 694 Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, R.E. Handsaker, S. Kashin, S.A. McCarroll, Cornell 695 University, J.L. Rodriguez-Flores, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, European 696 Bioinformatics Institute, P. Flicek, L. Clarke, X. Zheng-Bradley, New York Genome Center, Y. 697 Erlich, M. Gymrek, T. Frederick Willems, Stanford University, C.D. Bustamante, F.L. Mendez, 698 G. David Poznik, P.A. Underhill, The Jackson Laboratory for Genomic Medicine, C. Lee, E. 699 Cerveira, A. Malhotra, M. Romanovitch, C. Zhang, University of Michigan, G.R. Abecasis, 700 University of Queensland, L. Coin, H. Shao, Virginia Bioinformatics Institute, D. Mittelman, 701 Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, C. Tyler-Smith, Q. Ayub, R. Banerjee, M. Cerezo, Y. Chen, 702 T.W. Fitzgerald, S. Louzada, A. Massaia, S. McCarthy, G.R. Ritchie, Y. Xue, F. Yang, Data 703 coordination center group, Baylor College of Medicine, R.A. Gibbs, C. Kovar, D. Kalra, W. 704 Hale, D. Muzny, J.G. Reid, BGI-Shenzhen, J. Wang, X. Dan, X. Guo, G. Li, Y. Li, C. Ye, X. 705 Zheng, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, D.M. Altshuler, European Molecular Biology 706 Laboratory, European Bioinformatics Institute, P. Flicek, L. Clarke, X. Zheng-Bradley, 707 Illumina, D.R. Bentley, A. Cox, S. Humphray, S. Kahn, Max Planck Institute for Molecular 708 Genetics, R. Sudbrak, M.W. Albrecht, M. Lienhard, McDonnell Genome Institute at 709 Washington University, D. Larson, Translational Genomics Research Institute, D.W. Craig, T. 710 Izatt, A.A. Kurdoglu, US National Institutes of Health, S.T. Sherry, C. Xiao, University of 711 California, Santa Cruz, D. Haussler, University of Michigan, G.R. Abecasis, University of 712 Oxford, G.A. McVean, Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, R.M. Durbin, S. Balasubramaniam, 713 T.M. Keane, S. McCarthy, J. Stalker, Samples and ELSI group, A. Chakravarti, B.M. Knoppers, 714 G.R. Abecasis, K.C. Barnes, C. Beiswanger, E.G. Burchard, C.D. Bustamante, H. Cai, H. Cao, 715 R.M. Durbin, N.P. Gerry, N. Gharani, R.A. Gibbs, C.R. Gignoux, S. Gravel, B. Henn, D. Jones, 716 L. Jorde, J.S. Kaye, A. Keinan, A. Kent, A. Kerasidou, Y. Li, R. Mathias, G.A. McVean, A. 717 Moreno-Estrada, P.N. Ossorio, M. Parker, A.M. Resch, C.N. Rotimi, C.D. Royal, K. Sandoval, 718 Y. Su, R. Sudbrak, Z. Tian, S. Tishkoff, L.H. Toji, C. Tyler-Smith, M. Via, Y. Wang, H. Yang, 719 L. Yang, J. Zhu, Sample collection, British from England and Scotland (GBR), W. Bodmer, 720 Colombians in Medellín, Colombia (CLM), G. Bedoya, A. Ruiz-Linares, Han Chinese South 721 (CHS), Z. Cai, Y. Gao, J. Chu, Finnish in Finland (FIN), L. Peltonen, Iberian Populations in 722 Spain (IBS), A. Garcia-Montero, A. Orfao, Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico (PUR), J. Dutil, J.C. 723 Martinez-Cruzado, T.K. Oleksyk, African Caribbean in Barbados (ACB), K.C. Barnes, R.A. 724 Mathias, A. Hennis, H. Watson, C. McKenzie, Bengali in Bangladesh (BEB), F. Qadri, R. 725 LaRocque, P.C. Sabeti, Chinese Dai in Xishuangbanna, China (CDX), J. Zhu, X. Deng, Esan in 726 Nigeria (ESN), P.C. Sabeti, D. Asogun, O. Folarin, C. Happi, O. Omoniwa, M. Stremlau, R. 727 Tariyal, Gambian in Western Division – Mandinka (GWD), M. Jallow, F. Sisay Joof, T. Corrah, 728 K. Rockett, D. Kwiatkowski, Indian Telugu in the UK (ITU) and Sri Lankan Tamil in the UK 729 (STU), J. Kooner, Kinh in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam (KHV), T. Tịnh Hiê`n, S.J. Dunstan, N.

- 730 Thuy Hang, Mende in Sierra Leone (MSL), R. Fonnie, R. Garry, L. Kanneh, L. Moses, P.C. Sabeti, J. Schieffelin, D.S. Grant, Peruvian in Lima, Peru (PEL), C. Gallo, G. Poletti, Punjabi in 732 Lahore, Pakistan (PJL), D. Saleheen, A. Rasheed, Scientific management, L.D. Brooks, A.L. 733 Felsenfeld, J.E. McEwen, Y. Vaydylevich, E.D. Green, A. Duncanson, M. Dunn, J.A. Schloss, 734 J. Wang, H. Yang, Writing group, A. Auton, L.D. Brooks, R.M. Durbin, E.P. Garrison, H. Min 735 Kang, J.O. Korbel, J.L. Marchini, S. McCarthy, G.A. McVean, G.R. Abecasis, A global 736 reference for human genetic variation, Nature 526 (2015) 68–74. 737 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15393.
- 738 [22] A. Gusev, A. Ko, H. Shi, G. Bhatia, W. Chung, B.W.J.H. Penninx, R. Jansen, E.J.C. de Geus, 739 D.I. Boomsma, F.A. Wright, P.F. Sullivan, E. Nikkola, M. Alvarez, M. Civelek, A.J. Lusis, T. 740 Lehtimäki, E. Raitoharju, M. Kähönen, I. Seppälä, O.T. Raitakari, J. Kuusisto, M. Laakso, A.L. 741 Price, P. Pajukanta, B. Pasaniuc, Integrative approaches for large-scale transcriptome-wide 742 association studies, Nat Genet 48 (2016) 245–252. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3506.
- 743 [23] Y. Hu, M. Li, Q. Lu, H. Weng, J. Wang, S.M. Zekavat, Z. Yu, B. Li, J. Gu, S. Muchnik, Y. Shi, 744 B.W. Kunkle, S. Mukherjee, P. Natarajan, A. Naj, A. Kuzma, Y. Zhao, P.K. Crane, H. Lu, H. 745 Zhao, A statistical framework for cross-tissue transcriptome-wide association analysis, Nat 746 Genet 51 (2019) 568–576. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0345-7.
- 747 [24] G. Hemani, J. Zheng, B. Elsworth, K.H. Wade, V. Haberland, D. Baird, C. Laurin, S. Burgess, 748 J. Bowden, R. Langdon, V.Y. Tan, J. Yarmolinsky, H.A. Shihab, N.J. Timpson, D.M. Evans, C. 749 Relton, R.M. Martin, G. Davey Smith, T.R. Gaunt, P.C. Haycock, The MR-Base platform 750 supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome, eLife 7 (2018) e34408. 751 https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.34408.
- 752 [25] C. Giambartolomei, D. Vukcevic, E.E. Schadt, L. Franke, A.D. Hingorani, C. Wallace, V. 753 Plagnol, Bayesian test for colocalisation between pairs of genetic association studies using 754 summary statistics, PLoS Genetics 10 (2014) e1004383. 755 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004383.
- 756 [26] J. Zhu, C. Ma, L. Zhu, J. Li, F. Peng, L. Huang, X. Luan, A role for the NLRC4 inflammasome in premature rupture of membrane, PLoS ONE 15 (2020) e0237847. 758 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0237847.
- 759 [27] D. Zheng, T. Liwinski, E. Elinav, Inflammasome activation and regulation: toward a better 760 understanding of complex mechanisms, Cell Discov 6 (2020) 36. 761 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41421-020-0167-x.
- 762 [28] Y. An, Z. Zhai, X. Wang, Y. Ding, L. He, L. Li, Q. Mo, C. Mu, R. Xie, T. Liu, W. Zhong, B. 763 Wang, H. Cao, Targeting Desulfovibrio vulgaris flagellin-induced NAIP/NLRC4 764 inflammasome activation in macrophages attenuates ulcerative colitis, Journal of Advanced 765 Research 52 (2023) 219–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2023.08.008.
- 766 [29] J. Sim, J.W. Ahn, J. Park, Y.J. Kim, J.-Y. Jeong, J.M. Lee, K. Cho, H.J. Ahn, K.S. Sung, J.-S. 767 Moon, J.H. Moon, J. Lim, Non-canonical NLRC4 inflammasomes in astrocytes contribute to 768 glioma malignancy, Inflamm. Res. 72 (2023) 813–827. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00011-023- 769 01710-6.

- 770 [30] C. Delgado-Arévalo, M. Calvet-Mirabent, A. Triguero-Martínez, E. Vázquez De Luis, A. 771 Benguría-Filippini, R. Largo, D. Calzada-Fraile, O. Popova, I. Sánchez-Cerrillo, I. Tsukalov, R. 772 Moreno-Vellisca, H. De La Fuente, G. Herrero-Beaumont, A. Ramiro, F. Sánchez-Madrid, S. 773 Castañeda, A. Dopazo, I. González Álvaro, E. Martin-Gayo, NLRC4-mediated activation of 774 CD1c+ DC contributes to perpetuation of synovitis in rheumatoid arthritis, JCI Insight 7 (2022) 775 e152886. https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.152886.
- 776 [31] R.E. Vance, The NAIP/NLRC4 inflammasomes, Current Opinion in Immunology 32 (2015) 777 84–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coi.2015.01.010.
- 778 [32] W. Deng, L. Wang, Y. Xiong, J. Li, Y. Wang, T. Shi, D. Ma, The novel secretory protein 779 CGREF1 inhibits the activation of AP-1 transcriptional activity and cell proliferation, The 780 International Journal of Biochemistry & Cell Biology 65 (2015) 32–39. 781 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocel.2015.05.019.
- 782 [33] M. Xiang, Y. Gao, Y. Zhou, M. Wang, X. Yao, A novel nomogram based on cell cycle-related 783 genes for predicting overall survival in early-onset colorectal cancer, BMC Cancer 23 (2023) 784 595. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-023-11075-y.
- 785 [34] M. Xie, H. Dai, Q. Gu, C. Xiao, H. Wang, Y. Lei, C. Wu, X. Li, B. Lin, S. Li, Identification of 786 genes contributing to cisplatin resistance in osteosarcoma cells, FEBS Open Bio 13 (2023) 164– 787 173. https://doi.org/10.1002/2211-5463.13524.
- 788 [35] M.T. Le, M.A. Lanaspa, C.M. Cicerchi, J. Rana, J.D. Scholten, B.L. Hunter, C.J. Rivard, R.K. 789 Randolph, R.J. Johnson, Bioactivity-Guided Identification of Botanical Inhibitors of 790 Ketohexokinase, PLoS ONE 11 (2016) e0157458. 791 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0157458.
- 792 [36] J. Kim, J. Kang, Y.-L. Kang, J. Woo, Y. Kim, J. Huh, J.-W. Park, Ketohexokinase-A acts as a 793 nuclear protein kinase that mediates fructose-induced metastasis in breast cancer, Nat Commun 794 11 (2020) 5436. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19263-1.
- 795 [37] X. Li, X. Qian, L.-X. Peng, Y. Jiang, D.H. Hawke, Y. Zheng, Y. Xia, J.-H. Lee, G. Cote, H. 796 Wang, L. Wang, C.-N. Qian, Z. Lu, A splicing switch from ketohexokinase-C to 797 ketohexokinase-A drives hepatocellular carcinoma formation, Nat Cell Biol 18 (2016) 561–571. 798 https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb3338.
- 799 [38] J. Yang, S. Yang, Q. Wang, J. Pang, Y. Wang, H. Wang, X. Fu, KHK-A promotes the 800 proliferation of oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma through the up-regulation of PRPS1, 801 Arab Journal of Gastroenterology 22 (2021) 40–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajg.2020.08.007.
- 802 [39] J.A. Johnston, D.R. Nelson, P. Bhatnagar, S.E. Curtis, Y. Chen, J.G. MacKrell, Prevalence and 803 cardiometabolic correlates of ketohexokinase gene variants among UK Biobank participants, 804 PLoS ONE 16 (2021) e0247683. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247683.
- 805 [40] C.-H. Yu, T. Xie, R.-P. Zhang, Z.-C. A, Association of the common SNPs in RNF212, STAG3 806 and RFX2 gene with male infertility with azoospermia in Chinese population, European Journal 807 of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology 221 (2018) 109–112. 808 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2017.12.030.

- 809 [41] A. Riera-Escamilla, A. Enguita-Marruedo, D. Moreno-Mendoza, C. Chianese, E. Sleddens-810 Linkels, E. Contini, M. Benelli, A. Natali, G.M. Colpi, E. Ruiz-Castañé, M. Maggi, W.M. 811 Baarends, C. Krausz, Sequencing of a 'mouse azoospermia' gene panel in azoospermic men: 812 identification of RNF212 and STAG3 mutations as novel genetic causes of meiotic arrest, 813 Human Reproduction 34 (2019) 978–988. https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/dez042.
- 814 [42] A. Reynolds, H. Qiao, Y. Yang, J.K. Chen, N. Jackson, K. Biswas, J.K. Holloway, F. Baudat, B. 815 De Massy, J. Wang, C. Höög, P.E. Cohen, N. Hunter, RNF212 is a dosage-sensitive regulator of 816 crossing-over during mammalian meiosis, Nat Genet 45 (2013) 269–278. 817 https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.2541.
- 818 [43] Y. Fujiwara, H. Matsumoto, K. Akiyama, A. Srivastava, M. Chikushi, M. Ann Handel, T. 819 Kunieda, An ENU-induced mutation in the mouse Rnf212 gene is associated with male meiotic 820 failure and infertility, REPRODUCTION 149 (2015) 67–74. https://doi.org/10.1530/REP-14- 821 0122.
- 822 [44] H. Qiao, H.B.D. Prasada Rao, Y. Yang, J.H. Fong, J.M. Cloutier, D.C. Deacon, K.E. Nagel, 823 R.K. Swartz, E. Strong, J.K. Holloway, P.E. Cohen, J. Schimenti, J. Ward, N. Hunter, 824 Antagonistic roles of ubiquitin ligase HEI10 and SUMO ligase RNF212 regulate meiotic 825 recombination, Nat Genet 46 (2014) 194–199. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.2858.
- 826

827 **9 Tables**

828 **9.1 Table 1**

- 829 **Table 1** TWAS / SMR/HEIDI results of the GWAS data on Dorsopathies, blood eQTL
- 830 data.TWAS/SMR/HEIDI results of the GWAS data on Dorsopathies, blood eQTL data. Ch
- 831 represents chromosome;position indicates the gene's position, Z_TWAS, P_TWAS are the Z-score
- 832 and p-value of the TWAS test; Tissue represents the tissue source used in the TWAS analyses.
- 833 topSNP represents the top SNP in the SMR analyses. P_SMR is the p-value for the SMR test;
- 834 B SMR is the effect size from the SMR test; SE_SMR is the standard error of B_SMR; P_HEIDI is

- 835 the p-value for the HEIDI test; N_HEIDI is the number of SNPs used in the HEIDI test; FDR
- 836 represents false discovery rate.
- 837

838 **9.2 Table 2**

839

840 **Table 2** Main Results of Intermediary analyses. b is the effect size, se is the standard error of effect 841 size, and p is the P-value. prop_mediated represents the proportion of indirect effect in the total effect.

effect.

- 843
- 844 **10 Figures**
- 845 **10.1 Figure 1**

Fig.1 Venn Plot of the main results of multi analysis

-
- **10.2 Figure 2**

- 851 **Fig.2** Methylation sites affect disease pathways.
- 852 **10.3 Figure 3**

853

- **Fig.3** Manhattan plot of the MR/SMR/FUSION analysis results using QTLs and Dorsopathies 855 GWAS summary statistics. The red dashed line represents the Bonferroni-corrected significance
- GWAS summary statistics. The red dashed line represents the Bonferroni-corrected significance
- 856 threshold.
-

10.4 Figure 4

- **Fig.4** MR results for genes expression significantly associated with dorsopathies after FDR 861 correction.
-

10.5 Figure 5

- 865 **Fig. 5** SMR locus plot illustrating dorsopathies at the gene locus utilizing blood eQTL data. In the
- 866 upper plot, each gray dot represents a SNP identified through GWAS on dorsopathies. A red
- 867 diamond indicates passage of the SMR test for the probe, while a solid diamond signifies successful
- 868 completion of both the SMR and HEIDI tests. In the lower plot, each red cross represents an SNP
- 869 identified in the eQTL study corresponding to each gene. The x-axis displays the genomic positions
- 870 (Mb, GRCh37) of SNPs, probes, and genes on the chromosome. The y-axis displays the negative
- 871 logarithm (base 10) of p-values for SNPs identified in the GWAS on dorsopathies, SMR test, and
- 872 eQTL study corresponding to each gene.
- 873
- 874 **10.6 Figure 6**

876 **Fig. 6** Locus comparison plot displays the results of colocalization analysis for SNPs associated with

- 877 gene expression in blood and datasets related to dorsopathies. Each dot represents a specific SNP,
- 878 with the color indicating its linkage disequilibrium (LD) value (r2) with the lead GWAS variant,
- 879 marked by a purple diamond. In the right panel, the x-axis represents genomic positions in
- 880 megabases (GRCh37) along the chromosome, while the y-axis shows the -log10 p-values for SNPs
- 881 from the dorsopathies GWAS (top) and the gene expression eQTL study (bottom). The left panel
- 882 compares the p-values from the dorsopathies GWAS with those from the gene expression eQTL
- 883 study.

884