

1 **Leisure-time physical activity, sedentary behavior, and biological aging: evidence from**  
2 **genetic correlation and Mendelian randomization analyses**

3 Xunying Zhao<sup>1¶</sup>, Xueyao Wu<sup>1,2¶</sup>, Lin He<sup>1</sup>, Jinyu Xiao<sup>1</sup>, Rong Xiang<sup>3</sup>, Linna Sha<sup>3</sup>, Mingshuang  
4 Tang<sup>1</sup>, Yu Hao<sup>1</sup>, Yang Qu<sup>1</sup>, Changfeng Xiao<sup>1</sup>, Chenjiarui Qin<sup>3</sup>, Jiaojiao Hou<sup>1</sup>, Qin Deng<sup>3</sup>,  
5 Jiangbo Zhu<sup>3</sup>, Sirui Zheng<sup>3</sup>, Jinyu Zhou<sup>3</sup>, Ting Yu<sup>1</sup>, Bin Yang<sup>3</sup>, Xin Song<sup>1</sup>, Tao Han<sup>3</sup>, Jiaqiang  
6 Liao<sup>1</sup>, Tao Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Mengyu Fan<sup>1</sup>, Jiayuan Li<sup>1\*</sup>, Xia Jiang<sup>1,3,4\*</sup>

7 ¶ Xunying Zhao and Xueyao Wu contributed equally to this work.

8 **Affiliations:**

9 <sup>1</sup> *Department of Epidemiology and Health Statistics and West China-PUMC C. C. Chen*  
10 *Institute of Health, West China School of Public Health and West China Fourth Hospital,*  
11 *Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China.*

12 <sup>2</sup> *Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Rockville,*  
13 *Maryland, USA.*

14 <sup>3</sup> *Department of Nutrition and Food Hygiene, West China School of Public Health and West*  
15 *China Fourth Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China.*

16 <sup>4</sup> *Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Center for Molecular Medicine, Karolinska Institutet,*  
17 *Solna, Stockholm, Sweden.*

18

19 **\*Correspondence to:** West China School of Public Health and West China Fourth Hospital,  
20 Sichuan University 16#, Section 3, Renmin Nan Lu Chengdu, Sichuan 610041, P. R. China  
21 (Xia Jiang, PhD, E-mail: [xia.jiang@ki.se](mailto:xia.jiang@ki.se), [xiajiang@scu.edu.cn](mailto:xiajiang@scu.edu.cn); Jiayuan Li, PhD, E-mail:  
22 [lijayuan@scu.edu.cn](mailto:lijayuan@scu.edu.cn)).

23 Word Count: 4,821

24

25

26

## 1 Abstract

2 Physical inactivity and sedentary behavior are associated with higher risks of age-related  
3 morbidity and mortality. However, whether they causally contribute to accelerating biological  
4 aging has not been fully elucidated. Utilizing the largest available genome-wide association  
5 study (GWAS) summary data, we implemented a comprehensive analytical framework to  
6 investigate the causal relationships between moderate-to-vigorous leisure-time physical activity  
7 (MVPA), leisure screen time (LST), and four epigenetic age acceleration (EAA) measures:  
8 HannumAgeAccel, intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel, PhenoAgeAccel, and GrimAgeAccel. Shared  
9 genetic backgrounds across these traits were quantified through genetic correlation analysis.  
10 Overall and independent causal effects were assessed through univariable and multivariable  
11 Mendelian randomization (MR). A recently developed tissue-partitioned MR approach was  
12 further adopted to explore potential tissue-specific pathway that contributes to the observed  
13 causal relationships. Among the four EAA measures investigated, consistent results were  
14 identified for PhenoAgeAccel and GrimAgeAccel. These two measures were negatively  
15 genetically correlated with MVPA ( $r_g = -0.18 \sim -0.29$ ) and positively genetically correlated  
16 with LST ( $r_g = 0.22 \sim 0.37$ ). Univariable MR yielded a robust effect of genetically predicted LST  
17 on GrimAgeAccel ( $\beta_{IVW} = 0.69$ ,  $P = 1.10 \times 10^{-7}$ ), while MVPA ( $\beta_{IVW} = -1.02$ ,  $P = 1.50 \times 10^{-2}$ ) and  
18 LST ( $\beta_{IVW} = 0.37$ ,  $P = 1.90 \times 10^{-2}$ ) showed marginal causal effects on PhenoAgeAccel.  
19 Multivariable MR suggested an independent causal role of LST in GrimAgeAccel after  
20 accounting for effects of MVPA and other important confounders. Tissue-partitioned MR  
21 suggested skeletal muscle tissue associated variants be predominantly responsible for driving  
22 the effect of LST on GrimAgeAccel. Findings support sedentary lifestyles as a modifiable  
23 causal risk factor in accelerating epigenetic aging, emphasizing the need for preventive  
24 strategies to reduce sedentary screen time for healthy aging.

25 **Keywords:** physical activity, sedentary behavior, biological aging, epigenetic clock, Mendelian  
26 randomization, causal inference, genetic correlation.

27

## 1 Introduction

2 Aging is a dynamic and intricate process characterized by the gradual accumulation of  
3 perturbations, spanning from subtle molecular changes to observable alterations in physiology  
4 and functionality<sup>1</sup>. Due to the heterogeneity observed in the aging processes among individuals  
5 of similar chronological age<sup>2</sup>, biological age taking into account the internal physiological states  
6 and inter-individual variations represents a more precise indicator of aging<sup>3</sup>. Epigenetic clocks,  
7 which estimate chronological age or related phenotypes (e.g., mortality) based on levels of  
8 DNA methylation (DNAm) at specific cytosine-phosphate-guanine (CpG) sites<sup>4</sup>, have emerged  
9 as one of the most promising measures of biological aging<sup>5</sup>. Accumulating evidence suggests  
10 that exceeding chronological age according to epigenetic clock estimates, known as epigenetic  
11 age acceleration (EAA), is linked to multiple adverse aging-related health consequences<sup>6-8</sup>.

12 Epigenetic clocks are largely modifiable<sup>9</sup>, identifying intervenable factors such as lifestyle  
13 choices that can decelerate or reverse EAA thus holds great potential in informing early  
14 interventions to promote healthy aging. Among them, physical activity and sedentary behavior  
15 are believed to play a role in reducing age-related morbidity and enhancing lifespan<sup>10-12</sup>. While  
16 several epidemiological studies have investigated the “physical activity-EAA” link, results  
17 across different epigenetic clocks remain inconsistent. For instance, a study involving 284  
18 participants reported a reverse association between daily step counts with extrinsic Hannum  
19 age acceleration (HannumAgeAccel,  $\beta = -0.100$ ,  $P = 0.027$ ), but a positive association between  
20 sit-to-stand transitions with intrinsic Horvath age acceleration (HorvathAgeAccel,  $\beta = 0.006$ ,  $P$   
21  $= 0.049$ )<sup>13</sup>. However, two subsequent studies, one involving 3,567 participants and the other  
22 involving 2,758 participants, found no evidence to support such associations<sup>14 15</sup>. Meanwhile,  
23 the putative impact of sedentary behavior on biological aging remains largely unexplored,  
24 despite the recognition that its adverse health effects may largely be independent of physical  
25 activity levels<sup>16 17</sup>. In addition to the potential influence of insufficiently active lifestyles on  
26 aging, the aging process itself, accompanied by declining physical fitness, may also contribute  
27 to changes in physical activity and sedentary behavior<sup>18</sup>. Owing to biases derived from  
28 confounding and reverse causality, it is therefore difficult for conventional epidemiological  
29 studies to elucidate the causal relationships.

30 One way to evaluate causality while mitigating the limitations of conventional epidemiological  
31 studies is through Mendelian randomization (MR), a framework that utilizes genetic variants  
32 (single-nucleotide polymorphism, SNP) as instrumental variables (IVs) to make causal  
33 inference by fulfilling three key assumptions (the relevance assumption, the independence  
34 assumption, and the exclusion restriction assumption)<sup>19</sup>. Multivariable MR extends this  
35 approach to assess the independent causal effects of multiple exposures on an outcome<sup>20</sup>.  
36 Further, tissue-partitioned MR that builds upon multivariable MR separates the phenotypic

37 subcomponents of an exposure, allowing for the identification of tissue-specific subcomponent  
38 that predominantly drives its causal effect on an outcome, providing insights into the underlying  
39 biological mechanisms<sup>21 22</sup>. To the best of our knowledge, no MR study of sedentary behavior  
40 with EAA has been performed; only one existing MR assessed the putative effect of physical  
41 activity on EAA and identified no evidence of a causal relationship using the then available IVs  
42 (N = 6)<sup>23</sup>. Given the discovery of additional genetic loci for each trait of interest<sup>24 25</sup> and recent  
43 developments in novel methodological techniques, a comprehensive MR study is urgently  
44 needed to validate and expand previous findings.

45 Here, leveraging the hitherto largest genome-wide association study (GWAS) summary  
46 statistics and comprehensive genetic correlation and MR analyses, we aimed to (i) understand  
47 the average shared genetic basis underlying physical activity, sedentary behavior and EAA  
48 measures; (ii) investigate the overall causal effects of genetically predicted physical activity  
49 and sedentary behavior on each EAA measure; (iii) examine their independent causal effects  
50 after accounting for the interplay between physical activity and sedentary behavior, as well as  
51 the confounding effects from other important factors; (iv) explore which tissue-dependent  
52 biological pathways may predominantly contribute to the observed causal effects.

53

## 54 **Methods**

55 In our study, we used publicly available summary-level data that had obtained ethical approval  
56 in all original studies. We followed the guidelines of the Strengthening the Reporting of  
57 Observational Studies in Epidemiology - Mendelian Randomization (STROBE-MR)<sup>26</sup>  
58 (**Supplementary File 1**, <https://www.strobe-mr.org/>). Flowchart of the overall study design is  
59 depicted in **Figure 1**.

## 60 **GWAS datasets**

61 **Physical activity and sedentary behavior** We obtained the hitherto largest summary-level  
62 data for physical activity and sedentary behavior from a GWAS meta-analysis of 51 studies,  
63 comprising 661,399 participants of European ancestry<sup>24</sup>. In brief, this meta-analysis utilized  
64 questionnaire-based data, capturing self-reported domain- and intensity-specific physical  
65 activity and sedentary traits as phenotypes. Moderate-to-vigorous leisure-time physical activity  
66 (MVPA) and leisure screen time (LST) were used as proxies for levels of leisure-time physical  
67 activity and sedentary behavior, respectively. MVPA (N = 608,595, SNP-heritability = 8%)  
68 was categorized as a dichotomous variable to account for the heterogeneity of the  
69 questionnaires used across cohorts, whereas LST (N = 526,725, SNP-heritability = 16%) was  
70 defined as a continuous variable.

71 **Epigenetic clock acceleration** We obtained the hitherto largest summary-level data for EAA  
72 measures from a GWAS meta-analysis of 30 cohorts, comprising 34,710 participants of  
73 European ancestry<sup>25</sup>. Four EAA measures were chosen to index epigenetic age acceleration,  
74 including HannumAgeAccel<sup>27</sup> (N = 34,449), intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel<sup>28</sup> (N = 34,461),  
75 PhenoAge acceleration<sup>29</sup> (PhenoAgeAccel, N = 34,463), and GrimAge acceleration<sup>30</sup>  
76 (GrimAgeAccel, N = 34,467), with SNP-heritability estimated ranging from 10% to 17%.

77 The Hannum and Horvath clocks, referred to as the first-generation epigenetic clocks, were  
78 developed to estimate chronological age based on DNAm data from blood and human  
79 tissues/cell types, respectively<sup>27 28</sup>. Intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel, as a derivative of the Horvath  
80 clock, was adjusted to exclude the effects of blood cell composition and capture the cell-  
81 intrinsic properties of aging<sup>31</sup>. PhenoAge and GrimAge, recognized as the second-generation  
82 epigenetic clocks, were developed to predict health and lifespan by incorporating DNAm  
83 information associated with mortality and certain clinical biomarkers<sup>29 30</sup>. Details of these EAA  
84 measures can be found in the referenced publications<sup>25 27-30</sup>.

85 **Confounders** Six additional factors, including educational attainment, smoking, drinking,  
86 obesity, sleep duration, and parental longevity, were considered potential confounders in the  
87 MVPA/LST-EAA relationship. We obtained GWAS summary data for educational attainment  
88 from the Social Science Genetic Association Consortium, involving 766,345 individuals of  
89 European ancestry after excluding subjects of 23andMe (due to data restrictions)<sup>32</sup>. For smoking  
90 and drinking, we obtained GWAS summary data from GWAS & Sequencing Consortium of  
91 Alcohol and Nicotine, involving 632,802 individuals of European ancestry for smoking  
92 initiation and 537,349 individuals of European ancestry for alcohol consumption (both  
93 excluded subjects of 23andMe)<sup>33</sup>. For obesity, we used GWAS summary data from a GWAS  
94 meta-analysis of the UK Biobank and the Genetic Investigation of Anthropometric Traits  
95 Consortium, involving 806,834 individuals of European ancestry for body-mass index (BMI)<sup>34</sup>.  
96 For sleep duration and parental longevity, we used GWAS summary data of European ancestry  
97 from the UK Biobank, including data on sleep duration for 446,118 individuals and on parental  
98 age at death for 208,118 individuals, respectively<sup>35 36</sup>.

99 Details on the characteristics of each GWAS dataset are presented in **Supplementary Table 1**.

## 100 **Statistical analysis**

101 **Genome-wide genetic correlation** We first conducted a genome-wide genetic correlation  
102 analysis to quantify the average shared genetic effects underlying MVPA, LST and EAA  
103 measures using the linkage-disequilibrium (LD) score regression (LDSC) software<sup>37</sup>. The  
104 genetic correlation estimates ( $r_g$ ) range from  $-1$  to  $+1$ , where  $+1$  denotes a total positive  
105 correlation and  $-1$  denotes a total negative correlation. We used pre-computed LD-scores

106 of ~1.2 million common SNPs in European ancestry from the Hapmap3 reference panel,  
107 aligning with the European origin of our GWAS samples. According to Bonferroni  
108 correction, a statistically significant  $r_g$  was defined as  $P < 6.25 \times 10^{-3}$  ( $\alpha = 0.05/8$ , number of  
109 trait-pairs), and a suggestively significant  $r_g$  was defined as  $6.25 \times 10^{-3} \leq P < 0.05^{38}$ .

110 **Univariable Mendelian randomization** To investigate the overall causal effects of genetically  
111 predicted MVPA or LST on EAA measures, a univariable MR was first performed through  
112 exposure-associated SNPs as IVs, then through the genome-wide summary statistics for the  
113 exposure traits.

114 To meet the relevance assumption of MR, we screened IVs through a clumping strategy of  $P <$   
115  $5 \times 10^{-8}$  and an LD window of  $\pm 1.0$  Mb ( $r^2 < 0.001$ ). For IVs that were not available in the  
116 outcome GWAS, we used LDlinkR (R package) to identify proxy SNPs in LD ( $r^2 > 0.8$ ) with  
117 the index SNPs from the outcome GWAS data<sup>39</sup>. We calculated the proportion of trait variance  
118 explained by each IV ( $R^2$ ), as well as their  $F$ -statistics. An  $F$ -statistic below 10 suggests a weak  
119 instrument, which would be excluded from the analysis<sup>40</sup>. Statistical power was calculated with  
120 a web-based application (<https://sb452.shinyapps.io/power/>)<sup>41</sup>. Heterogeneity of the  
121 instruments was calculated using Cochran's Q statistics<sup>42</sup>. Details on the characteristics of IVs  
122 are presented in **Supplementary Table 2-3**.

123 We applied inverse-variance weighted (IVW) as our primary approach. This method pools the  
124 estimate from each IV and provides an overall estimate of the causal effect assuming all IVs to  
125 be valid (meet the MR assumptions); or are invalid in such a way that the overall pleiotropy is  
126 balanced to be zero<sup>19,41</sup>. We performed several sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of  
127 the primary results and to further validate the exclusion restriction and independence  
128 assumptions of MR<sup>41</sup>. These include: (i) MR-Egger regression incorporating an intercept term  
129 to account for directional pleiotropy<sup>43</sup>; (ii) weighted-median approach exhibiting stronger  
130 robustness against invalid IVs<sup>44</sup>; (iii) MR-Pleiotropy Residual Sum and Outlier (MR-PRESSO)  
131 dealing with uncorrelated pleiotropy based on outlier removal<sup>45</sup>; (iv) IVW excluding  
132 palindromic IVs with strand ambiguity; (v) IVW excluding pleiotropic IVs associated with  
133 potential confounders (accessed in GWAS catalog on 02/20/2024, <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/>;  
134 pleiotropic IVs are listed in **Supplementary Table 2**); (vi) leave-one-out analysis where each  
135 IV was excluded at a time and IVW was conducted using the remaining IVs; (vii) IVW-based  
136 reverse-direction MR to rule out the possibility of causal effects of EAA measures on MVPA  
137 or LST.

138 We then employed the Causal Analysis Using Summary Effect Estimates (CAUSE) method<sup>46</sup>.  
139 Integrating information from genome-wide SNPs, CAUSE has several advantages over the  
140 conventional MR approaches: it accounts for both uncorrelated and correlated horizontal

141 pleiotropy, improves statistical power, corrects for potential sample overlap, and reduces the  
142 likelihood of false positives. Under a Bayesian framework, CAUSE assumes a proportion ( $q$   
143 value) of variants that are likely to show correlated horizontal pleiotropy, and provides posterior  
144 distribution estimates under two models - the sharing model, which allows only for horizontal  
145 pleiotropic effects, and the causal model, which accommodates both horizontal pleiotropy and  
146 causality. A one-sided  $P_{\text{causal vs. sharing}}$  is generated to evaluate whether the sharing model is at  
147 least as effective as the causal model in fitting the data, with a rejection of the null hypothesis  
148 ( $P_{\text{causal vs. sharing}} < 0.05$ ) indicating that the data are more likely to be explained by causal effects.  
149 To mitigate the impact of strong regional LD structure, we excluded variants within the Major  
150 Histocompatibility Complex (MHC) region (chr6: 25M-35M).

151 Bonferroni correction was applied across all univariable MR approaches, considering a  $P <$   
152  $6.25 \times 10^{-3}$  as evidence for statistical significance and a  $6.25 \times 10^{-3} \leq P < 0.05$  as suggestive  
153 significance<sup>38</sup>. To define a robust causal effect, we required that the MR effect estimate  
154 demonstrated statistical significance in any univariable MR approach and remained  
155 directionally consistent across all approaches, and its null hypothesis for model fitting was  
156 rejected ( $P_{\text{causal vs. sharing}} < 0.05$ ) in CAUSE.

157 **Multivariable Mendelian randomization** To further evaluate the independent causal effect of  
158 MVPA or LST on each EAA measure, a multivariable MR was subsequently conducted<sup>20</sup>.  
159 Given the potential inter-correlation between MVPA and LST, a multivariable model (referred  
160 to as Model 1) was first constructed incorporating both MVPA and LST to estimate their causal  
161 effects on EAA independent from each other. Considering potential confounding effects from  
162 other factors, a second multivariable model (Model 2) was developed, wherein each speculated  
163 confounding factor (i.e., educational attainment, smoking, drinking, BMI, sleep duration, and  
164 parental age at death) was included individually together with the exposure. In the third  
165 multivariable model (Model 3), confounders in Model 2 were included simultaneously to assess  
166 their combined influence. We removed SNPs in LD ( $r^2 \geq 0.001$ ) to avoid overlapping or  
167 correlated SNPs after combining different sets of IVs (**Supplementary Table 4-7**). Conditional  
168  $F$ -statistics were calculated to evaluate the joint instrument strength in multivariable MR  
169 settings, with values below 10 indicating weak instruments<sup>47</sup>. According to Bonferroni  
170 correction, a  $P < 6.25 \times 10^{-3}$  was considered as evidence for statistical significance, and a  
171  $6.25 \times 10^{-3} \leq P < 0.05$  as suggestive significance<sup>38</sup>.

172 **Tissue-partitioned Mendelian randomization** Previous post-GWAS analyses have shown  
173 that loci associated with MVPA or LST are mainly enriched for gene expressions in brain and  
174 skeletal muscle tissues<sup>24</sup>. Both brain and skeletal muscle tissues play a non-negligible role in  
175 regulating physical activity and sedentary behavior – while the brain is responsible for  
176 generating and regulating behavioral patterns and motivation, the skeletal muscle facilitates or

177 restricts movement<sup>48</sup>. Hence, MVPA/LST influencing genes expressed in the brain may be  
178 more likely to achieve their effects by regulating behavior, whereas those expressed in skeletal  
179 muscle may impact greater extent pathways related to muscle metabolism. Accordingly, the  
180 observed causal effects of MVPA/LST on EAA may involve separate pathways mediated  
181 through the brain or skeletal muscle. While other pathways may also likely mediate these effects,  
182 they are not the most relevant candidates in this study.

183 To investigate the primary biological pathways underlying the observed causal relationships,  
184 we finally performed an exploratory tissue-partitioned MR. This approach enables us to  
185 separate the effects of phenotypic subcomponents of MVPA/LST, here, the “brain-tissue  
186 instrumented MVPA/LST” and the “skeletal muscle-tissue instrumented MVPA/LST”, through  
187 fractionation of the original IVs according to whether they colocalize with gene expression in  
188 the brain or skeletal muscle tissue<sup>21</sup>.

189 Specifically, at each locus surrounding the original MVPA/LST IVs (within a 200 kb window),  
190 we used the Bayesian method “*coloc*” to assess the presence of a single causal variant  
191 responsible for both the MVPA/LST GWAS signal and the tissue-specific gene-expression-  
192 association signal, a phenomenon referred to as colocalization. Colocalization analyses were  
193 conducted twice at each locus: first with expression quantitative trait loci (eQTL) data derived  
194 from brain tissue and then separately with eQTL data from skeletal muscle tissue. A posterior  
195 probability (PPH4)  $\geq 0.8$  was considered as strong evidence of colocalization, as recommended  
196 by authors of the original method<sup>21,49</sup>. Consequently, the initial set of IVs was divided into two  
197 sets, with each set specifically indexing the brain- or the skeletal muscle-tissue instrumented  
198 MVPA/LST (tissue-specific IVs). We obtained the brain eQTL dataset from a meta-analysis  
199 study of 10 brain regions (N = 1,194, all of European ancestry)<sup>50</sup>, and the skeletal muscle eQTL  
200 dataset from the GTEx consortium v.8 (N = 706, ~80% European ancestry)<sup>51</sup>. Variants residing  
201 within the MHC region (chr6: 25M-35M) were excluded from the analysis.

202 Exposure-outcome pairs that showed robust causal relationships in univariable MR and  
203 directionally consistent estimates in multivariable MR were selected for inclusion in the tissue-  
204 partitioned analysis. Utilizing the derived tissue-specific IVs, we first performed a univariable  
205 MR to evaluate the unadjusted effect of each phenotypic subcomponent of the exposure(s) on  
206 the outcome(s). Following this, a multivariable MR was performed to estimate the independent  
207 effect of each subcomponent, with IVs weighted using their tissue-specific PPH4 values<sup>21</sup>.  
208 Given the largely reduced number of IVs and the resulting decreased statistical power, we used  
209 a conventional significance threshold of  $P < 0.05$  in the analysis. Further details regarding the  
210 analytical procedures can be found in **Supplementary File 2**.



211 All MR analyses were conducted using R software (v4.1.0) with packages including  
212 “TwoSampleMR” (v0.5.4), “MRPRESSO” (v1.0), “MendelianRandomization” (v0.7.0),  
213 “CAUSE” (v1.2.0), “MVMR” (v0.4), and “coloc” (v5.1.0).

214

## 215 **Results**

### 216 **Genome-wide genetic correlation**

217 After Bonferroni correction, we observed statistically significant negative genetic correlations  
218 of MVPA with PhenoAgeAccel ( $r_g = -0.18$ ,  $P = 2.40 \times 10^{-3}$ ) and GrimAgeAccel ( $r_g = -0.29$ ,  
219  $P = 9.69 \times 10^{-7}$ ), as well as statistically significant positive genetic correlations of LST with  
220 PhenoAgeAccel ( $r_g = 0.22$ ,  $P = 1.02 \times 10^{-5}$ ) and GrimAgeAccel ( $r_g = 0.37$ ,  $P = 1.14 \times 10^{-11}$ ). A  
221 suggestively significant genetic correlation was observed for LST with HannumAgeAccel ( $r_g$   
222  $= 0.08$ ,  $P = 4.84 \times 10^{-2}$ ). No significant genetic correlations were found for other trait-pairs  
223 **(Table 1)**.

### 224 **Univariable Mendelian randomization**

225 Motivated by the significant genetic overlap, we proceeded to examine the potential causal  
226 effects of MVPA and LST on EAA measures. Altogether 15 independent SNPs were  
227 determined as IVs for MVPA, and 130 independent SNPs as IVs for LST.  $F$ -statistics of these  
228 IVs indicated a minimal likelihood of weak instrument bias (all  $F$ -statistics  $> 10$ ;  
229 **Supplementary Table 2-3**). At an alpha level of 0.05, our univariable MR was estimated to  
230 have 80% power to detect causal estimates ( $\beta$ ) ranging from 0.15 to 0.50 (**Supplementary**  
231 **Table 8**).

232 As shown in **Figure 2**, we identified a statistically significant relationship between genetically  
233 predicted longer LST and faster GrimAgeAccel ( $\beta_{IVW} = 0.69$ , 95% confidence intervals,  
234 95%CIs =  $0.43 \sim 0.94$ ,  $P = 1.10 \times 10^{-7}$ ; **Supplementary Table 9**). Despite a modest  
235 heterogeneity indicated across individual SNP estimates ( $P_{\text{Cochran's } Q} = 0.02$ ), all sensitivity  
236 analyses generated statistically significant and directionally consistent results (**Supplementary**  
237 **Table 9-11**). We also found that genetically predicted lower levels of MVPA ( $\beta_{IVW} = -1.02$ ,  
238 95%CIs =  $-1.84 \sim -0.20$ ,  $P = 1.50 \times 10^{-2}$ ) and genetically predicted longer LST ( $\beta_{IVW} = 0.37$ ,  
239 95%CIs =  $0.06 \sim 0.67$ ,  $P = 1.90 \times 10^{-2}$ ) were associated with faster PhenoAgeAccel under  
240 suggestive significance. No evidence of a significant causal effect of MVPA or LST on  
241 HannumAgeAccel or intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel was found.

242 As for the reverse direction, 10, 26, 11, and 4 SNPs were utilized as IVs for HannumAgeAccel,  
243 intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel, PhenoAgeAccel, and GrimAgeAccel, respectively, with  $F$ -  
244 statistics indicating minimal weak instrument bias (all  $F$ -statistics  $> 10$ ; **Supplementary Table**

245 3). No evidence was found to support a reverse effect of any genetically predicted EAA measure  
246 on MVPA or LST (**Supplementary Table 12**).

247 Leveraging genome-wide summary statistics, evidence from CAUSE further supported the  
248 significant causal relationships between LST and GrimAgeAccel (median causal effect = 0.39,  
249 95%CIs = 0.24 ~ 0.55,  $P_{\text{causal vs. sharing}} = 7.00 \times 10^{-3}$ ; **Figure 2** and **Supplementary Table 13**).  
250 The low absolute value of median shared effect ( $-0.04$ ) and the low  $q$  value (0.04) implied that  
251 horizontal pleiotropy was limited. CAUSE yielded a suggestively significant estimate for  
252 genetically predicted LST with PhenoAgeAccel (median causal effect = 0.25, 95%CIs = 0.06  
253 ~ 0.43), but not for genetically predicted MVPA with PhenoAgeAccel (median causal effect =  
254  $-0.30$ , 95%CIs =  $-0.60$  ~ 0.04). Nevertheless, results of modeling tests suggested that both  
255 associations (LST/MVPA-PhenoAgeAccel) were more likely to be explained by horizontal  
256 correlated pleiotropy rather than causality ( $P_{\text{causal vs. sharing}} > 0.05$ ).

### 257 **Multivariable Mendelian randomization**

258 We prioritized evaluating the independent causal relationship between genetically predicted  
259 LST and GrimAgeAccel, based on its robust overall effect confirmed in univariable MR by  
260 both the conventional IV-based method and the genome-wide summary statistics-based  
261 approach. Taking into account the effect of MVPA, results of Model 1 demonstrated a  
262 statistically significant independent effect of genetically predicted LST on GrimAgeAccel  
263 (**Figure 3** and **Supplementary Table 14**). Model 2, which incorporated LST with each  
264 potential confounder (other than MVPA), provided additional support for its independent causal  
265 role. Causal estimates obtained from each separate analysis consistently demonstrated the same  
266 direction and were largely statistically significant (except for educational attainment, which  
267 yielded to an estimate of suggestive significance; **Figure 3** and **Supplementary Table 14**).  
268 Model 3 including all potential confounders again generated directionally consistent “LST-  
269 GrimAgeAccel” causal associations, despite the attenuated magnitude of effect and the weaker  
270 significance. Most conditional  $F$ -statistics for LST indicated a minimal likelihood of weak  
271 instrument bias in multivariable MR settings ( $>10$ ), with a few exceptions for example when  
272 jointly considering MVPA, educational attainment, and BMI (**Supplementary Table 15**).

273 For the “LST-PhenoAgeAccel” and the “MVPA-PhenoAgeAccel” associations that exhibited  
274 suggestive significance in univariable MR, the directions of the estimates derived from Models  
275 1-3 remained consistently aligned with their corresponding overall effects. Nevertheless, half  
276 of the causal estimates failed to reach suggestive significance, and only the effect of genetically  
277 predicted MVPA on PhenoAgeAccel after adjusting for smoking survived Bonferroni  
278 corrections (**Figure 3** and **Supplementary Table 14**).

### 279 **Tissue-partitioned Mendelian randomization**

280 A tissue-partitioned MR was finally conducted to explore whether the “brain-tissue  
281 instrumented LST” or the “skeletal muscle-tissue instrumented LST” predominantly drives the  
282 observed causal effect of LST on GrimAgeAccel. Among the 130 original IVs for LST, 28 were  
283 identified with strong evidence of colocalization for brain-tissue-derived gene expressions, and  
284 30 for skeletal muscle-tissue-derived gene expressions (**Supplementary Table 16**). The  
285 average effect sizes of the two IV sets on LST were virtually identical (brain = 0.028 vs. skeletal  
286 muscle = 0.027).

287 As shown in **Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 17**, univariable MR suggested significant  
288 genetically predicted effects of both brain- ( $\beta_{IVW} = 0.55$ , 95%CIs = 0.00 ~ 1.10,  $P = 4.90 \times 10^{-2}$ )  
289 and skeletal muscle-tissue ( $\beta_{IVW} = 0.86$ , 95%CIs = 0.35 ~ 1.37,  $P = 9.70 \times 10^{-4}$ ) instrumented  
290 LST on GrimAgeAccel. Multivariable MR concomitantly incorporating both subcomponents  
291 demonstrated a significant effect of skeletal muscle-tissue instrumented LST on GrimAgeAccel  
292 ( $\beta_{IVW} = 1.16$ , 95%CIs = 0.22 ~ 2.09,  $P = 1.05 \times 10^{-2}$ ). We also repeated the analysis with an  
293 expanded set of IVs using a more relaxed clumping strategy of  $P < 1 \times 10^{-5}$  and an LD window  
294 of  $\pm 1.0$  Mb ( $r^2 < 0.001$ ), and generated largely consistent results (**Supplementary Table 17-**  
295 **19**). Unfortunately, the conditional  $F$ -statistics for tissue-specific instrumented LST were all  
296 below 10 (**Supplementary Table 18**).

297

## 298 **Discussion**

299 The current study investigated the shared genetic background and causal relationships between  
300 MVPA and LST with four EAA measures, utilizing the largest combination of available  
301 datasets and a comprehensive analytical framework. Our findings reveal moderate genetic  
302 overlaps of MVPA or LST with both PhenoAgeAccel and GrimAgeAccel. Among these, we  
303 highlight strong evidence for an independent causal link between increased LST and  
304 accelerated biological aging measured by GrimAgeAccel, with skeletal muscle-related  
305 biological pathways playing a predominant role in mediating this effect.

306 Accumulative studies have consistently shown that the rate of epigenetic aging can be  
307 influenced by environmental or lifestyle factors<sup>52</sup>. However, the strength of such relationships  
308 varies across different epigenetic clocks, possibly due to the slightly diverse aspects of aging  
309 that each clock captures<sup>5,53</sup>. The second-generation clocks, trained on aging-related outcomes  
310 rather than solely chronological age, have been found to exhibit stronger correlations with  
311 health-related behaviors compared to the first-generation clocks<sup>53</sup>. Multiple observational  
312 studies have reported links between higher levels of physical activity with slower  
313 PhenoAgeAccel and GrimAgeAccel but not with HannumAgeAccel or intrinsic  
314 HorvathAgeAccel<sup>14,15</sup>. Our identification of genome-wide genetic correlations for MVPA or

315 LST with only the acceleration of the second-generation epigenetic clocks provides additional  
316 support for prior observational findings from a genetic perspective.

317 Among the observed genetic overlaps, our MR study further uncovered compelling evidence to  
318 support a robust causal effect of genetically predicted LST on GrimAgeAccel, which remains  
319 significant even after accounting for the effects of MVPA and other major confounders. In  
320 addition, we discerned a marginal association between genetically predicted longer LST with  
321 faster PhenoAgeAccel. Two previous cross-sectional studies reported a positive correlation  
322 between sedentary time and GrimAgeAccel ( $\beta = 0.043$ ,  $P = 0.015$ ;  $\beta = 0.200$ ,  $P = 0.025$ ), with  
323 no correlations found for the other EAA measures<sup>14 54</sup>. A more recent study using prospective  
324 data revealed an acceleration of GrimAge in the sedentary group compared with the active  
325 group ( $P = 0.034$ ), but this association was largely attenuated after adjusting for other lifestyle  
326 factors<sup>55</sup>. While these studies hint at a potential link between sedentary behavior and GAA, the  
327 evidence is largely weakened by the inherent limitations of the observational design, primarily  
328 due to confounding factors and reverse causality, as well as by the single-point measurements  
329 of EAA, limiting the tracking of longitudinal changes of epigenetic clock. Utilizing both  
330 exposure-associated SNPs and genome-wide summary results, we have for the first time  
331 confirmed the causal relationships between LST with GrimAgeAccel, alongside a potential  
332 association with PhenoAgeAccel, under a comprehensive MR framework. Our work closely  
333 aligns with and greatly expands upon the previous observational studies by providing more  
334 reliable evidence of causal inference, thereby paving the way for targeted interventions.

335 Our MR study also revealed a marginal causal effect of genetically predicted MVPA on  
336 PhenoAgeAccel, aligning with a cross-sectional observational study ( $\beta = -0.26$ ,  $P = 0.021$ )<sup>14</sup>.  
337 In contrast to LST, there has already been one previous MR conducted to examine the causal  
338 links between MVPA and two measures of EAA – PhenoAgeAccel ( $\beta_{IVW} = 0.368$ ,  $P = 0.747$ )  
339 and GrimAgeAccel ( $\beta_{IVW} = -0.186$ ,  $P = 0.837$ ), which found no significant results<sup>23</sup>. However,  
340 the limited number of IVs adopted by this study (6 compared to ours 15), derived from a small-  
341 scale MVPA GWAS, might have compromised the precision of estimates due to insufficient  
342 power. By using the largest and most updated GWAS summary data for MVPA, findings from  
343 our MR suggested an inverse effect of MVPA on PhenoAgeAccel. This effect, however, largely  
344 dissipated after accounting for the effects of LST and other confounding factors, calling for  
345 further validation with more powerful IVs as they become available. Compared with the robust  
346 effects observed for LST, the substantially attenuated associations between MVPA and EAA  
347 measures further highlight the primary causal contribution of LST, rather than MVPA, in  
348 accelerating epigenetic aging.

349 Disintegrating genetically predicted LST, the major aging-accelerating risk factor, into tissue-  
350 partitioned subcomponents, our work further highlights an important role of skeletal muscle in

351 driving its causal effect on GrimAgeAccel. Loss of muscle mass and strength is a well-  
352 established distinctive feature of the aging process<sup>56</sup>, closely related to mobility impairments,  
353 physical frailty, and all-cause mortality<sup>57-59</sup>. Several mechanisms have been proposed to explain  
354 the alterations in skeletal muscle during aging, such as an imbalance between protein synthesis  
355 and degradation<sup>60</sup>, mitochondrial dysfunction<sup>61</sup>, a decrease in type II fiber satellite cells<sup>62</sup>, and  
356 infiltration of intramuscular and intermuscular fat<sup>63</sup>. Some of these mechanisms are indeed  
357 supported by the detected genes whose skeletal muscle-specific expression was colocalized  
358 with LST GWAS associations in our analysis (**Supplementary Table 16**) – for instance,  
359 *IGFBP2* (involved in IGF signaling pathways which closely influence protein synthesis and  
360 degradation<sup>64</sup>) and *ATP5J2* (involved in mitochondrial function and energy metabolism<sup>65</sup>),  
361 indicating energy use and metabolism alterations in muscles during prolonged sedentary  
362 periods. A plausible explanation for our identification is that the altered expression of genes  
363 associated with LST in skeletal muscle exacerbates muscle atrophy and weakness through  
364 multiple pathways (such as a decrease of energy expenditure and metabolism alterations)<sup>66 67</sup>,  
365 thereby accelerating biological aging<sup>58 64</sup>. Future research is needed to uncover the exact  
366 biological mechanisms, especially those related to muscle wasting or weakness during the aging  
367 process.

368 Taken together, our research provides valuable implications for clinical practice and public  
369 health policy by emphasizing the importance of reducing sedentary time as an effective lifestyle  
370 intervention to promote healthy aging. Our findings suggest that the acceleration of the  
371 biological aging process observed among individuals with a physically inactive lifestyle,  
372 resulting from prolonged sedentary time, cannot be fully offset by short periods of exercise or  
373 changes in other health-related lifestyles. Therefore, we advocate minimizing the overall  
374 sedentary time and adopting “interval activity” and “exercise snacks” strategies, encouraging  
375 short breaks for standing, walking, or stretching during prolonged sitting to stimulate muscle  
376 activity and mitigate the adverse effects of sedentarism<sup>68 69</sup>. Furthermore, our results emphasize  
377 the potential of the second-generation epigenetic clocks, particularly GrimAge, as a valuable  
378 tool for assessing the effects of interventions targeting the reduction of sedentary behavior.

379 Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, using self-reported MVPA as a proxy for  
380 physical activity may constrain our results by omitting factors like activity type, duration,  
381 intensity, and objective measurements. Additionally, our focus on self-reported LST may not  
382 capture the effects of other sedentary behaviors or differentiate between “mentally passive”  
383 (such as watching TV) and “mentally active” (such as using computers) sedentary activities due  
384 to data limitation<sup>70</sup>. Future investigations should delve deeper into these aspects for a more  
385 comprehensive understanding. Second, sample overlap in two-sample MR design is an  
386 important issue that needs to be considered<sup>71</sup>. In this study, ~5% of participants in the exposure

387 GWASs and ~20% of participants in the outcome GWASs included several of the same studies  
388 (inCHIANTI, TwinsUK, and the Rotterdam Study, etc.). To address this, we used the CAUSE  
389 method to correct for the sample overlap, reconfirming the robust causal effect of LST on  
390 GrimAgeAccel. Third, although our univariable MR yielded highly robust results, we observed  
391 that certain conditional  $F$ -statistics fell below 10 in multivariable MR settings. This suggests  
392 the potential presence of weak instrument bias, which could reduce the power of independent  
393 causal estimates in multivariable MR<sup>47</sup>. Therefore, the results of multivariable MR should be  
394 interpreted with caution, and future studies should aim to augment sample sizes and IVs to  
395 validate our findings. Finally, it should be noted that our tissue-partitioned MR analysis was  
396 hypothesis-driven rather than data-driven, indicating that our findings do not exclude the  
397 potential roles of other tissue-related pathways (beyond brain or skeletal muscle tissues) in  
398 driving the causal effect of genetically predicted LST on GrimAgeAccel. Future research is  
399 encouraged to explore these additional mechanisms.

#### 400 **Conclusion**

401 To conclude, our study provides evidence in support of physically inactive lifestyles, especially  
402 increased sedentary time, as a modifiable causal risk factor of epigenetic aging acceleration.  
403 Findings from tissue-partitioned analysis shed new light on the underlying mechanisms, with  
404 implications for skeletal muscle tissue-related pathways. Our work emphasizes the importance  
405 of reducing sedentary time as a preventive strategy to delay the aging process and promote  
406 healthy aging.

407

#### 408 **Availability of data and codes**

409 The data used in this study are publicly available. GWAS summary data are accessible in all  
410 original studies. GWAS summary data of leisure-time physical activity and sedentary behavior,  
411 <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/publications/36071172>, GWAS summary data of four epigenetic  
412 age acceleration measures, <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/publications/34187551> or  
413 <https://datashare.ed.ac.uk/handle/10283/3645>, GWAS summary data of educational attainment,  
414 <http://www.thessgac.org/data>, GWAS summary data of smoking and drinking,  
415 <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/publications/30643251>, GWAS summary data of BMI,  
416 <https://zenodo.org/record/1251813>, GWAS summary data of sleep duration,  
417 <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/publications/30846698>, GWAS summary data of parents age at  
418 death, <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/publications/29227965>.

419 The data of eQTL are accessible at the website of SMR (Summary Mendelian Randomization,  
420 <https://cnsgenomics.com/software/smr/>), which has already mapped the eQTL data to the hg19  
421 genome build using the GRCh37 reference assembly.

422 This paper does not report any original code. The software, R packages, and other resources  
423 used in this study are accessible at: LDSC, <https://github.com/bulik/ldsc>, PLINK,  
424 <https://www.cog-genomics.org/plink/1.9/>, LDlinkR, <https://github.com/CBIIT/LDlinkR>,  
425 TwoSampleMR, <https://mrcieu.github.io/TwoSampleMR/>, MR-PRESSO,  
426 <https://github.com/rondolab/MR-PRESSO>, NHGRI-EBI GWAS Catalog,  
427 <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/>, CAUSE, <https://github.com/jean997/cause>, MVMR,  
428 <https://github.com/WSpiller/MVMR>, MendelianRandomization,  
429 <https://github.com/cran/MendelianRandomization>, Coloc,  
430 <https://chr1swallace.github.io/coloc/>.

431 Any additional information required to reanalyze the data reported in this paper is available  
432 from the corresponding author (Xia Jiang, PhD, E-mail: [xia.jiang@ki.se](mailto:xia.jiang@ki.se), [xiajiang@scu.edu.cn](mailto:xiajiang@scu.edu.cn))  
433 upon reasonable request.

434

#### 435 **Consent for publication**

436 Not applicable.

437

#### 438 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

439 In our study, we utilized publicly available summary-level data from original studies that had  
440 received ethical approval and consent for participation.

441

#### 442 **Patient and public involvement**

443 Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or  
444 dissemination plans of our research.

445

#### 446 **Funding**

447 This study was supported by funds from the National Natural Science Foundation of China  
448 (82204170).

449

#### 450 **Acknowledgments**

451 We thank all the patients, staff, and investigators who contributed to the summary statistics  
452 used in this study. The GWAS meta-analysis of physical activity and sedentary behavior was  
453 conducted by Wang et al. The GWAS meta-analysis of EAA measures was conducted by

454 McCartney et al. The GWAS summary data of educational attainment from the Social Science  
455 Genetic Association Consortium was conducted by Lee et al. The GWAS summary data of  
456 smoking and drinking from the GWAS & Sequencing Consortium of Alcohol and Nicotine was  
457 conducted by Liu et al. The GWAS meta-analysis of BMI from the UK Biobank and the Genetic  
458 Investigation of Anthropometric Traits Consortium was conducted by Pulit et al. The GWAS  
459 summary data of sleep duration from the UK Biobank was conducted by Dashti et al. The  
460 GWAS summary data of parental longevity from the UK Biobank was conducted by Pilling et  
461 al. The meta-analysis of brain eQTL data was conducted by Qi et al., and the skeletal muscle  
462 eQTL data was obtained from the GTEx Consortium.

463

#### 464 **Competing interests**

465 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

466

#### 467 **Equity, diversity, and inclusion statement**

468 We support inclusive, diverse, and equitable conduct of research.

469

#### 470 **Author's contributions**

471 Conceptualization: X.J., J.L., X.Z., X.W. Data curation: X.Z., X.W. Formal analysis: X.Z.,  
472 X.W., L.H., L.S., Y.Q., C.X., C.Q., J.H., Q.D., J.Z. Funding acquisition: X.J. Investigation:  
473 X.Z., X.W., L.H., R.X. Methodology: L.H., J.X., R.X., Y.H., M.T. Project administration: X.Z.,  
474 X.W., S.Z., J.Z., T.Y., B.Y., X.S., T.H. Supervision: X.J., J.L., M.F., T.Z., J.L. Writing-original  
475 draft: X.Z., X.W. Writing-review & editing: X.J., X.Z., X.W., L.H.



1 **References:**

- 2 1. Ferrucci L, Levine ME, Kuo PL, et al. Time and the Metrics of Aging. *Circ Res*  
3 2018;123(7):740-44. doi: 10.1161/circresaha.118.312816
- 4 2. Kuo CL, Pilling LC, Liu Z, et al. Genetic associations for two biological age  
5 measures point to distinct aging phenotypes. *Aging Cell* 2021;20(6):e13376.  
6 doi: 10.1111/accel.13376 [published Online First: 20210526]
- 7 3. López-Otín C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, et al. Hallmarks of aging: An expanding  
8 universe. *Cell* 2023;186(2):243-78. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2022.11.001 [published  
9 Online First: 20230103]
- 10 4. Jylhävä J, Pedersen NL, Hägg S. Biological Age Predictors. *EBioMedicine*  
11 2017;21:29-36. doi: 10.1016/j.ebiom.2017.03.046 [published Online First:  
12 20170401]
- 13 5. Liu Z, Leung D, Thrush K, et al. Underlying features of epigenetic aging clocks in  
14 vivo and in vitro. *Aging Cell* 2020;19(10):e13229. doi: 10.1111/accel.13229  
15 [published Online First: 20200915]
- 16 6. Fransquet PD, Wrigglesworth J, Woods RL, et al. The epigenetic clock as a  
17 predictor of disease and mortality risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
18 *Clin Epigenetics* 2019;11(1):62. doi: 10.1186/s13148-019-0656-7 [published  
19 Online First: 20190411]
- 20 7. Oblak L, van der Zaag J, Higgins-Chen AT, et al. A systematic review of  
21 biological, social and environmental factors associated with epigenetic clock  
22 acceleration. *Ageing Res Rev* 2021;69:101348. doi: 10.1016/j.arr.2021.101348  
23 [published Online First: 20210428]
- 24 8. Ryan J, Wrigglesworth J, Loong J, et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of  
25 Environmental, Lifestyle, and Health Factors Associated With DNA  
26 Methylation Age. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2020;75(3):481-94. doi:  
27 10.1093/gerona/glz099
- 28 9. Johnson AA, English BW, Shokhirev MN, et al. Human age reversal: Fact or  
29 fiction? *Aging Cell* 2022;21(8):e13664. doi: 10.1111/accel.13664 [published  
30 Online First: 20220702]
- 31 10. Campisi J, Kapahi P, Lithgow GJ, et al. From discoveries in ageing research to  
32 therapeutics for healthy ageing. *Nature* 2019;571(7764):183-92. doi:  
33 10.1038/s41586-019-1365-2 [published Online First: 20190710]
- 34 11. Moore SC, Patel AV, Matthews CE, et al. Leisure time physical activity of  
35 moderate to vigorous intensity and mortality: a large pooled cohort analysis.  
36 *PLoS Med* 2012;9(11):e1001335. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001335  
37 [published Online First: 20121106]
- 38 12. Duggal NA, Pollock RD, Lazarus NR, et al. Major features of immunesenescence,  
39 including reduced thymic output, are ameliorated by high levels of physical  
40 activity in adulthood. *Aging Cell* 2018;17(2) doi: 10.1111/accel.12750  
41 [published Online First: 20180308]
- 42 13. Gale CR, Marioni RE, Čukić I, et al. The epigenetic clock and objectively  
43 measured sedentary and walking behavior in older adults: the Lothian Birth

- 44 Cohort 1936. *Clin Epigenetics* 2018;10:4. doi: 10.1186/s13148-017-0438-z  
45 [published Online First: 20180108]
- 46 14. Fox FAU, Liu D, Breteler MMB, et al. Physical activity is associated with slower  
47 epigenetic ageing-Findings from the Rhineland study. *Aging Cell*  
48 2023;22(6):e13828. doi: 10.1111/ace1.13828 [published Online First:  
49 20230410]
- 50 15. Kresovich JK, Garval EL, Martinez Lopez AM, et al. Associations of Body  
51 Composition and Physical Activity Level With Multiple Measures of  
52 Epigenetic Age Acceleration. *Am J Epidemiol* 2021;190(6):984-93. doi:  
53 10.1093/aje/kwaa251
- 54 16. Panahi S, Tremblay A. Sedentariness and Health: Is Sedentary Behavior More  
55 Than Just Physical Inactivity? *Front Public Health* 2018;6:258. doi:  
56 10.3389/fpubh.2018.00258 [published Online First: 20180910]
- 57 17. Ekelund U, Steene-Johannessen J, Brown WJ, et al. Does physical activity  
58 attenuate, or even eliminate, the detrimental association of sitting time with  
59 mortality? A harmonised meta-analysis of data from more than 1 million men  
60 and women. *Lancet* 2016;388(10051):1302-10. doi: 10.1016/s0140-  
61 6736(16)30370-1 [published Online First: 20160728]
- 62 18. Raffin J, de Souto Barreto P, Le Traon AP, et al. Sedentary behavior and the  
63 biological hallmarks of aging. *Ageing Res Rev* 2023;83:101807. doi:  
64 10.1016/j.arr.2022.101807 [published Online First: 20221122]
- 65 19. Burgess S, Scott RA, Timpson NJ, et al. Using published data in Mendelian  
66 randomization: a blueprint for efficient identification of causal risk factors.  
67 *Eur J Epidemiol* 2015;30(7):543-52. doi: 10.1007/s10654-015-0011-z  
68 [published Online First: 2015/03/17]
- 69 20. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Multivariable Mendelian randomization: the use of  
70 pleiotropic genetic variants to estimate causal effects. *Am J Epidemiol*  
71 2015;181(4):251-60. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwu283 [published Online First:  
72 20150127]
- 73 21. Leyden GM, Greenwood MP, Gaborieau V, et al. Disentangling the aetiological  
74 pathways between body mass index and site-specific cancer risk using tissue-  
75 partitioned Mendelian randomisation. *Br J Cancer* 2023;128(4):618-25. doi:  
76 10.1038/s41416-022-02060-6 [published Online First: 20221124]
- 77 22. Leyden GM, Shapland CY, Davey Smith G, et al. Harnessing tissue-specific  
78 genetic variation to dissect putative causal pathways between body mass index  
79 and cardiometabolic phenotypes. *Am J Hum Genet* 2022;109(2):240-52. doi:  
80 10.1016/j.ajhg.2021.12.013 [published Online First: 20220131]
- 81 23. Kong L, Ye C, Wang Y, et al. Genetic Evidence for Causal Effects of  
82 Socioeconomic, Lifestyle, and Cardiometabolic Factors on Epigenetic-Age  
83 Acceleration. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2023;78(7):1083-91. doi:  
84 10.1093/gerona/glad078

- 85 24. Wang Z, Emmerich A, Pillon NJ, et al. Genome-wide association analyses of  
86 physical activity and sedentary behavior provide insights into underlying  
87 mechanisms and roles in disease prevention. *Nat Genet* 2022;54(9):1332-44.  
88 doi: 10.1038/s41588-022-01165-1 [published Online First: 20220907]
- 89 25. McCartney DL, Min JL, Richmond RC, et al. Genome-wide association studies  
90 identify 137 genetic loci for DNA methylation biomarkers of aging. *Genome*  
91 *Biol* 2021;22(1):194. doi: 10.1186/s13059-021-02398-9 [published Online  
92 First: 20210629]
- 93 26. Skrivankova VW, Richmond RC, Woolf BAR, et al. Strengthening the Reporting  
94 of Observational Studies in Epidemiology Using Mendelian Randomization:  
95 The STROBE-MR Statement. *Jama* 2021;326(16):1614-21. doi:  
96 10.1001/jama.2021.18236
- 97 27. Hannum G, Guinney J, Zhao L, et al. Genome-wide methylation profiles reveal  
98 quantitative views of human aging rates. *Mol Cell* 2013;49(2):359-67. doi:  
99 10.1016/j.molcel.2012.10.016 [published Online First: 20121121]
- 100 28. Horvath S. DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types. *Genome Biol*  
101 2013;14(10):R115. doi: 10.1186/gb-2013-14-10-r115
- 102 29. Levine ME, Lu AT, Quach A, et al. An epigenetic biomarker of aging for lifespan  
103 and healthspan. *Aging (Albany NY)* 2018;10(4):573-91. doi:  
104 10.18632/aging.101414
- 105 30. Lu AT, Quach A, Wilson JG, et al. DNA methylation GrimAge strongly predicts  
106 lifespan and healthspan. *Aging (Albany NY)* 2019;11(2):303-27. doi:  
107 10.18632/aging.101684
- 108 31. Chen BH, Marioni RE, Colicino E, et al. DNA methylation-based measures of  
109 biological age: meta-analysis predicting time to death. *Aging (Albany NY)*  
110 2016;8(9):1844-65. doi: 10.18632/aging.101020
- 111 32. Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okbay A, et al. Gene discovery and polygenic prediction from  
112 a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1.1 million  
113 individuals. *Nat Genet* 2018;50(8):1112-21. doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0147-3  
114 [published Online First: 20180723]
- 115 33. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, et al. Association studies of up to 1.2 million  
116 individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol  
117 use. *Nat Genet* 2019;51(2):237-44. doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0307-5  
118 [published Online First: 20190114]
- 119 34. Pulit SL, Stoneman C, Morris AP, et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide  
120 association studies for body fat distribution in 694 649 individuals of  
121 European ancestry. *Hum Mol Genet* 2019;28(1):166-74. doi:  
122 10.1093/hmg/ddy327
- 123 35. Pilling LC, Kuo CL, Sicinski K, et al. Human longevity: 25 genetic loci associated  
124 in 389,166 UK biobank participants. *Aging (Albany NY)* 2017;9(12):2504-20.  
125 doi: 10.18632/aging.101334

- 126 36. Dashti HS, Jones SE, Wood AR, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies  
127 genetic loci for self-reported habitual sleep duration supported by  
128 accelerometer-derived estimates. *Nat Commun* 2019;10(1):1100. doi:  
129 10.1038/s41467-019-08917-4 [published Online First: 20190307]
- 130 37. Bulik-Sullivan B, Finucane HK, Anttila V, et al. An atlas of genetic correlations  
131 across human diseases and traits. *Nat Genet* 2015;47(11):1236-41. doi:  
132 10.1038/ng.3406 [published Online First: 20150928]
- 133 38. Bland JM, Altman DG. Multiple significance tests: the Bonferroni method. *Bmj*  
134 1995;310(6973):170. doi: 10.1136/bmj.310.6973.170
- 135 39. Myers TA, Chanock SJ, Machiela MJ. LDlinkR: An R Package for Rapidly  
136 Calculating Linkage Disequilibrium Statistics in Diverse Populations. *Front*  
137 *Genet* 2020;11:157. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2020.00157 [published Online First:  
138 20200228]
- 139 40. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Avoiding bias from weak instruments in Mendelian  
140 randomization studies. *Int J Epidemiol* 2011;40(3):755-64. doi:  
141 10.1093/ije/dyr036 [published Online First: 20110316]
- 142 41. Burgess S, Davey Smith G, Davies NM, et al. Guidelines for performing  
143 Mendelian randomization investigations: update for summer 2023. *Wellcome*  
144 *Open Res* 2019;4:186. doi: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15555.3 [published  
145 Online First: 20230804]
- 146 42. Bowden J, Del Greco MF, Minelli C, et al. Improving the accuracy of two-sample  
147 summary-data Mendelian randomization: moving beyond the NOME  
148 assumption. *Int J Epidemiol* 2019;48(3):728-42. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyy258
- 149 43. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid  
150 instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int*  
151 *J Epidemiol* 2015;44(2):512-25. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv080 [published Online  
152 First: 20150606]
- 153 44. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, et al. Consistent Estimation in  
154 Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted  
155 Median Estimator. *Genet Epidemiol* 2016;40(4):304-14. doi:  
156 10.1002/gepi.21965 [published Online First: 20160407]
- 157 45. Verbanck M, Chen CY, Neale B, et al. Detection of widespread horizontal  
158 pleiotropy in causal relationships inferred from Mendelian randomization  
159 between complex traits and diseases. *Nat Genet* 2018;50(5):693-98. doi:  
160 10.1038/s41588-018-0099-7 [published Online First: 20180423]
- 161 46. Morrison J, Knoblauch N, Marcus JH, et al. Mendelian randomization accounting  
162 for correlated and uncorrelated pleiotropic effects using genome-wide  
163 summary statistics. *Nat Genet* 2020;52(7):740-47. doi: 10.1038/s41588-020-  
164 0631-4 [published Online First: 20200525]
- 165 47. Sanderson E, Spiller W, Bowden J. Testing and correcting for weak and  
166 pleiotropic instruments in two-sample multivariable Mendelian randomization.

- 167 *Stat Med* 2021;40(25):5434-52. doi: 10.1002/sim.9133 [published Online  
168 First: 20210802]
- 169 48. Lightfoot JT, EJC DEG, Booth FW, et al. Biological/Genetic Regulation of  
170 Physical Activity Level: Consensus from GenBioPAC. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*  
171 2018;50(4):863-73. doi: 10.1249/mss.0000000000001499
- 172 49. Giambartolomei C, Vukcevic D, Schadt EE, et al. Bayesian test for colocalisation  
173 between pairs of genetic association studies using summary statistics. *PLoS*  
174 *Genet* 2014;10(5):e1004383. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1004383 [published  
175 Online First: 20140515]
- 176 50. Qi T, Wu Y, Zeng J, et al. Identifying gene targets for brain-related traits using  
177 transcriptomic and methylomic data from blood. *Nat Commun*  
178 2018;9(1):2282. doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-04558-1 [published Online First:  
179 20180611]
- 180 51. The GTEx Consortium atlas of genetic regulatory effects across human tissues.  
181 *Science* 2020;369(6509):1318-30. doi: 10.1126/science.aaz1776
- 182 52. Zhang W, Qu J, Liu GH, et al. The ageing epigenome and its rejuvenation. *Nat*  
183 *Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2020;21(3):137-50. doi: 10.1038/s41580-019-0204-5  
184 [published Online First: 20200204]
- 185 53. Crimmins EM, Thyagarajan B, Levine ME, et al. Associations of Age, Sex,  
186 Race/Ethnicity, and Education With 13 Epigenetic Clocks in a Nationally  
187 Representative U.S. Sample: The Health and Retirement Study. *J Gerontol A*  
188 *Biol Sci Med Sci* 2021;76(6):1117-23. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glab016
- 189 54. Spartano NL, Wang R, Yang Q, et al. Association of Accelerometer-Measured  
190 Physical Activity and Sedentary Time with Epigenetic Markers of Aging. *Med*  
191 *Sci Sports Exerc* 2023;55(2):264-72. doi: 10.1249/mss.0000000000003041  
192 [published Online First: 20220913]
- 193 55. Kankaanpää A, Tolvanen A, Joensuu L, et al. The associations of long-term  
194 physical activity in adulthood with later biological ageing and all-cause  
195 mortality - a prospective twin study. *medRxiv* 2023 doi:  
196 10.1101/2023.06.02.23290916 [published Online First: 20230605]
- 197 56. Roubenoff R. Sarcopenia and its implications for the elderly. *Eur J Clin Nutr*  
198 2000;54 Suppl 3:S40-7. doi: 10.1038/sj.ejcn.1601024
- 199 57. Janssen I, Heymsfield SB, Ross R. Low relative skeletal muscle mass (sarcopenia)  
200 in older persons is associated with functional impairment and physical  
201 disability. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2002;50(5):889-96. doi: 10.1046/j.1532-  
202 5415.2002.50216.x
- 203 58. Srikanthan P, Karlamangla AS. Muscle mass index as a predictor of longevity in  
204 older adults. *Am J Med* 2014;127(6):547-53. doi:  
205 10.1016/j.amjmed.2014.02.007 [published Online First: 20140218]
- 206 59. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, et al. Frailty in older adults: evidence for a  
207 phenotype. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2001;56(3):M146-56. doi:  
208 10.1093/gerona/56.3.m146

- 209 60. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Sayer AA. Sarcopenia. *Lancet* 2019;393(10191):2636-46. doi:  
210 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31138-9 [published Online First: 20190603]
- 211 61. Sakellariou GK, Vasilaki A, Palomero J, et al. Studies of mitochondrial and  
212 nonmitochondrial sources implicate nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide  
213 phosphate oxidase(s) in the increased skeletal muscle superoxide generation  
214 that occurs during contractile activity. *Antioxid Redox Signal* 2013;18(6):603-  
215 21. doi: 10.1089/ars.2012.4623 [published Online First: 20121206]
- 216 62. Verdijk LB, Snijders T, Drost M, et al. Satellite cells in human skeletal muscle;  
217 from birth to old age. *Age (Dordr)* 2014;36(2):545-7. doi: 10.1007/s11357-  
218 013-9583-2
- 219 63. Addison O, Drummond MJ, LaStayo PC, et al. Intramuscular fat and  
220 inflammation differ in older adults: the impact of frailty and inactivity. *J Nutr*  
221 *Health Aging* 2014;18(5):532-8. doi: 10.1007/s12603-014-0019-1
- 222 64. Shur NF, Creedon L, Skirrow S, et al. Age-related changes in muscle architecture  
223 and metabolism in humans: The likely contribution of physical inactivity to  
224 age-related functional decline. *Ageing Res Rev* 2021;68:101344. doi:  
225 10.1016/j.arr.2021.101344 [published Online First: 20210416]
- 226 65. Grevendonk L, Connell NJ, McCrum C, et al. Impact of aging and exercise on  
227 skeletal muscle mitochondrial capacity, energy metabolism, and physical  
228 function. *Nat Commun* 2021;12(1):4773. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-24956-2  
229 [published Online First: 20210806]
- 230 66. Pinto AJ, Bergouignan A, Dempsey PC, et al. Physiology of sedentary behavior.  
231 *Physiol Rev* 2023;103(4):2561-622. doi: 10.1152/physrev.00022.2022  
232 [published Online First: 20230616]
- 233 67. Tumasian RA, 3rd, Harish A, Kundu G, et al. Skeletal muscle transcriptome in  
234 healthy aging. *Nat Commun* 2021;12(1):2014. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-  
235 22168-2 [published Online First: 20210401]
- 236 68. Healy GN, Dunstan DW, Salmon J, et al. Breaks in sedentary time: beneficial  
237 associations with metabolic risk. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31(4):661-6. doi:  
238 10.2337/dc07-2046 [published Online First: 20080205]
- 239 69. Lai TF, Liao Y, Lin CY, et al. Diurnal pattern of breaks in sedentary time and the  
240 physical function of older adults. *Arch Public Health* 2023;81(1):35. doi:  
241 10.1186/s13690-023-01050-1 [published Online First: 20230306]
- 242 70. Kikuchi H, Inoue S, Sugiyama T, et al. Distinct associations of different sedentary  
243 behaviors with health-related attributes among older adults. *Prev Med*  
244 2014;67:335-9. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.08.011 [published Online First:  
245 20140810]
- 246 71. Burgess S, Davies NM, Thompson SG. Bias due to participant overlap in two-  
247 sample Mendelian randomization. *Genet Epidemiol* 2016;40(7):597-608. doi:  
248 10.1002/gepi.21998 [published Online First: 20160914]  
249

## 1 Tables and Figures

**Table 1. Genetic correlation between MVPA and LST with each measure of EAA**

| <b>Triat1</b> | <b>Trait2</b>             | <b><math>r_g</math></b> | <b>95%CI</b>            | <b>P-value</b>                           |
|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| MVPA          | HannumAgeAccel            | -0.073                  | (-0.186, 0.040)         | 0.20                                     |
|               | Intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel | -0.017                  | (-0.116, 0.083)         | 0.74                                     |
|               | <b>PhenoAgeAccel</b>      | <b>-0.179</b>           | <b>(-0.294, -0.063)</b> | <b><math>2.40 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>  |
|               | <b>GrimAgeAccel</b>       | <b>-0.294</b>           | <b>(-0.412, -0.177)</b> | <b><math>9.69 \times 10^{-7}</math></b>  |
| LST           | HannumAgeAccel            | 0.084                   | (0.001, 0.168)          | $4.84 \times 10^{-2}$                    |
|               | Intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel | 0.070                   | (-0.001, 0.142)         | 0.05                                     |
|               | <b>PhenoAgeAccel</b>      | <b>0.222</b>            | <b>(0.123, 0.320)</b>   | <b><math>1.02 \times 10^{-5}</math></b>  |
|               | <b>GrimAgeAccel</b>       | <b>0.368</b>            | <b>(0.262, 0.474)</b>   | <b><math>1.14 \times 10^{-11}</math></b> |


Bold-face:  $P$ -value  $< 6.25 \times 10^{-3}$ . MVPA (Moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity during leisure time), LST (leisure screen time), EAA (epigenetic age acceleration), HannumAgeAccel (Hannum age acceleration), Intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel (intrinsic Horvath age acceleration), PhenoAgeAccel (PhenoAge acceleration), GrimAgeAccel (GrimAge acceleration),  $r_g$  (genetic correlation), and 95%CI (95% confidence interval).

2

3

4

5



6


7 **Figure 1. The flowchart of the study.**

8 GWAS (genome-wide association study), HannumAgeAccel (Hannum age acceleration), Intrinsic

9 HorvathAgeAccel (intrinsic Horvath age acceleration), PhenoAgeAccel (PhenoAge acceleration), and

10 GrimAgeAccel (GrimAge acceleration).






11

12 **Figure 2. Total effects of physical activity and sedentary behavior on each epigenetic age**  
 13 **acceleration using univariable Mendelian randomization.**

14 Causal effects of MVPA on EAA are shown in the left panel (A), and causal effects of LST on EAA  
 15 are shown in the right panel (B). Diamonds represent the point estimates, and error bars represent 95%  
 16 confidence intervals. Estimates with gray diamond for CAUSE indicate that the null hypothesis for  
 17 model fitting was not rejected in CAUSE ( $P_{\text{causal vs. sharing}} > 0.05$ ), suggesting that the data are more likely  
 18 to be explained by horizontal pleiotropic effects. One asterisk (\*) represents  $P < 0.05$  and two asterisks  
 19 (\*\*\*) represent the tests that survived Bonferroni correction ( $P < 6.25 \times 10^{-3}$ ). IVW (inverse-variance  
 20 weighted), SNPs (single-nucleotide polymorphisms), MVPA (Moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical  
 21 activity during leisure time), LST (leisure screen time), HannumAgeAccel (Hannum age acceleration),  
 22 Intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel (intrinsic Horvath age acceleration), PhenoAgeAccel (PhenoAge  
 23 acceleration), GrimAgeAccel (GrimAge acceleration), and 95%CI (95% confidence interval).




24

25 **Figure 3. Independent effects of physical activity and sedentary behavior on each epigenetic age**  
26 **acceleration using multivariable Mendelian randomization analysis.**

27 Independent causal effects of MVPA on EAA are shown in the upper panel (A), and independent causal  
28 effects of LST on EAA are shown in the lower panel (B). One asterisk (\*) represents  $P < 0.05$  and two  
29 asterisks (\*\*) represent the tests that survived Bonferroni correction ( $P < 6.25 \times 10^{-3}$ ). Diamonds  
30 represent the point estimates of total causal effects, and error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.  
31 M1 (Model 1) estimates the independent effects of MVPA and LST from each other. M2 (Model 2)  
32 estimates the independent effects of exposures after adjusting for one confounder at a time. M3 (Model  
33 3) estimates the independent effects of exposures after adjusting for all confounders together. Blue  
34 represents a negative effect and red represents a positive effect. The darker the color, the larger the  
35 absolute value of the effect.

36 MVPA (Moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity during leisure time), LST (leisure screen time),  
37 HannumAgeAccel (Hannum age acceleration), Intrinsic HorvathAgeAccel (intrinsic Horvath age  
38 acceleration), PhenoAgeAccel (PhenoAge acceleration), and GrimAgeAccel (GrimAge acceleration),  
39 M2.adjEducational.attainment (causal effects of exposures on outcomes after controlling by educational  
40 attainment), M2.adjSmoking.initiation (causal effects of exposures on outcomes after controlling by  
41 smoking initiation), M2.adjAlcohol.consumption (causal effects of exposures on outcomes after  
42 controlling by alcohol consumption), M2.adjSleep.duration (causal effects of exposures on outcomes  
43 after controlling by sleep duration), and M2.adjParents.age.at.death (causal effects of exposures on  
44 outcomes after controlling by longevity).



45

46 **Figure 4. The effects of brain- and skeletal muscle-tissue instrumented LST on GrimAgeAccel**  
 47 **using tissue-partitioned Mendelian randomization analysis.**

48 Univariable MR analysis evaluates the unadjusted effects of phenotypic subcomponents of brain-tissue  
 49 instrumented LST and skeletal muscle-tissue instrumented LST on GrimAgeAccel, while multivariable  
 50 MR estimates the putatively independent effects of each subcomponent with IVs weighted by their  
 51 PPH4 values for each tissue type. Diamonds represent the point estimates, and error bars represent 95%  
 52 confidence intervals. One asterisk (\*) represents  $P < 0.05$ . LST (leisure screen time), GrimAgeAccel  
 53 (GrimAge acceleration), MR (Mendelian randomization), and 95%CI (95% confidence interval).

54