

1 **TITLE: Predicting thoracic aortic dissection in a diverse biobank using a**  
2 **polygenic risk score**

3  
4 **Authors:** John DePaolo, MD, PhD,<sup>1\*</sup> Siavash Zamirpour, MS,<sup>2\*</sup> Sarah Abramowitz,  
5 BA,<sup>1</sup> Gina Biagetti, MD,<sup>3</sup> Renae Judy, MS,<sup>1</sup> Cameron Beeche, BS,<sup>4,5</sup> Jeffrey Duda<sup>6</sup>,  
6 James Gee<sup>6</sup>, Walter R. Witschey, PhD,<sup>6</sup> Julio A. Chirinos, MD, PhD,<sup>5</sup> Nicholas J. Goel,  
7 MD,<sup>7</sup> Nimesh Desai, MD, PhD,<sup>7</sup> Wilson Y. Szeto, MD,<sup>7</sup> Dongchuan Guo, PhD,<sup>8</sup> Dianna  
8 M. Milewicz, MD, PhD,<sup>8</sup> Michael G. Levin, MD,<sup>5,9</sup> James P. Pirruccello, MD<sup>2,10,11#</sup> Scott  
9 M. Damrauer, MD,<sup>3,9,12,13#</sup>

10  
11 **Affiliations:**

12 <sup>1</sup> Department of Surgery, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania,  
13 Philadelphia, PA, USA.

14 <sup>2</sup> Institute for Human Genetics, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco,  
15 CA, USA.

16 <sup>3</sup> Division of Vascular Surgery and Endovascular Therapy, Department of Surgery,  
17 Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

18 <sup>4</sup> Department of Bioengineering, University of Pennsylvania, PA, USA.

19 <sup>5</sup> Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Medicine, Perelman School of  
20 Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, PA, USA.

21 <sup>6</sup> Department of Radiology, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania,  
22 PA, USA.

23 <sup>7</sup> Division of Cardiovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, Perelman School of  
24 Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

25 <sup>8</sup> Division of Medical Genetics, Department of Internal Medicine, McGovern Medical  
26 School, University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, Houston, TX, USA.

27 <sup>9</sup> Corporal Michael J. Crescenz VA Medical Center, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

28 <sup>10</sup> Division of Cardiology, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA,  
29 USA.

30 <sup>11</sup> Bakar Computation Health Sciences Institute, University of California San Francisco,  
31 San Francisco, CA, USA.

32 <sup>12</sup> Cardiovascular Institute, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania,  
33 PA, USA.

34 <sup>13</sup> Department of Genetics, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania,  
35 Philadelphia, PA, USA.

36  
37  
38 \* These authors contributed equally to this work

39 # These authors jointly supervised the work

40  
41  
42 **Brief Title:** Polygenic scoring for dissection risk

43 **Word count :** 4305

44 **References :** 41

45 **Tables :** 1

46 **Figures :** 4

47

48 **Address for correspondence:**

49 Scott Damrauer, MD

50 Division of Vascular Surgery and Endovascular Therapy

51 Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania

52 3400 Civic Center Drive, 14th Floor South Perelman Center

53 Philadelphia, PA 19104

54 Office: 215-615-1698

55 [damrauer@upenn.edu](mailto:damrauer@upenn.edu)

56 **Abstract**

57 **Background:** Thoracic aortic dissection is a life-threatening condition that often occurs  
58 in the presence of aortic dilation. Despite a known association between ascending aortic  
59 diameter (AscAoD) and dissection risk, predicting dissection risk remains challenging.

60 **Objectives:** Determine whether common variant genetics can be used to improve  
61 identification of individuals most at risk for dissection.

62 **Methods:** A genome wide association study (GWAS)-by-subtraction was performed to  
63 characterize the diameter-independent genetics of thoracic aortic dissection by  
64 subtracting a GWAS of aortic diameter (AoD) from a GWAS of thoracic aortic aneurysm  
65 and dissection (TAAD). A polygenic risk score (PRS) was calculated using the PRS-  
66 Continuous Shrinkage statistical package and evaluated for its ability to predict aortic  
67 dissection. The primary analytic cohort was Penn Medicine Biobank (PMBB) which  
68 comprises volunteers consenting to linkage of health records with biospecimens,  
69 including DNA which has undergone genome-wide genotyping; additional analyses  
70 were performed in the National Institutes of Health All of Us (AoU) cohort.

71 **Results:** We identified 43 significant genetic risk loci in our GWAS-by-subtraction and  
72 derived a “Dissection-PRS.” In the PMBB, the Dissection-PRS associated with an  
73 increased risk of prevalent dissection (odds ratio [OR]=2.13 per 1 standard deviation  
74 [sd] increase in Dissection-PRS, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.91 to 2.39,  $P<0.001$ ),  
75 These results were consistent when excluding individuals with pathogenic or likely  
76 pathogenic variants in established aortopathy genes. When adjusting for clinical risk  
77 factors including ascending aortic diameter, the association of the Dissection-PRS with  
78 prevalent dissection attenuated but remained significant (OR=1.62 per 1 sd increase in

79 PRS, 95% CI 1.36 to 1.94,  $P < 0.001$ ). The addition of the PRS to a model containing  
80 age, sex, clinical risk factors, and ascending aortic diameter substantially improved  
81 model discrimination (base model area under the receiver operator characteristic curve  
82 [AUROC]=0.676, 95% CI 0.651 to 0.702; with addition of PRS AUROC=0.723, 95% CI  
83 0.702 to 0.744). Analysis in AoU demonstrated similar findings.

84 **Conclusions:** A common-variant PRS can predict aortic dissection in a diverse  
85 population.

86 **Abbreviations**

87 **AoD** Aortic diameter

88 **AscAoD** Ascending aortic diameter

89 **AUROC** Area under the receiver operator characteristic curve

90 **CI** Confidence interval

91 **CT** Computed tomography

92 **CRF** Clinical Risk Factors

93 **DesAoD** Descending aortic diameter

94 **PRS** Polygenic risk score

95 **ROC** Receiver operator characteristic curve

96 **SEM** Structural equation modeling

97 **TAAD** Thoracic aortic aneurysm and dissection

98 **TTE** Transthoracic echocardiography

99

100 **Main Text**

101 **Introduction**

102 Thoracic aortic dissection is characterized by tearing of the intimal layer of the  
103 thoracic aorta, more commonly in the ascending portion (Stanford Type A dissection),  
104 leading to formation of a false lumen resulting in antegrade and/or retrograde  
105 malperfusion.<sup>1</sup> Dissection has an incidence rate of approximately 3-10 per 100,000  
106 individuals annually,<sup>2-5</sup> and although rare, acute dissection can have devastating health  
107 consequences with 30-day mortality rates ranging from 17% to more than 50% when  
108 considering out-of-hospital deaths.<sup>6-11</sup> Currently, individuals with dilated or aneurysmal  
109 thoracic aortas are treated with aggressive blood pressure management and serial  
110 imaging with elective surgical repair at ascending thoracic aortic diameters (AscAoD)  $\geq$   
111 5-5.5 cm.<sup>12</sup> However, it has become increasingly evident by the prevalence of dissection  
112 among individuals with AscAoD < 5.5 cm that this size cutoff alone is insufficient to  
113 guide clinical decision making.<sup>13</sup>

114 Dissection, along with ascending and descending thoracic aortic aneurysms, are  
115 included in the group of related conditions referred to as thoracic aortic aneurysm and  
116 dissection (TAAD). Rare pathogenic (P) or likely pathogenic (LP) variants in several  
117 Mendelian aortopathy genes associated with hereditary TAAD (HTAAD) are causally  
118 linked to familial and/or syndromic disease.<sup>14,15</sup> Notably, due to overwhelming genetic  
119 risk, the size threshold for surgical intervention to prevent dissection is lower among  
120 individuals with P/LP rare variants in a subset of aortopathy genes associated with  
121 familial or syndromic disease.<sup>12</sup> Despite TAAD being historically thought of as a  
122 Mendelian disease, approximately 80% of cases of TAAD occur among individuals

123 without evidence of heritable disease.<sup>16</sup> Recent genome-wide association studies  
124 (GWAS) have identified dozens of common single nucleotide variants (SNVs)  
125 associated with increased thoracic aortic diameter (AoD),<sup>17,18</sup> and TAAD.<sup>19</sup> To  
126 characterize common variant risk, polygenic risk scores (PRS) have been constructed  
127 from these GWAS data using different methodologies and have shown consistent  
128 association with prevalent and incident thoracic aortic disease in different biobank  
129 cohorts.<sup>17-19</sup>

130 In this study, we utilized Genomic-Structural Equation Modeling (Genomic-SEM)  
131 to perform a GWAS-by-subtraction to determine the diameter independent common  
132 genetic variants associated with dissection. This procedure revealed 43 genome-wide  
133 significant genetic risk loci associated with diameter-independent thoracic aortic  
134 disease. From this GWAS we generated a “Dissection-PRS” that better associates with  
135 prevalent dissection compared to existing PRSs. Using this novel Dissection-PRS, we  
136 were able to predict individuals who are most at risk of dissection independent of other  
137 clinical factors, including aortic size.

138

## 139 **Methods**

140 *Study Population*

141 PMBB

142 The Penn Medicine BioBank is a genomic and precision medicine cohort  
143 comprising participants who receive care in the Penn Medicine health system and who  
144 consent to linkage of electronic health records with biospecimens, including 43,731 with  
145 DNA which has undergone whole exome sequencing and 43,623 which has undergone

146 genome-wide genotyping ([pmbb.med.upenn.edu](http://pmbb.med.upenn.edu)).<sup>20</sup> Among these individuals, 7,947  
147 have had at least one transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) study with a recorded  
148 measurement of AscAoD or a computed tomography (CT) scan with an interpretable  
149 aortic diameter. Details of the genetic acquisition, quality control, and assignment of  
150 population groups are included in the **Supplemental Methods**.

151

### 152 All of Us

153 The *All of Us* (AOU) research program is a multi-site, prospective cohort study in  
154 the United States.<sup>21</sup> The enrollment process included a physical examination and  
155 biospecimen collection, with follow-up based on electronic health record (EHR) records  
156 and surveys. All participants provided written, informed consent. Analysis of AOU was  
157 considered exempt by the UCSF IRB (#22-37715). Further information regarding  
158 genetic information and data analysis of the *AOU* cohort are provided in the  
159 **Supplemental Methods**.

160

### 161 *Primary outcome in the PMBB*

162 The primary outcome of our study was thoracic aortic dissection. Dissection was  
163 defined either as  $\geq 2$  outpatient or  $\geq 1$  inpatient encounters coded with *International*  
164 *Classification of Diseases, 10<sup>th</sup> Revision* (ICD10) diagnosis codes I71.01 or I71.03, or  
165 *International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision* (ICD9) codes 441.01 or 441.03.

166

### 167 *Clinical Covariate Selection*



168 Previous studies have identified several clinical variables as risk factors for  
169 ascending thoracic aortic dilation and/or dissection.<sup>22-25</sup> From these studies, we selected  
170 those covariates that are most easily and universally assessed, referred to as clinical  
171 risk factors (CRF), including height, weight, body mass index (BMI), body surface area  
172 (BSA), systolic blood pressure (SBP), diastolic blood pressure (DBP), and heart rate  
173 (HR). For each individual, the mean value of each covariate taken over time was used  
174 in the analysis. In a subset of the analyses, we also used AscAoD as measured by  
175 either TTE, or computed tomography (CT). Participant TTE measurements were derived  
176 from clinical echocardiography reports recorded in EHR. CT measurements were  
177 derived using automated segmentation of the ascending aorta as previously  
178 described.<sup>26</sup>

179

#### 180 *Genome Wide Association Study*

181 GWAS-by-subtraction was performed using Genomic-Structural Equation  
182 Modeling (SEM), as previously described.<sup>27</sup> Genomic-SEM is a flexible modeling  
183 framework that allows a user to create systems of equations to model relationships  
184 between the genetic components of observed traits and related latent traits. Because  
185 TAAD comprises both aortic aneurysm (i.e. large aortic diameter) and dissection, we  
186 posited that subtracting the genetic contribution of aortic size from TAAD would isolate  
187 the genetics of aortic dissection. Using publicly available summary statistics from  
188 GWAS of TAAD,<sup>19</sup> ascending aortic diameter (AscAoD),<sup>17</sup> and descending aortic  
189 diameter (DesAoD)<sup>17</sup> (summary information in **Supplemental Table 1**) we employed  
190 the genomic-SEM framework to perform GWAS-by-subtraction based on a Cholesky

191 decomposition model that subtracts out the genetic covariance contributed by multiple  
192 related traits resulting in a novel GWAS of latent traits.<sup>28</sup> This allowed us to identify  
193 variants uniquely associated with TAAO and independent of AscAoD or DesAoD.<sup>29</sup>

194 The objective of this method was to estimate the association with TAAO  
195 independent of that variant's association with AscAoD and DesAoD for each genetic  
196 variant identified in the TAAO parent GWAS. To do this, the Cholesky decomposition  
197 model (**Supplemental Figure 1**) regressed each genetic variant on three latent factors:  
198 one defined as all aortic diameter plus TAAO (AscAoD + DesAoD + TAAO), a second  
199 defined as descending aortic diameter + TAAO – ascending aortic diameter [(DesAoD +  
200 TAAO) – AscAoD], and a third defined as diameter-independent TAAO (TAAO –  
201 (AscAoD + DesAoD)), which we posit represents dissection alone. In creating such a  
202 model, we assume that all genetic variants that affect thoracic aortic diameter also  
203 affect TAAO. The analysis allows for three paths by which a genetic variant can affect  
204 TAAO: first, mediated through aortic diameter + the TAAO latent trait (Latent Trait 1);  
205 second, mediated through just the DesAoD + TAAO) – AscAoD latent trait (Latent Trait  
206 2), and finally mediated through the diameter-independent TAAO latent trait (Latent Trait  
207 3), our latent trait of focus. Each genetic variant was regressed on each latent trait to  
208 determine the effect size specific to the latent trait of interest. Independent lead loci for  
209 the diameter-independent TAAO latent trait were then selected using  $P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$ , a radius  
210 of 250kb, and an LD threshold of  $r^2 < 0.001$ .

211

212 *Polygenic risk score creation*

213 PRS-CSx-auto<sup>30</sup> was used to construct a PRS for each of the following traits: 1)  
214 AscAoD from a GWAS performed among 38,694 UKB participants;<sup>17</sup> 2) TAAD from a  
215 GWAS among a diverse population of 461,669 MVP participants (8,626 cases, 453,043  
216 disease-free controls);<sup>19</sup> 3) thoracic aortic dissection (“Dissection-PRS”) using our  
217 GWAS-by-subtraction summary statistics described above. These are described further  
218 in the **Supplemental Methods**.

219 To apply each PRS in the PMBB, individual participant scores were calculated  
220 using `pgsc_calc`, a pipeline developed by the PGS Catalog that computes individual  
221 scores by combining imputed genotypes with PRS weights.<sup>31</sup> As allele frequency  
222 differences across diverse populations can influence PRS distribution and limit  
223 accuracy, `pgsc_calc` allows a genetic principal component (PC)-based method to  
224 normalize scores across populations by adjusting the mean and variance relative to the  
225 1000 Genomes Project and Human Genomes Diversity Project (HGDP).<sup>32</sup> In this  
226 approach, a PC space is created using reference populations and a PRS is modeled as  
227 a linear function of the PCs. Score residuals are calculated as the difference between  
228 the observed and predicted PRS, and then divided by the standard deviation of the  
229 residuals. This ensures that the adjusted PRS values have a mean of 0 when  
230 considering the influence of population diversity. To adjust for the variations in PRS  
231 range, the variance of the residuals is modeled as a function of the PCs, and then is  
232 used to normalize the residual PRS. The variance of the final PRS values distribution is  
233 therefore approximately 1 across all populations.

234

235 *Prediction model creation*

236 Using the selected clinical covariates and the Dissection-PRS we created, we  
237 derived the following six regression models to predict dissection in the PMBB:

238 1) Age + Sex + genetic PC1-PC5 (Age + Sex model)

239 2) Age + Sex + genetic PC1-PC5 + Clinical Risk Factors (Age + Sex + CRF  
240 model)

241 3) Age + Sex + genetic PC1-PC5 + Clinical Research Factors + Dissection-PRS  
242 (Age + Sex + CRF + PRS model)

243 4) Age + Sex + genetic PC1-PC5 + Clinical Research Factors + AscAoD (Age +  
244 Sex + CRF + AscAoD model)

245 5) Age + Sex + genetic PC1-PC5 + Clinical Research Factors + AscAoD +  
246 Dissection-PRS (Age + Sex + CRF + AscAoD + PRS model)

247 Prediction model cross-validation and statistical testing is described in the

## 248 **Supplemental Methods.**

249

### 250 *Statistical Analysis*

251 Multivariable logistic regression was employed to evaluate the risk of prevalent  
252 dissection associated with the Dissection-PRS adjusting for age, sex, and genetic PCs  
253 1-5. Incident dissection was modeled with Cox proportional hazards model with the R  
254 survival package,<sup>33</sup> and including the same covariates, as above. Where described,  
255 other covariates were added to specific analyses. All statistical analyses were performed  
256 in R version 4.3.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

## 257 **Results**

258 *Study population for PRS Analysis*

259           The primary analysis was performed in the Penn Medicine BioBank (PMBB).  
260   There were 43,249 participants in the analytic cohort (**Table 1**), of which 262 individuals  
261   had a diagnosis of aortic dissection. Of those with a dissection 86 (33%) were female,  
262   76 (29%) were genetically similar to the 1000 Genomes Project (1000G) African  
263   reference population (AFR), and the median age at analysis of individuals was 63.4  
264   years (interquartile range [IQR]: 53.9-71.1 years). Among those without a diagnosis of  
265   dissection, 21,576 (50%) were female, 11,035 (26%) were genetically similar to the  
266   1000G AFR reference population, and the median age at analysis was 57.2 years (IQR:  
267   42.5-67.2 years). Overall, individuals with a diagnosis of dissection had greater median  
268   height (175.3 cm compared to 170.2 cm), weight (86.2 kg compared to 83.0 kg), body  
269   mass index (BMI) [28.5 compared to 28.2], body surface area (BSA) [2.02 m<sup>2</sup> compared  
270   to 1.96 m<sup>2</sup>], and systolic blood pressure (127.5 mmHg compared to 126.3 mmHg).  
271   Concurrently, individuals with a diagnosis of dissection had a lower median diastolic  
272   blood pressure (70.7 mmHg compared to 74.0 mmHg) and heart rate (73.9 beats per  
273   minute [bpm] compared to 77.2 bpm).

274           Replication analyses were performed in the AOU cohort. There were 245,149  
275   participants in this cohort, 133,444 of whom were genetically similar to the 1000G  
276   European reference population (EUR) and 56,870 genetically similar to the 1000G AFR  
277   reference population. Of the 205 individuals with diagnosis of dissection, 114 were  
278   genetically similar to the 1000G EUR reference population and 65 were genetically  
279   similar to the 1000G AFR reference population.

280

281   *Genome-wide association study-by-subtraction*

282 Previously, we published a GWAS of TAAD performed among a diverse  
283 population in the Million Veterans Program (MVP) that identified 21 genetic risk loci  
284 associated with TAAD.<sup>19</sup> Similarly, we published a GWAS of AscAoD and DesAoD in  
285 the UK Biobank that identified 82 (AscAoD) and 47 (DesAoD) independent loci,  
286 respectively.<sup>17</sup> In an attempt to better characterize the pathologic variants associated  
287 with dissection but independent from thoracic AoD, we performed a GWAS-by-  
288 subtraction<sup>27</sup> using the Genomic-SEM framework<sup>29</sup> to model the genetics of a novel  
289 latent trait referred to as “diameter-independent dissection”. Using this methodology, we  
290 identified 43 independent risk loci that reached genome-wide significance and were  
291 primarily associated with thoracic aortic dissection independently of their effects on  
292 aortic diameter, (**Figure 1, Supplemental Tables 2-3, Supplemental Figures 2-5**)  
293 described further in the **Supplemental Results**.

294

### 295 *Polygenic risk score association with prevalent thoracic aortic dissection*

296 To determine whether we could use genetic information to better predict  
297 dissection, we used our GWAS-by-subtraction summary statistics to create a diameter-  
298 independent dissection PRS, referred to as the “Dissection-PRS.” Individuals in the  
299 PMBB, an independent cohort of patients separate from the parent GWAS included in  
300 the GWAS-by-subtraction, were then used to assess the PRS association with prevalent  
301 thoracic aortic dissection (**Central Illustration**).

302 Compared to individuals without a diagnosis of dissection (median PRS = 0.03,  
303 95% CI = 0.01 to 0.04), individuals with a diagnosis of dissection had a significantly  
304 higher median PRS (0.88, 95% CI 0.68 to 1.06,  $P=1.07 \times 10^{-30}$ ) [**Supplemental Figure**

305 **6]**. To further characterize the strength of the Dissection-PRS, we compared its  
306 association with prevalent dissection in the PMBB to the association of either a TAAD-  
307 PRS or AscAoD-PRS. Compared to the AscAoD-PRS (OR=1.27 per 1 sd increase in  
308 PRS, 95% CI 1.13 to 1.44,  $P<0.001$ ) and the TAAD-PRS (OR=1.34 per 1 sd increase in  
309 PRS, 95% CI 1.19 to 1.51,  $P<0.001$ ), the Dissection-PRS had a profoundly stronger  
310 association with prevalent dissection (OR=2.13 per 1 sd increase in PRS, 95% CI 1.91  
311 to 2.39,  $P<0.001$ ) [**Central Illustration**]. This was consistent when individuals were  
312 stratified by genetically similar population group (EUR: OR=1.93 per 1 sd increase in  
313 PRS, 95% CI 1.67 to 2.23,  $P<0.001$ ; AFR: OR=2.61 per 1 sd increase in PRS, 95% CI  
314 2.14 to 3.18,  $P<0.001$ ; Meta: OR=2.14 per 1 sd increase in PRS, 95% CI 1.91 to 2.41,  
315  $P<0.001$ ) [**Supplemental Figure 7**], and when individuals carrying pathogenic/likely  
316 pathogenic (P/LP) HTAAD gene variants were excluded from the analysis (OR=2.15 per  
317 1 sd increase in PRS, 95% CI 1.91 to 2.42,  $P<0.001$ ) [**Supplemental Figure 8**].

318 To validate our findings, analyses were replicated in the AOU cohort with genetic  
319 data (N=245,149, including 132 participants with prevalent dissection). In this cohort,  
320 the Dissection-PRS remained robustly associated with prevalent dissection (OR=1.48,  
321 95% CI 1.27 to 1.74,  $P<0.001$ ). When stratified by population group, similar results were  
322 observed in the EUR population that included 73 cases of prevalent dissection  
323 (OR=1.89, 95% CI 1.52 to 2.34,  $P<0.001$ ), however the association was not statistically  
324 significant among AFR population that included 38 cases of dissection (OR=1.09, 95%  
325 CI 0.82 to 1.45,  $P=0.57$ ). We conclude that the Dissection-PRS strongly associates with  
326 prevalent dissection in PMBB across diverse populations, has been externally validated

327 in AOU though with an attenuated effect in the AFR population, and is independent of  
328 P/LP HTAAD gene variants.

### 329 *Effect of Dissection-PRS when adjusting for known risk factors*

330 To determine if the Dissection-PRS was independently associated with prevalent  
331 dissection independent of other risk factors, we performed multivariable logistic  
332 regression analysis adjusting for CRF including age, sex, height, weight, BMI, BSA,  
333 SBP, DBP, and HR. When we adjusted for these variables, the effect of the Dissection-  
334 PRS remained consistent (OR=2.29 per 1 sd increase in PRS, 95% CI 1.97 to 2.65,  
335  $P<0.001$ ) [**Figure 3**].

336 As AscAoD is the most critical clinical factor in determining when to offer surgical  
337 intervention,<sup>12,13</sup> we repeated our multivariable logistic regression to also adjust for  
338 AscAoD among 7,974 individuals with AscAoD measured by TTE (7,414) or CT (560)  
339 [**Supplemental Table 4**]. When adjusting for AscAoD alone (OR=1.59 per 1 sd increase  
340 in PRS, 95% CI 1.33 to 1.92,  $P<0.001$ ), or AscAoD and CRF (OR=1.61 per 1 sd  
341 increase in PRS, 95% CI 1.35 to 1.92,  $P<0.001$ ), the effect estimate of the Dissection-  
342 PRS was attenuated but remained statistically significant [**Figure 3**]. These results  
343 suggest that the risk of dissection associated with the Dissection-PRS is completely  
344 independent of CRFs and largely independent of measured AscAoD.

345

### 346 *PRS effect on predictive model calibration*

347 To determine if the Dissection-PRS could improve identification of individuals at  
348 increased risk of dissection, we integrated the Dissection-PRS in prediction models and  
349 compared model performance with and without the PRS. To determine the effect of the



350 Dissection-PRS on model calibration, we assessed differences in model log-loss. Log-  
351 loss is a measure of how close a predictive probability is to the corresponding actual  
352 value with a lower log-loss equating to model improvement; a lower log-loss connotes  
353 improved model calibration. A prediction model constructed with just age, sex, and the  
354 first 5 genetic PCs (Age + Sex) had a log-loss of 0.075 (95% CI 0.070 to 0.080)  
355 **[Supplemental Figure 9]**. Compared to an Age + Sex + CRF model that integrated  
356 weight, BMI, height, BSA, SBP, DBP, and HR (log-loss=0.074, 95% CI 0.069 to 0.079),  
357 an Age + Sex + CRF + Dissection-PRS had an improved model log-loss (log-  
358 loss=0.071, 95% CI 0.066 to 0.076). Similarly, compared to an Age + Sex + CRF +  
359 AscAoD model (log-loss=0.071, 95% CI 0.066 to 0.076), an Age + Sex + CRF +  
360 AscAoD + Dissection-PRS had an improved log-loss (log-loss=0.069, 95% CI 0.064 to  
361 0.074). To determine if the addition of the Dissection-PRS meaningfully improved model  
362 calibration, we employed cross-model Bayesian ANOVA analysis of log-loss. The  
363 addition of the Dissection-PRS to the Age + Sex + CRF model (mean log-loss difference  
364 = -0.002, 95% credible interval -0.004 to 0.000; >95% probability of a practical  
365 improvement in log-loss) and the Age + Sex + CRF + AscAoD (mean log-loss difference  
366 = -0.002, 95% credible interval -0.004 to 0.001; >88% probability of a practical  
367 improvement in log-loss) **[Supplemental Figure 10, Supplemental Table 5]**,  
368 demonstrated that the Dissection-PRS meaningfully improved model log-loss. These  
369 results were also supported in analyses using a frequentist approach employing the  
370 likelihood-ratio test (**Supplemental Table 6**). Finally, model calibration improvement  
371 with the addition of the Dissection-PRS was consistent when stratifying by either sex  
372 (**Supplemental Figures 11-13, Summary Tables 7-8**) or genetically similar population

373 group (**Supplemental Figures 14-16, Summary Tables 9-10**). These results lead us to  
374 conclude that the Dissection-PRS consistently enhances clinical model calibration.

375 *PRS effect on model discrimination*

376 The ability to determine patients most at risk of dissection, especially among  
377 individuals with ascending thoracic aortic dilation, remains elusive. To investigate  
378 whether the Dissection-PRS could meaningfully improve clinical prediction model  
379 discrimination between individuals with and without dissection, we tested whether its  
380 inclusion increased model area under receiver operator characteristic curve (AUROC).  
381 The Age + Sex model had an AUROC=0.572 (95% CI 0.547 to 0.597) [**Figure 4**]. The  
382 Age + Sex + CRF model had an AUROC=0.634 (95% CI 0.610 to 0.657), whereas the  
383 Age + Sex + CRF + Dissection-PRS had an AUROC=0.700 (95% CI 0.677 to 0.722).  
384 Similarly, the Age + Sex + CRF + AscAoD model had an AUROC=0.676 (95% CI 0.651  
385 to 0.702), whereas the Age + Sex + CRF + AscAoD + Dissection-PRS model had an  
386 AUROC=0.723 (95% CI 0.702 to 0.744). To determine if the addition of the PRS  
387 meaningfully improved model discrimination, we once more employed cross-model  
388 Bayesian analysis of AUROC. The addition of the Dissection-PRS to the Age + Sex +  
389 CRF model (AUROC mean difference = 0.066, 95% credible interval 0.057 to 0.075;  
390 >95% probability of a practical improvement in AUROC) and the Age + Sex + CRF +  
391 AscAoD (AUROC mean difference = 0.047, 95% credible interval 0.037 to 0.056; >95%  
392 probability of a practical improvement in AUROC) [**Supplemental Figure 17,**  
393 **Supplemental Table 11**], demonstrated that the Dissection-PRS meaningfully improved  
394 model AUROC. These results were supported with frequentist analysis of differences in  
395 AUROC using the DeLong method (**Supplemental Table 12**). Models were once more

396 compared when stratifying the cohort by either sex (**Supplemental Figures 18-20,**  
397 **Supplemental Tables 13-14**) or genetically similar population group (**Supplemental**  
398 **Figure 21-23, Supplemental Tables 15-16**) with consistent results. These results lead  
399 us to conclude that the Dissection-PRS consistently enhances clinical model  
400 discrimination.

#### 401 *Incident thoracic aortic dissection analysis*

402 As a sensitivity analysis we performed time-to-event analyses using a Cox  
403 proportional hazard model among individuals with incident dissection in the PMBB and  
404 AOU. In the PMBB, for every 1 sd increase in Dissection-PRS, the hazard ratio (HR)  
405 was 2.30 (95% CI 1.99 to 2.64,  $P<0.001$ ) and 2.27 when adjusting for CRF (95% CI  
406 1.96 to 2.62,  $P<0.001$ ) [**Supplemental Figure 24A**]. When this analysis was restricted  
407 to individuals with measured AscAoD prior to dissection, and AscAoD was adjusted for  
408 with or without CRF, the effect of the Dissection-PRS remained significant (adjusted for  
409 AscAoD: HR=1.65, 95% CI 1.08 to 2.53,  $P=0.021$ ; adjusted for AscAoD + CRF:  
410 HR=1.74, 95% CI 1.12 to 2.70,  $P=0.013$ ) [**Supplemental Figure 24B**]. These incident  
411 analysis results were consistent among individuals in the AOU validation cohort where a  
412 1 sd increase in Dissection-PRS yielded an HR of 1.36 (95% CI 1.10 to 1.67,  $P=0.005$ ).  
413 Taken together, these results demonstrate that the Dissection-PRS is associated with  
414 incident thoracic aortic dissection across two diverse cohorts.

415

#### 416 **Discussion**

417 Identification of diameter-independent risk factors for dissection remains one of  
418 the key unresolved challenges in preventing premature deaths due to thoracic aortic

419 disease. In this study, we performed a GWAS-by-subtraction that identified 43 genetic  
420 loci associated with diameter-independent thoracic aortic disease, 20 of which were  
421 previously unreported. From our summary statistics, we created a PRS that strongly  
422 associated with dissection in the PMBB independent of clinical variables including  
423 AscAoD and validated our findings in AOU. We then demonstrated that inclusion of the  
424 Dissection-PRS in a clinical risk prediction model improves model calibration and  
425 discrimination across diverse populations.

426         The explanation for the improvement in the strength of association with prevalent  
427 and incident dissection provided by the Dissection-PRS, as compared to the TAAD-PRS  
428 or AscAoD-PRS, is likely partially explained by the identification of novel variants  
429 associated with dissection using the GWAS-by-subtraction methodology. However,  
430 some of the improvement is also likely due to the subtle statistical reweighting of known  
431 variants such that the weights are substantially changed and reflected in the overall  
432 observed PRS effect. For example, the effect estimate of the *CDH13* risk locus in the  
433 TAAD GWAS was -0.12 while the effect estimate in our GWAS-by-subtraction was -  
434 0.14. The enhancement in PRS performance raises the prospect of a true dissection  
435 GWAS, rather than the present one inferred through latent values, and whether a PRS  
436 from such a GWAS would exceed what we have shown in this present study. In future  
437 work, it will also be interesting to attempt to de-convolve the Dissection-PRS into  
438 recognizable features (e.g., features of aortic geometry; properties of the aortic wall;  
439 etc.).

440         Determining which patients should receive prophylactic surgical intervention to  
441 prevent an acute dissection, and the timing of that intervention, represents an ongoing

442 challenge in cardiovascular medicine and surgery. While the standard AscAoD size  
443 threshold for repair remains 5-5.5 cm,<sup>12</sup> it is clear from retrospective data that this  
444 threshold is insufficient to identify at-risk individuals.<sup>13</sup> Despite myriad attempts to  
445 develop algorithms to better predict dissection risk,<sup>34-37</sup> there remains limited clinical  
446 implementation of risk factors other than AscAoD, rate of diameter growth, and family  
447 history. Genetic data is changing the way we interpret multi-factorial disease risk. Our  
448 results suggest that using common genetic risk factors aggregated in a PRS can  
449 contribute to improved assessment of dissection risk and may enhance patient selection  
450 for surgical intervention.

451         Importantly, the Dissection-PRS had a similar effect on dissection risk across  
452 diverse populations. This was true in incident analyses across both the primary and  
453 validation cohorts, as well as prevalent analyses in the primary cohort. We also  
454 observed robust prediction model discrimination improvement with the addition of the  
455 Dissection-PRS in both the EUR and AFR population groups. Extensive investigation  
456 has been performed on the lack of portability of PRS across diverse populations.<sup>38,39</sup>  
457 The present multi-trait GWAS-by-subtraction is benefited by the diversity inherent in the  
458 previously published TAAD GWAS in the MVP and not penalized by subtracting out  
459 AoD using summary statistics from a GWAS largely performed in an EUR population.  
460 The use of multi-trait GWAS from more diverse parent GWAS data to derive equitable  
461 PRS may improve PRS portability as biobanks continue to work to overcome historical  
462 lack of diversity.

463         Determining if a prediction model that includes a PRS improves patient  
464 identification will require prospective investigation. For example, future studies may

465 benefit from incorporating a model that includes a PRS for thoracic aortic dissection  
466 among patients at risk of dissection to identify those patients who could be considered  
467 for expedited repair at a lower diameter threshold. One way to address this is to  
468 prospectively enroll individuals at high volume aortic centers with dilated ascending  
469 thoracic aortas to have genetic testing and PRS calculation, and integrating the  
470 individual PRS into a model to predict dissection risk. Subsequently, individuals would  
471 be followed over time to determine the utility of such a model. As thoracic aortic  
472 dissection is a relatively rare event, coordinated efforts across many different aortic  
473 centers may be better powered to demonstrate an effect.

#### 474 *Limitations*

475 This study has several limitations. First, our GWAS-by-subtraction is not a true  
476 GWAS of dissection and should not be misconstrued as serving that purpose, although  
477 it will be interesting to compare these findings with future thoracic dissection GWAS as  
478 they become available. Second, the PMBB is enriched for cases of dissection and the  
479 robust association of the Dissection-PRS with prevalent and incident dissection may be  
480 overestimated in this cohort. Third, dissection is a relatively rare event and therefore  
481 any understanding of the true predictive capacity of the Dissection-PRS would be best  
482 evaluated prospectively. Fourth, for the TTE data in the PMBB, each TTE was  
483 interpreted by a cardiologist in a clinical echocardiography lab, which is accredited by  
484 the Intersocietal Commission for the Accreditation of Echocardiography Labs and  
485 staffed by cardiologists who are board-certified in echocardiography. However, each  
486 TTE was not interpreted by the same cardiologist and small differences in measurement  
487 and interpretation may exist between studies. Additionally, although we used the largest

488 and most diverse GWAS studies available to perform our GWAS-by-subtraction, the  
489 AscAoD and DesAoD GWAS were performed in the UKB which is almost entirely  
490 composed of individuals genetically similar to the 1000G EUR reference population.

#### 491 *Conclusions*

492 Our findings suggest that our GWAS-by-subtraction allowed the construction of a  
493 Dissection-PRS that associates with prevalent dissection. Using this PRS, we can better  
494 predict individuals at increased risk of acute dissection. Future clinical implementation of  
495 our model requires prospective studies to investigate the benefit of identifying patients  
496 at increased risk of dissection and offering earlier surgical intervention.

497

498

#### 499 **Data Availability**

500 The summary statistics for the GWAS-by-subtraction will be made publicly  
501 available on Zenodo. The PRS weights will be submitted to the Polygenic Score  
502 Catalog. All other data may be made available upon reasonable request to the  
503 corresponding author.

504

#### 505 **Acknowledgements**

506 We acknowledge Perline Demange, PhD, Andrew D. Grotzinger, PhD, Michael  
507 G. Nivard, PhD, and Elliot M. Tucker-Drob, PhD who assisted in the methodology of  
508 GWAS-by-subtraction and maintain the Genomic Structural Equation Modeling package  
509 in R. We acknowledge the Penn Medicine BioBank (PMBB) for providing data and  
510 thank the patient-participants of Penn Medicine who consented to participate in this



511 research program. We would also like to thank the Penn Medicine BioBank team and  
512 Regeneron Genetics Center for providing genetic variant data for analysis. The PMBB is  
513 approved under IRB protocol# 813913 and supported by Perelman School of Medicine  
514 at University of Pennsylvania, a gift from the Smilow family, and the National Center for  
515 Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under CTSA  
516 award number UL1TR001878. The summary statistics for the TAAD GWAS performed  
517 in the MVP were obtained through dbGaP, accession number phs001672.v11.p1. The  
518 authors thank the MVP staff, researchers, and volunteers who have contributed to MVP,  
519 and especially participants who previously served their country in the military and now  
520 generously agreed to enroll in the study. (See <https://www.research.va.gov/mvp/> for  
521 more details). This research is based on data from the Million Veteran Program, Office  
522 of Research and Development, Veterans Health Administration, and was supported by  
523 the Veterans Administration (VA) MVP award #000. The All of Us Research Program is  
524 supported by the National Institutes of Health, Office of the Director: Regional Medical  
525 Centers: 1 OT2 OD026549; 1 OT2 OD026554; 1 OT2 OD026557; 1 OT2 OD026556; 1  
526 OT2 OD026550; 1 OT2 OD 026552; 1 OT2 OD026553; 1 OT2 OD026548; 1 OT2  
527 OD026551; 1 OT2 OD026555; IAA #: AOD 16037; Federally Qualified Health Centers:  
528 HHSN 263201600085U; Data and Research Center: 5 U2C OD023196; Biobank: 1 U24  
529 OD023121; The Participant Center: U24 OD023176; Participant Technology Systems  
530 Center: 1 U24 OD023163; Communications and Engagement: 3 OT2 OD023205; 3  
531 OT2 OD023206; and Community Partners: 1 OT2 OD025277; 3 OT2 OD025315; 1 OT2  
532 OD025337; 1 OT2 OD025276. We gratefully acknowledge *All of Us* participants for their  
533 contributions, without whom this research would not have been possible. We also thank



534 the National Institutes of Health's [All of Us Research Program](#) for making available the  
535 participant data examined in this study.

536

### 537 **Sources of Funding**

538 J.D. is supported by the American Heart Association (23POST1011251). The  
539 views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect  
540 the position or policy of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the United States  
541 government. W.R.W. is supported by NIH R01 HL171709, P41 EB029460, and R01  
542 HL169378. D.M.M. and D.C.G. are supported by the NIH (R01HL109942), the John  
543 Ritter Foundation. M.G.L. received support from the Doris Duke Foundation (2023-  
544 0224) and Department of Veterans Affairs Biomedical Research and Development  
545 Award IK2-BX006551. J.P.P is supported by the NIH (K08HL159346).

546

### 547 **Disclosures**

548 M.G.L. receives research support to his institution from MyOme outside of this  
549 work. S.M.D receives research support to his institution from RenalytixAI and in kind  
550 support from Novo Nordisk, both outside of this work. SMD is named as a co-inventor  
551 on a government-owned US Patent application related to the use of genetic risk  
552 prediction for venous thromboembolic disease filed by the US Department of Veterans  
553 Affairs in accordance with Federal regulatory requirements.

554

### 555 **Supplemental Material**

556 [Supplement 1](#)

- 557 - Supplemental table 1-2
- 558 Supplement 2
- 559 - Supplemental Methods
- 560 - Supplemental Results
- 561 - Supplemental Authors
- 562 - Supplemental Tables 3-16
- 563 - Supplemental Figures 1-24

564 **References**

- 565 1. Gudbjartsson T, Ahlsson A, Geirsson A, Gunn J, Hjortdal V, Jeppsson A,  
566 Mennander A, Zindovic I, Olsson C. Acute type A aortic dissection – a review.  
567 *Scandinavian Cardiovascular Journal*. 2020;54:1-13. doi:  
568 10.1080/14017431.2019.1660401
- 569 2. DeMartino RR, Sen I, Huang Y, Bower TC, Oderich GS, Pochettino A, Greason  
570 K, Kalra M, Johnstone J, Shuja F, et al. Population-Based Assessment of the  
571 Incidence of Aortic Dissection, Intramural Hematoma, and Penetrating Ulcer, and  
572 Its Associated Mortality From 1995 to 2015. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*.  
573 2018;11:e004689. doi: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.118.004689
- 574 3. Clouse WD, Hallett JW, Jr., Schaff HV, Spittell PC, Rowland CM, Ilstrup DM,  
575 Melton LJ, 3rd. Acute aortic dissection: population-based incidence compared  
576 with degenerative aortic aneurysm rupture. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2004;79:176-180.  
577 doi: 10.4065/79.2.176
- 578 4. Olsson C, Thelin S, Ståhle E, Ekbom A, Granath F. Thoracic aortic aneurysm  
579 and dissection: increasing prevalence and improved outcomes reported in a  
580 nationwide population-based study of more than 14,000 cases from 1987 to  
581 2002. *Circulation*. 2006;114:2611-2618. doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.106.630400
- 582 5. Mody PS, Wang Y, Geirsson A, Kim N, Desai MM, Gupta A, Dodson JA,  
583 Krumholz HM. Trends in aortic dissection hospitalizations, interventions, and  
584 outcomes among medicare beneficiaries in the United States, 2000-2011. *Circ*  
585 *Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2014;7:920-928. doi:  
586 10.1161/circoutcomes.114.001140

- 587 6. Pape Linda A, Awais M, Woznicki Elise M, Suzuki T, Trimarchi S, Evangelista A,  
588 Myrmel T, Larsen M, Harris Kevin M, Greason K, et al. Presentation, Diagnosis,  
589 and Outcomes of Acute Aortic Dissection. *Journal of the American College of*  
590 *Cardiology*. 2015;66:350-358. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2015.05.029
- 591 7. McClure RS, Ouzounian M, Boodhwani M, El-Hamamsy I, Chu MWA, Pozeg Z,  
592 Dagenais F, Sikdar KC, Appoo JJ. Cause of Death Following Surgery for Acute  
593 Type A Dissection: Evidence from the Canadian Thoracic Aortic Collaborative.  
594 *Aorta (Stamford)*. 2017;5:33-41. doi: 10.12945/j.aorta.2017.16.034
- 595 8. Verstraeten A, Luyckx I, Loeys B. Aetiology and management of hereditary  
596 aortopathy. *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 2017;14:197-208. doi: 10.1038/nrcardio.2016.211
- 597 9. Melvinsdottir IH, Lund SH, Agnarsson BA, Sigvaldason K, Gudbjartsson T,  
598 Geirsson A. The incidence and mortality of acute thoracic aortic dissection:  
599 results from a whole nation study. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. 2016;50:1111-1117.  
600 doi: 10.1093/ejcts/ezw235
- 601 10. Howard DP, Banerjee A, Fairhead JF, Perkins J, Silver LE, Rothwell PM, Oxford  
602 Vascular S. Population-based study of incidence and outcome of acute aortic  
603 dissection and premorbid risk factor control: 10-year results from the Oxford  
604 Vascular Study. *Circulation*. 2013;127:2031-2037. doi:  
605 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.112.000483
- 606 11. Evangelista A, Isselbacher EM, Bossone E, Gleason TG, Eusanio MD, Sechtem  
607 U, Ehrlich MP, Trimarchi S, Braverman AC, Myrmel T, et al. Insights From the  
608 International Registry of Acute Aortic Dissection: A 20-Year Experience of

- 609 Collaborative Clinical Research. *Circulation*. 2018;137:1846-1860. doi:  
610 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.031264
- 611 12. Isselbacher EM, Preventza O, Hamilton Black J, 3rd, Augoustides JG, Beck AW,  
612 Bolen MA, Braverman AC, Bray BE, Brown-Zimmerman MM, Chen EP, et al.  
613 2022 ACC/AHA Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of Aortic Disease:  
614 A Report of the American Heart Association/American College of Cardiology  
615 Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2022;146:e334-  
616 e482. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000001106
- 617 13. Pape LA, Tsai TT, Isselbacher EM, Oh JK, O'Gara P T, Evangelista A, Fattori R,  
618 Meinhardt G, Trimarchi S, Bossone E, et al. Aortic diameter  $\geq$  5.5 cm is not a  
619 good predictor of type A aortic dissection: observations from the International  
620 Registry of Acute Aortic Dissection (IRAD). *Circulation*. 2007;116:1120-1127. doi:  
621 10.1161/circulationaha.107.702720
- 622 14. Wolford BN, Hornsby WE, Guo D, Zhou W, Lin M, Farhat L, McNamara J,  
623 Driscoll A, Wu X, Schmidt EM, et al. Clinical Implications of Identifying  
624 Pathogenic Variants in Individuals With Thoracic Aortic Dissection. *Circ Genom*  
625 *Precis Med*. 2019;12:e002476. doi: 10.1161/CIRCGEN.118.002476
- 626 15. Renard M, Francis C, Ghosh R, Scott AF, Witmer PD, Ades LC, Andelfinger GU,  
627 Arnaud P, Boileau C, Callewaert BL, et al. Clinical Validity of Genes for Heritable  
628 Thoracic Aortic Aneurysm and Dissection. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;72:605-615.  
629 doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2018.04.089
- 630 16. Pinard A, Jones GT, Milewicz DM. Genetics of Thoracic and Abdominal Aortic  
631 Diseases. *Circ Res*. 2019;124:588-606. doi: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.118.312436

- 632 17. Pirruccello JP, Chaffin MD, Chou EL, Fleming SJ, Lin H, Nekoui M, Khurshid S,  
633 Friedman SF, Bick AG, Arduini A, et al. Deep learning enables genetic analysis  
634 of the human thoracic aorta. *Nat Genet.* 2022;54:40-51. doi: 10.1038/s41588-  
635 021-00962-4
- 636 18. Tcheandjieu C, Xiao K, Tejeda H, Lynch JA, Ruotsalainen S, Bellomo T, Palnati  
637 M, Judy R, Klarin D, Kember RL, et al. High heritability of ascending aortic  
638 diameter and trans-ancestry prediction of thoracic aortic disease. *Nat Genet.*  
639 2022;54:772-782. doi: 10.1038/s41588-022-01070-7
- 640 19. Klarin D, Devineni P, Sendamarai AK, Angueira AR, Graham SE, Shen YH,  
641 Levin MG, Pirruccello JP, Surakka I, Karnam PR, et al. Genome-wide association  
642 study of thoracic aortic aneurysm and dissection in the Million Veteran Program.  
643 *Nat Genet.* 2023;55:1106-1115. doi: 10.1038/s41588-023-01420-z
- 644 20. Verma A, Damrauer SM, Naseer N, Weaver J, Kripke CM, Guare L, Sirugo G,  
645 Kember RL, Drivas TG, Dudek SM, et al. The Penn Medicine BioBank: Towards  
646 a Genomics-Enabled Learning Healthcare System to Accelerate Precision  
647 Medicine in a Diverse Population. *Journal of Personalized Medicine.*  
648 2022;12:1974.
- 649 21. Denny JC, Devaney SA, Gebo KA. The "All of Us" Research Program. Reply. *N*  
650 *Engl J Med.* 2019;381:1884-1885. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc1912496
- 651 22. Zhou Z, Cecchi AC, Prakash SK, Milewicz DM. Risk Factors for Thoracic Aortic  
652 Dissection. *Genes (Basel).* 2022;13. doi: 10.3390/genes13101814

- 653 23. Takada M, Yamagishi K, Tamakoshi A, Iso H, Group JS. Body Mass Index and  
654 Mortality From Aortic Aneurysm and Dissection. *J Atheroscler Thromb*.  
655 2021;28:338-348. doi: 10.5551/jat.57232
- 656 24. Zafar MA, Li Y, Rizzo JA, Charilaou P, Saeyeldin A, Velasquez CA, Mansour AM,  
657 Bin Mahmood SU, Ma WG, Brownstein AJ, et al. Height alone, rather than body  
658 surface area, suffices for risk estimation in ascending aortic aneurysm. *J Thorac*  
659 *Cardiovasc Surg*. 2018;155:1938-1950. doi: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2017.10.140
- 660 25. Pirruccello JP, Lin H, Khurshid S, Nekoui M, Weng LC, Vasan RS, Isselbacher  
661 EM, Benjamin EJ, Lubitz SA, Lindsay ME, Ellinor PT. Development of a  
662 Prediction Model for Ascending Aortic Diameter Among Asymptomatic  
663 Individuals. *JAMA*. 2022;328:1935-1944. doi: 10.1001/jama.2022.19701
- 664 26. Beeche C, Dib MJ, Zhao B, Azzo JD, Maynard H, Duda J, Gee J, Salman O,  
665 Penn Medicine B, Witschey WR, Chirinos JA. Three-dimensional aortic  
666 geometry: clinical correlates, prognostic value and genetic architecture. *bioRxiv*.  
667 2024. doi: 10.1101/2024.05.09.593413
- 668 27. Demange PA, Malanchini M, Mallard TT, Biroli P, Cox SR, Grotzinger AD,  
669 Tucker-Drob EM, Abdellaoui A, Arseneault L, van Bergen E, et al. Investigating  
670 the genetic architecture of noncognitive skills using GWAS-by-subtraction. *Nat*  
671 *Genet*. 2021;53:35-44. doi: 10.1038/s41588-020-00754-2
- 672 28. St Pourcain B, Eaves LJ, Ring SM, Fisher SE, Medland S, Evans DM, Davey  
673 Smith G. Developmental Changes Within the Genetic Architecture of Social  
674 Communication Behavior: A Multivariate Study of Genetic Variance in Unrelated

- 675 Individuals. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2018;83:598-606. doi:  
676 10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.09.020
- 677 29. Grotzinger AD, Rhemtulla M, de Vlaming R, Ritchie SJ, Mallard TT, Hill WD, Ip  
678 HF, Marioni RE, McIntosh AM, Deary IJ, et al. Genomic structural equation  
679 modelling provides insights into the multivariate genetic architecture of complex  
680 traits. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2019;3:513-525. doi: 10.1038/s41562-019-0566-x
- 681 30. Ruan Y, Lin YF, Feng YA, Chen CY, Lam M, Guo Z, Stanley Global Asia I, He L,  
682 Sawa A, Martin AR, et al. Improving polygenic prediction in ancestrally diverse  
683 populations. *Nat Genet*. 2022;54:573-580. doi: 10.1038/s41588-022-01054-7
- 684 31. Lambert SA, Gil L, Jupp S, Ritchie SC, Xu Y, Buniello A, McMahon A, Abraham  
685 G, Chapman M, Parkinson H, et al. The Polygenic Score Catalog as an open  
686 database for reproducibility and systematic evaluation. *Nature Genetics*.  
687 2021;53:420-425. doi: 10.1038/s41588-021-00783-5
- 688 32. Fairley S, Lowy-Gallego E, Perry E, Flicek P. The International Genome Sample  
689 Resource (IGSR) collection of open human genomic variation resources. *Nucleic  
690 Acids Res*. 2020;48:D941-D947. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkz836
- 691 33. Therneau TM, Grambsch PM. The Cox Model. In: Therneau TM, Grambsch PM,  
692 eds. *Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model*. New York, NY: Springer  
693 New York; 2000:39-77.
- 694 34. von Kodolitsch Y, Schwartz AG, Nienaber CA. Clinical prediction of acute aortic  
695 dissection. *Arch Intern Med*. 2000;160:2977-2982. doi:  
696 10.1001/archinte.160.19.2977



- 697 35. Adriaans BP, Wildberger JE, Westenberg JJM, Lamb HJ, Schalla S. Predictive  
698 imaging for thoracic aortic dissection and rupture: moving beyond diameters. *Eur*  
699 *Radiol.* 2019;29:6396-6404. doi: 10.1007/s00330-019-06320-7
- 700 36. Heuts S, Adriaans BP, Rylski B, Muhl C, Bekkers S, Olsthoorn JR, Natour E,  
701 Bouman H, Berezowski M, Kosiorowska K, et al. Evaluating the diagnostic  
702 accuracy of maximal aortic diameter, length and volume for prediction of aortic  
703 dissection. *Heart.* 2020;106:892-897. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2019-316251
- 704 37. Wu J, Qiu J, Xie E, Jiang W, Zhao R, Qiu J, Zafar MA, Huang Y, Yu C. Predicting  
705 in-hospital rupture of type A aortic dissection using Random Forest. *J Thorac Dis.*  
706 2019;11:4634-4646. doi: 10.21037/jtd.2019.10.82
- 707 38. Popejoy AB, Fullerton SM. Genomics is failing on diversity. *Nature.*  
708 2016;538:161-164. doi: 10.1038/538161a
- 709 39. Ding Y, Hou K, Xu Z, Pimplaskar A, Petter E, Boulier K, Prive F, Vilhjalmsjon BJ,  
710 Olde Loohuis LM, Pasaniuc B. Polygenic scoring accuracy varies across the  
711 genetic ancestry continuum. *Nature.* 2023;618:774-781. doi: 10.1038/s41586-  
712 023-06079-4
- 713 40. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, Thomas L, Ferreira MA, Bender D, Maller J,  
714 Sklar P, de Bakker PI, Daly MJ, Sham PC. PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome  
715 association and population-based linkage analyses. *Am J Hum Genet.*  
716 2007;81:559-575. doi: 10.1086/519795
- 717 41. Genomes Project C, Abecasis GR, Auton A, Brooks LD, DePristo MA, Durbin  
718 RM, Handsaker RE, Kang HM, Marth GT, McVean GA. An integrated map of

- 719 genetic variation from 1,092 human genomes. *Nature*. 2012;491:56-65. doi:  
720 10.1038/nature11632
- 721 42. Pruim RJ, Welch RP, Sanna S, Teslovich TM, Chines PS, Gliedt TP, Boehnke M,  
722 Abecasis GR, Willer CJ. LocusZoom: regional visualization of genome-wide  
723 association scan results. *Bioinformatics*. 2010;26:2336-2337. doi:  
724 10.1093/bioinformatics/btq419
- 725 43. Lawrence M, Huber W, Pages H, Aboyoun P, Carlson M, Gentleman R, Morgan  
726 MT, Carey VJ. Software for computing and annotating genomic ranges. *PLoS*  
727 *Comput Biol*. 2013;9:e1003118. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003118
- 728 44. de Leeuw CA, Mooij JM, Heskes T, Posthuma D. MAGMA: generalized gene-set  
729 analysis of GWAS data. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2015;11:e1004219. doi:  
730 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004219
- 731 45. Consortium GT. The GTEx Consortium atlas of genetic regulatory effects across  
732 human tissues. *Science*. 2020;369:1318-1330. doi: 10.1126/science.aaz1776
- 733 46. Wang G, Sarkar A, Carbonetto P, Stephens M. A simple new approach to  
734 variable selection in regression, with application to genetic fine mapping. *J R Stat*  
735 *Soc Series B Stat Methodol*. 2020;82:1273-1300. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12388
- 736 47. Wallace C. A more accurate method for colocalisation analysis allowing for  
737 multiple causal variants. *PLoS Genet*. 2021;17:e1009440. doi:  
738 10.1371/journal.pgen.1009440
- 739 48. Dewey FE, Gusarova V, O'Dushlaine C, Gottesman O, Trejos J, Hunt C, Van  
740 Hout CV, Habegger L, Buckler D, Lai KM, et al. Inactivating Variants in

- 741 ANGPTL4 and Risk of Coronary Artery Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374:1123-  
742 1133. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1510926
- 743 49. Verma A, Damrauer SM, Naseer N, Weaver J, Kripke CM, Guare L, Sirugo G,  
744 Kember RL, Drivas TG, Dudek SM, et al. The Penn Medicine BioBank: Towards  
745 a Genomics-Enabled Learning Healthcare System to Accelerate Precision  
746 Medicine in a Diverse Population. *J Pers Med*. 2022;12. doi:  
747 10.3390/jpm12121974
- 748 50. Loh P-R, Danecek P, Palamara PF, Fuchsberger C, A Reshef Y, K Finucane H,  
749 Schoenherr S, Forer L, McCarthy S, Abecasis GR, et al. Reference-based  
750 phasing using the Haplotype Reference Consortium panel. *Nature Genetics*.  
751 2016;48:1443-1448. doi: 10.1038/ng.3679
- 752 51. Das S, Forer L, Schön herr S, Sidore C, Locke AE, Kwong A, Vrieze SI, Chew  
753 EY, Levy S, McGue M, et al. Next-generation genotype imputation service and  
754 methods. *Nature Genetics*. 2016;48:1284-1287. doi: 10.1038/ng.3656
- 755 52. Price AL, Patterson NJ, Plenge RM, Weinblatt ME, Shadick NA, Reich D.  
756 Principal components analysis corrects for stratification in genome-wide  
757 association studies. *Nature Genetics*. 2006;38:904-909. doi: 10.1038/ng1847
- 758 53. Karczewski KJ, Francioli LC, Tiao G, Cummings BB, Alfoldi J, Wang Q, Collins  
759 RL, Laricchia KM, Ganna A, Birnbaum DP, et al. The mutational constraint  
760 spectrum quantified from variation in 141,456 humans. *Nature*. 2020;581:434-  
761 443. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2308-7
- 762 54. Ioannidis NM, Rothstein JH, Pejaver V, Middha S, McDonnell SK, Baheti S,  
763 Musolf A, Li Q, Holzinger E, Karyadi D, et al. REVEL: An Ensemble Method for

- 764 Predicting the Pathogenicity of Rare Missense Variants. *Am J Hum Genet.*  
765 2016;99:877-885. doi: 10.1016/j.ajhg.2016.08.016
- 766 55. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, Bick D, Das S, Gastier-Foster J, Grody WW, Hegde  
767 M, Lyon E, Spector E, et al. Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of  
768 sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College  
769 of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology.  
770 *Genet Med.* 2015;17:405-424. doi: 10.1038/gim.2015.30
- 771 56. All of Us Research Program Genomics I. Genomic data in the All of Us Research  
772 Program. *Nature.* 2024;627:340-346. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06957-x
- 773 57. Venner E, Patterson K, Kalra D, Wheeler MM, Chen YJ, Kalla SE, Yuan B,  
774 Karnes JH, Walker K, Smith JD, et al. The frequency of pathogenic variation in  
775 the All of Us cohort reveals ancestry-driven disparities. *Commun Biol.*  
776 2024;7:174. doi: 10.1038/s42003-023-05708-y
- 777 58. Khan A, Turchin MC, Patki A, Srinivasasainagendra V, Shang N, Nadukuru R,  
778 Jones AC, Malolepsza E, Dikilitas O, Kullo IJ, et al. Genome-wide polygenic  
779 score to predict chronic kidney disease across ancestries. *Nat Med.*  
780 2022;28:1412-1420. doi: 10.1038/s41591-022-01869-1
- 781 59. Marcot BG, Hanea AM. What is an optimal value of k in k-fold cross-validation in  
782 discrete Bayesian network analysis? *Computational Statistics.* 2021;36:2009-  
783 2031. doi: 10.1007/s00180-020-00999-9
- 784 60. Kuhn MW, H. Tidymodels: a collection of packages for modeling and machine  
785 learning using tidyverse principles. 2020.

- 786 61. Wilimitis D, Walsh CG. Practical Considerations and Applied Examples of Cross-  
787 Validation for Model Development and Evaluation in Health Care: Tutorial. *JMIR*  
788 *AI*. 2023;2:e49023. doi: 10.2196/49023
- 789 62. Kruschke JK, Liddell TM. The Bayesian New Statistics: Hypothesis testing,  
790 estimation, meta-analysis, and power analysis from a Bayesian perspective.  
791 *Psychon Bull Rev*. 2018;25:178-206. doi: 10.3758/s13423-016-1221-4
- 792 63. Kruschke JK. Rejecting or Accepting Parameter Values in Bayesian Estimation.  
793 *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. 2018;1:270-280.  
794 doi: 10.1177/2515245918771304
- 795 64. Kuhn M. tidyposterior: Bayesian Analysis to Compare Models using Resampling  
796 Statistics. 2022.
- 797 65. Harrell F. Statistically Efficient Ways to Quantify Added Predictive Value of New  
798 Measurements. In: *Statistical Thinking*. 2018.
- 799 66. Harrell JFE. Regression Modeling Strategies : With Applications to Linear  
800 Models, Logistic and Ordinal Regression, and Survival Analysis. In: *Springer*  
801 *Series in Statistics*,. Cham: Springer International Publishing : Imprint: Springer,;  
802 2015:1 online resource (XXV, 582 pages 157 illustrations, 553 illustrations in  
803 color.
- 804 67. Fronczek J, Polok K, de Lange DW, Jung C, Beil M, Rhodes A, Fjølner J, Górka  
805 J, Andersen FH, Artigas A, et al. Relationship between the Clinical Frailty Scale  
806 and short-term mortality in patients  $\geq 80$  years old acutely admitted to the ICU:  
807 a prospective cohort study. *Critical Care*. 2021;25:231. doi: 10.1186/s13054-021-  
808 03632-3

- 809 68. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or  
810 more correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric  
811 approach. *Biometrics*. 1988;44:837-845.
- 812 69. Akashi M, Higashi T, Masuda S, Komori T, Furuse M. A coronary artery disease-  
813 associated gene product, JCAD/KIAA1462, is a novel component of endothelial  
814 cell-cell junctions. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun*. 2011;413:224-229. doi:  
815 10.1016/j.bbrc.2011.08.073
- 816 70. Douglas G, Mehta V, Al Haj Zen A, Akoumianakis I, Goel A, Rashbrook VS,  
817 Trelfa L, Donovan L, Drydale E, Chuaiphichai S, et al. A key role for the novel  
818 coronary artery disease gene JCAD in atherosclerosis via shear stress  
819 mechanotransduction. *Cardiovasc Res*. 2020;116:1863-1874. doi:  
820 10.1093/cvr/cvz263
- 821 71. Guo B, Greenwood PL, Cafe LM, Zhou G, Zhang W, Dalrymple BP.  
822 Transcriptome analysis of cattle muscle identifies potential markers for skeletal  
823 muscle growth rate and major cell types. *BMC Genomics*. 2015;16:177. doi:  
824 10.1186/s12864-015-1403-x  
825


826 **Tables, Figures, and Figure Legends**

827 **Table 1: Clinical characteristics of Penn Medicine Biobank individuals with and**  
 828 **without thoracic aortic dissection.**

<b>Penn Medicine Biobank Participant Characteristics</b>		
	Non-Dissection	Dissection
Cohort Size, N	42987	262
Sex		
Female (%)	21576 (50%)	86 (33%)
Male (%)	21411 (50%)	176 (67%)
Population		
AFR (%)	11035 (26%)	76 (29%)
EUR (%)	29770 (69%)	177 (68%)
Other (%)	2182 (5.1%)	9 (3%)
Age in years, median (IQR)	57.2 (42.5-67.2)	63.4 (53.9-71.1)
Height in cm, median (IQR)	170.2 (162.6-177.8)	175.3 (166.8-182.9)
Weight in kg, median (IQR)	83.0 (70.1-97.9)	86.2 (75.1-98.7)
Body mass index, median (IQR)	28.2 (24.7-33.0)	28.5 (25.5-31.7)
Body surface area in meters squared, median (IQR)	1.96 (1.78-2.13)	2.02 (1.84-2.20)
Blood pressure		
Systolic, median (IQR)	126.3 (117.9-134.8)	127.5 (120.6-135.3)
Diastolic, median (IQR)	74.0 (69.0-79.0)	70.7 (65.6-76.4)
Heart rate, median (IQR)	77.2 (70.3-84.5)	73.9 (65.7-82.1)


829

830






**Figure 1: Genome-wide association study results. A)** Manhattan plot of multi-trait genome-wide association study-by-subtraction results subtracting AscAoD and DesAoD from TAAD. Each point represents a genetic variant. Genome-wide significant ( $P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$ ) loci are represented by peaks of red points that associate with diameter-independent dissection. The X-axis represents genomic position by chromosome and the y-axis represents the strength of association by  $-\log_{10}(P\text{-value})$ . **B)** Candidate genes, grouped by chromosome, were assigned to each genome-wide significant ( $P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$ ) locus in the diameter-independent “dissection” (red) and compared to the previously published TAAD GWAS (blue), ascending aortic diameter GWAS (purple), and descending aortic diameter GWAS (green) with previously unreported candidate genes denoted by stars. The size of each point corresponds to the strength of the association represented by  $-\log_{10}(P\text{-value})$ .




**Central Illustration: GWAS-by-subtraction, polygenic risk score creation, and association of different PRS with prevalent thoracic aortic dissection in the Penn Medicine Biobank.** Analytic approach to the GWAS-by-subtraction of diameter-independent dissection followed by polygenic risk score creation and multivariable logistic regression analysis of the Dissection-PRS, TAAD-PRS, and AscAoD-PRS among all individuals in the PMBB to determine respective association with prevalent thoracic aortic dissection, adjusting for age, sex, and the first five genetic principal components. AscAoD-PRS = Ascending aortic diameter polygenic risk score; CI = confidence interval; OR = Odds ratio; sd = standard deviation; TAAD-PRS = thoracic aortic aneurysm and dissection polygenic risk score; Dissection-PRS = thoracic aortic dissection polygenic risk score.



**Figure 3: Association of Dissection-PRS with prevalent dissection in multivariable logistic regression analysis adjusting for different clinical risk factors.**

Multivariable logistic regression analysis of the effect of Dissection-PRS on prevalent dissection adjusting for clinical risk factors, measured AscAoD, or clinical risk factors and measured AscAoD. Each logistic regression analysis was also adjusted for age, sex, and the first five genetic principal components. AscAoD = Ascending aortic diameter measured by TTE or CT; CI = confidence interval; OR = Odds ratio; sd = standard deviation; Dissection-PRS = thoracic aortic dissection polygenic risk score.



**Figure 4: Logistic regression model receiver operator characteristic curve (ROC) and area under the ROC curve to predict thoracic aortic dissection.** (A) Receiver operator characteristic curves for each of the primary models including Age + Sex, Age + Sex + CRF, Age + Sex + CRF + Dissection-PRS, Age + Sex + CRF + AscAoD, and Age + Sex + CRF + AscAoD + Dissection-PRS. (B) Corresponding area under the ROC curves with error bars demonstrating 95% confidence intervals for models utilized among all individuals. AscAoD = ascending thoracic aortic diameter; AUROC = area under the receiver operator characteristic curve; CI = 95% confidence interval; CRF = Clinical Risk Factors; Dissection-PRS = thoracic aortic dissection polygenic risk score.