

Supplementary Figure 1: Effect between image quality score (IQS) and fractal dimension. The contour plot evidences the joint distribution of **a** left and **b** right fractal dimension and image quality score. **C** The box plot illustrates the interocular fractal dimension difference at multiple IQS variation cases.



Supplementary Figure 2: QQ plots for the GWAS. These plots illustrate the expected vs observed -Log(P-value) comparison obtained in **a** the left and **b** right Df GWAS.



Supplementary Figure 3: Forest plots of Df-associated SNPs. These illustrate the effect of significant genetic variants (**a** rs16891982 **b** rs12203592 **c** rs12913832 **d** rs3138141) across UKB ancestries.

a



b

Correlated trait	LEFT EYE			RIGHT EYE		
	r_g^2	SE	P value	r_g^2	SE	P value
Hypertension	-0.2229	0.0534	3.0261e-05	-0.3020	0. 0659	4.52e-06
Acute myocardial infarction	-0.1717	0.0809	0.0801	-0.1585	0.1075	0.0308
Self reported acute myocardial infarction	-0.2071	0. 0754	0.006	-0.2663	0. 0982	0.0067
Coronary artery disease	-0.2214	0.0591	1.7854e-04	-0.1776	0. 0795	0.025
Atherosclerosis	-0.3585	0.1819	0.084	-0.2668	0.2100	0.051
Skin colour	0.0091	0.0536	0.8647	-0.0051	0. 0568	0.9282
Eye colour	-0.0751	0.0334	0.6372	-0.0598	0.0271	0.7658
Right Fractal dimension	0.9468	0.0962	1.75E-26	-		-

Supplementary Figure 4: Genetic correlations between fractal dimension and associated traits. a Heatmap illustrating the direction and percentage of shared genomic regions, also indicated by the number. **b** Table describing genetic correlation estimates and its P-value

Supplementary Figure 5: Traits and pathways sharing significant genetic effects with fractal.



Supplementary Figure 6: Feature importance score of the MI models based on a random forest classifier. SBP device: Systolic blood pressure measured at baseline UKB assessment using their automatic device. PRS: CAD polygenic risk score based on CARdioGRAM consortium. BMI: basal muscular index. Fd_left and Fd_right: measures of left and right fractal dimension, respectively. Smoker cat: participants who are current smokers at baseline examination.





Supplementary Figure 7: Left and right eye GWAS results comparisons between the final model and this model including an eye colour PRS. a Left and **b** right eye scatterplot illustrating the SNP's effect comparison between the final GWAS model and the GWAS including the pigmentation and the eye colour PRS. **c** Left and **d** right eye scatterplot representing the -Log(P-value) comparison among these two models. SNPs with a –Log10(P)=4.5 are only included in these figures for clarity.

Supplementary Table 1: Summary statistics of UKB traits. The table includes the linear regression effect, its standard deviation, P-value, Pearson correlation and its P-value. This table is within the excel spreadsheet.

Supplementary Table 2: GWAS summary statistics. Includes the MAF, SNP effect, SD and -Log(P-value) of all significant SNPs for both eyes. The nearest gene, its association with ocular or non-ocular traits it's also included.

SNP	CHR	MAF	LEFT EYE			RIGHT EYE			Nearest gene	Ocular association	Non-ocular association
			BETA	SD	-Log (P-value)	BETA	SD	-Log (P-value)			
rs1709657	3	0.23	9.42E-04	2.40E-04	4.15	1.13E-03	2.49E-04	5.33	*EIF2B5*		Inflammation and platelet count
rs16891982	5	0.024	3.75E-03	6.59E-04	7.93	3.53E-03	6.94E-04	6.46	*SLC45A2*		Skin, hair and eye colour and pigmentation disease
rs12203592	6	0.22	-2.31E-03	2.68E-04	28.67	-2.85E-03	2.80E-04	23.62	*IRF4*	Refractive error	Skin, hair colour, eye colour and disease and lymphocyte and leukocyte count.
rs80308281	7	0.005	-6.79E-03	1.46E-03	6.73	-7.19E-03	1.36E-03	6.88	*SLC12A9*	Choroid and retinal disease and retinal detachment	Skin colour, hair colour and disease, mean arterial pressure and resting heart rate
rs56108400	12	0.24	-1.07E-03	2.37E-04	5.17	-1.06E-03	2.48E-04	5.72	*RDH5/ ORMDL2*	Macular thickness, AMD, retinitis pigmentosa, disorders of the lens, cataract, ocular muscle, myopia and retinal detachment	
rs12913832	15	0.22	6.34E-03	2.58E-04	131.28	5.65E-03	2.71E-04	96.97	*HERC2*	Cataract, retinal arterial and venular width and tortuosity, visual acuity, AMD and IOP	Pulse pressure and hair, skin and eye colour
rs916977	15	0.15	5.12E-03	2.94E-04	66.93	4.48E-03	3.08E-04	47.13	*OCA2*	Cataract, IOP, lens disorders and Glaucoma	Hair, skin, and eye colour
rs4911429	20	0.31	-5.49E-04	2.23E-04	5.54	-1.33E.03	2.33E-04	7.98	*MAPILC3A*		Skin colour, platelet and reticulocyte count
rs73226964	21	0.02	-3.21E-03	7.48E-04	4.63	-4.00E-03	7.75E-04	6.63	*AGPAT3*		RBC count, eosinophil percentage, GFR diabetes miellitus, and disorders of the arteries.

Supplementary Table 3: Comparison between Zekavat et al. GWAS and this study. Includes reported genetic variants

			Zekava et al[56]		This study	
SNP	**MAF**	**NEAREST GENE**	**BETA**	**-Log (P-value)**	**BETA**	**-Log (P-value)**
rs12203592	0.22	*IRF4*	-0.05	13	-2.85E-03	23.62
rs12913832	0.22	*HERC2*	0.15	78	5.65E-03	96.97
rs7164220	0.15	*OCA2*	0.11	65	4.61E-03	51.76

Supplementary Table 4: Mendelian randomization results. Includes the heterogeneity and pleiotropy test as well as the statistic and P-value of the MR methods used for both cardiovascular outcomes in both eyes.

	Left Df						Right Df					
Cardiovascular event	Heterogeneity	Horizontal Pleiotropy	Inverse variance weighted	P-value	Maximum likelihood	P-value	Heterogeneity	Horizontal Pleiotropy	Inverse variance weighted	P-value	Maximum likelihood	P-value
Myocardial infarction	0.367	0.006	0.080 ±0.101	0.429	0.080 ±0.102	0.427	0.394	0.007	0.095 ±0.104	0.358	0.096 ±0.104	0.357
Mild Ischaemic heart disease	0.552	0.033	-0.064 ±0.122	0.600	-0.064 ±0.125	0.610	0.619	0.029	-0.074 ±0.049	0.533	-0.074 ±0.052	0.551

Supplementary Table 5: Demographics of the MI cases and controls. This table describes for cases and controls the centrality and dispersion of the epidemiological variables included in the MI predictive model. P-value* refers to the T-test completed among these two groups to estimate its difference.

Variable	MI cases	Control cases	P-Value*
Age (years)	57.31±6.47	54.21±7.84	1.076e-39
Sex (N.Females/N.Males)	122/403	298/227	-
BMI	28.54±4.63	26.42±4.39	5.52e-14
SBP (mmHg)	142.03±20.20	135.37±18.01	2.21e-8
Current smokers	69	28	-
Right D_f	1.485±0.03	1.5±0.075	3.33e-15
Left D_f	1.485±0.03	1.494±0.036	1.97e-08
PRS_{CAD}	3.58±0.32	3.41±0.24	1.94e-06

Supplementary Table 6: Wilcoxon signed-rank test across the examined MI models. This table includes the Wilcoxon signed-rank sum test and the P-Value of all the comparisons between the models we trained in this study.

Models comparison	Wilcoxon signed rank sum test	P-Value*
SCORE VS RFC with D_f and PRS_{CAD}	1.0	0.0039
SCORE VS RFC with D_f	1.0	0.0039
SCORE VS RFC with PRS_{CAD}	6.0	0.027
RFC with D_f and PRS_{CAD} VS RFC with PRS_{CAD}	7.0	0.037
RFC with D_f and PRS_{CAD} VS RFC with D_f	25.0	0.846
RFC with PRS_{CAD} VS RFC with D_f	7.0	0.037

In our ablation study we found three central elements ascertaining the superior accuracy of our model on distinguishing personalised MI risk in UKB. Firstly, the usage of continuous variables. Those models following this premise yield a greater performance than SCORE and its derivates (i.e., SCORE + D_f). We further investigated whether this situation was reproduced in RFC-based classifiers. Our results show that these models achieve a higher AUC when compared with the ones that introduce age, BMI and SBP as discrete variables. Secondly, we observe that the presence of D_f and PRS_{CAD} in the predictive model significantly improves its performance, regardless of the classifier's algorithm. Finally, RFC-based models yield higher AUC, precision, and recall when compared with SCORE and all the completed transformations, implying that a non-linear algorithm benefit individual MI prediction. Amongst these RFC classifiers, the one including both aforementioned elements achieves the greatest performance, followed by a similar model excluding PRS_{CAD}.

Supplementary Table 7: Ablation study of the MI models. These tables include the precision, recall and AUC for the variations in the model.* AUC estimates significantly different (Wilcoxson signed-rank test P-value<0.005) from the one obtained with the SCORE model.** AUC estimates significantly different (Wilcoxson signed-rank test P-value<0.005) from the one obtained with the SCORE model and the one from our final model.

	MI		
Model	Precision	Recall	AUC
SCORE model[16]	0.705 ±0.00096	0.729 ±0.0019	0.711 ±0.0008
SCORE model and Df	0.705 ±0.00083	0.731 ±0.0021	0.711 ±0.00086
SCORE model and PRS_{CAD}	0.721 ±0.001	0.739 ±0.0016	0.723 ±0.0011
SCORE model and Df + PRS_{CAD}	0.718 ±0.0012	0.737 ±0.0019	0.727 ±0.0009
SCORE model using continuous variables	0.732 ±0.0014	0.752 ±0.0024	0.737 ±0.0013
SCORE model with continuous variables and Df**	0.728 ±0.0014	0.754 ±0.0023	0.735 ±0.0013
SCORE model with continuous variables and PRS_{CAD}**	0.753 ±0.00096	0.768±0.0013	0.747 ±0.00083
SCORE model with continuous variables and Df + PRS_{CAD}*	0.752 ±0.001	0.775±0.0013	0.759 ±0.00086
SCORE model using a RFC	0.711 ±0.0013	0.745 ±0.0007	0.719 ±0.001
SCORE model using a RFC and Df*	0.758 ±0.0013	0.765 ±0.0016	0.748 ±0.0013
SCORE model using a RFC and PRS_{CAD}	0.727 ±0.0012	0.737 ±0.0022	0.728 ±0.0011
SCORE model using a RFC and Df + PRS_{CAD}**	0.745 ±0.001	0.781 ±0.0014	0.752 ±0.0009
SCORE model using continuous variables and RFC**	0.733 ±0.0013	0.750 ±0.0024	0.738 ±0.0013
SCORE model using continuous variables, Df and RFC*	0.756 ±0.0008	0.778±0.0013	0.763 ±0.0011
SCORE model using continuous variables, PRS_{CAD} and RFC**	0.735 ±0.0010	0.756 ±0.0021	0.741±0.0012
SCORE model using continuous variables, Df, PRS_{CAD} and RFC*	**0.763±0.0016**	**0.788 ±0.0014**	**0.770 ±0.0013**

Supplementary Table 8: Additional MI models performance. These tables include the precision, recall and AUC for the variations in th0se supplementary MI models.

	MI		
Model	Precision	Recall	AUC
Random Forest including left Df	0.756±0.001	0.773±0.002	0.761±0.001
Random Forest including left Df and PRS_{CAD}	0.759±0.001	0.793±0.001	0.774±0.001
Random Forest including right Df	0.759±0.001	0.778±0.002	0.765±0.001
Random Forest including right Df and PRS_{CAD}	0.756±0.001	0.787±0.001	0.772±0.001
Random Forest including quality-adjusted Df	0.766±0.001	0.784±0.002	0.771±0.001
Random Forest including quality-adjusted Df and PRS_{CAD}	0.768±0.001	0.796±0.001	0.774±0.001