

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

## Supplementary Material for

The pivotal role of the X-chromosome in the genetic architecture of the  
human brain

**This PDF file includes:**

Supplementary Methods and Results  
Captions of Supplementary Tables 1 to 23.

**Other Supplementary Information for this manuscript includes:**

Supplementary Figures 1 to 22 (available in a PDF file)  
Supplementary Tables 1 to 23 (.xlsx, available in a ZIP file)

## 1 SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS

### 2 Sex phenotypic differences

3 We used a linear model including sex and other covariates to test sex differences. Sex was the term of  
4 interest (males coded as 1 and females coded as 2) and the significance was tested via an F test. The  
5 covariates we adjusted for were the same as used in the dosage compensation and heritability analysis.  
6 We want to emphasize that we also adjusted the interaction terms between sex and age (and squared of  
7 age). Therefore, we focused on the main effect of sex on traits.

8

### 9 Detailed preprocessing for genetic data

10 We used the UKB imaging data released up to February 2020 (phases 1-3) for discovery (n = 36,000) and  
11 used the phase 4 imaging data (n = 3,100) for replication in X-chromosome association analysis (XWAS).  
12 Version 3 of imputed genetic data was downloaded from UKB. We processed the imputed genotype data  
13 with PLINK2<sup>1</sup> (v2.00a3LM, <https://www.cog-genomics.org/plink/2.0/>) separately for each set of imaging  
14 traits.

15

16 For the discovery data, we focused on the subjects with non-Hispanic white ancestries (Field 21000).  
17 Based on the quality control information provided by UKB investigators, we removed subjects with  
18 excessive heterozygosity (Field ID 22027), mismatched self-reported sex and genetic sex (Field ID  
19 22001), putative sex chromosome aneuploidy (Field ID 22019), and missing genotype rate over 5% (--  
20 mind 0.05). We excluded SNPs with an imputation score less than 0.3 (Resource 1967), a minor allele  
21 frequency (MAF) less than 0.0003 (--maf 0.0003) for dosage compensation (DC) and heritability analysis  
22 (more on this later), and further excluded SNPs with an imputation score less than 0.6, a MAF less than  
23 0.005 for XWAS. Moreover, SNPs with a Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium test p-value less than  $1 \times 10^{-6}$   
24 (--hwe 0.000001) and multiallelic sites (--snps-only just-acgt) were also excluded.

25

26 We pruned subjects in terms of relatedness by GCTA<sup>2</sup> (v1.93.2 beta,  
27 <https://yanglab.westlake.edu.cn/software/gcta/#Overview>). We first computed the genetic relationship  
28 matrix (GRM) for each autosome and merged them (--mgrm). Then we removed one of a pair of  
29 individuals with estimated relatedness larger than 0.05 (--grm-cutoff 0.05), which corresponds to 1<sup>st</sup>  
30 degree relatives. Approximately 1,800 subjects were excluded. The final discovery data had 33,591  
31 subjects (with a minimum of 29,078 for tfMRI and a maximum of 35,793 for SA) with 15,939 males and  
32 17,652 females. 289,866 NPR SNPs and 11,508 PAR SNPs on the X-chromosome were included in the  
33 analyses. The genetic data for the Y-chromosome was not imputed, and subject to the above processes,  
34 140 SNPs were remaining for association analysis.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

The genetic data for replication included UKB phase 4 non-Hispanic white subjects (UKBE,  $n = 4,181$ ), UKB phase 1 to 4 South Asian and Chinese subjects (UKBSAC,  $n = 462$ ), and UKB phase 1 to 4 African subjects (UKBA,  $n = 295$ ). To maximize the sample size, we merged white subjects that were excluded due to relatedness in the discovery phase and the phase 4 white subjects. Then we did another round of pruning for relatedness (--grm-cutoff 0.05). Asian and African subjects were also subject to relatedness pruning at the same level. Other QC steps were the same as before.

### Adjusting for multiple hypothesis testing in XWAS by wild bootstrap

Suppose we have  $Q$  traits in total, we want to adjust for multiple hypothesis testing considering the number of traits by wild bootstrap, which means we still use the genome-wide threshold  $5 \times 10^{-8}$  for the adjusted p-values. The specific steps are as follows,

1. For each trait  $Y_q$ , fit a null model  $Y_q = X_q \alpha_q + \varepsilon_q$ , where  $Y_q$  is a vector of trait;  $X_q$  is the covariate matrix for trait  $q$ . We get  $\hat{\alpha}_q$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_q$ .
2. Let  $v_i^{(b)} \sim N(0,1)$ , generate sample  $b$  for each trait and each subject  $i$ :  $Y_{iq}^{(b)} = X'_{iq} \hat{\alpha}_q + v_i^{(b)} \hat{\varepsilon}_{iq}$ . Note that  $v_i^{(b)}$  are the same for all traits but different among subjects and bootstrap samples.
3. For a SNP  $k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, N_g$ , do XWAS on all traits with models  $Y_q^{(b)} = X_q \alpha_q^{(b)} + Z_{qk} \beta_{qk}^{(b)} + \varepsilon_q^{(b)}$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, Q$ , where  $Z_{qk}$  are genotype vectors which may have difference sample size across traits. Then we can get  $F$  statistics for all  $Q$  traits  $(F_{1k}^{(b)}, \dots, F_{Qk}^{(b)})'$ . Take the max  $F$  statistic  $F_k^{(b)*}$  over traits.
4. Repeat the step 2, 3 for  $B = 150$  samples, we get  $(F_k^{(1)*}, \dots, F_k^{(B)*})'$ , then we can approximate a  $\chi^2$  distribution for SNP  $k$  by moment matching. Specifically, let  $k_1$ ,  $k_2$  and  $k_3$  denote the mean, variance, and skewness of  $(F_k^{(1)*}, \dots, F_k^{(B)*})'$ . We compute parameters  $a = k_3 / (4 \times k_2)$ ,  $b = k_1 - 2k_2^2 / k_3$ ,  $d = 8k_2^3 / k_3^2$ . Then the adjusted p-value for SNP  $k$  on trait  $q$  can be approximated by  $1 - pchisq(\frac{F_{qk}^{obs} - b}{a}, d)$ , where  $pchisq$  is the c.d.f. of  $\chi^2$  distribution, and  $F_{qk}^{obs}$  is the observed  $F$  statistic computed from the real data. Note the more bootstrap samples, the more accurate the approximation. If the raw p-values are extremely small, such as  $10^{-20}$ ,  $B$  may increase to 200 or 300.

Since the computational burden of doing the procedure for all SNPs was intractable, we split the SNPs into five groups based on MAF: [0.005, 0.01), [0.01, 0.05), [0.05, 0.10), [0.10, 0.25), [0.25, 0.50], and randomly picked 10 SNPs in each group. For a group, we combined  $(F_k^{(1)*}, \dots, F_k^{(B)*})$  generated from the

1 10 SNPs to approximate the  $\chi^2$  distribution for that group. In other words, we assumed that the  
2 distribution parameters were identical for SNPs in the same MAF group.

3

#### 4 SUPPLEMENTARY RESULTS

##### 5 Dosage compensation and X-linked heritability for DTI and fMRI traits

6 Out of the 110 tract-mean traits, 93 exhibited significant  $h_X^2$ , with an average of  $h_X^2 = 1.20\%$  (se =  
7 0.393%) (Fig. S17), whereas 330 out of 525 DTI PC traits were significant, with an average of  $h_X^2 =$   
8 1.30% (se = 0.422%) (Fig. 2E and Fig. S18). The atlas of enrichment for tract-mean DTI traits are in  
9 Fig. S19. For each pair of tract and DTI metric, there was a correspondence between the number of PCs  
10 favoring full DC and the DC status of the tract-mean trait (Fig. S20). Specifically, most tract-mean traits  
11 in favor of full DC had more than three PCs also in favor of full DC. In contrast, most tract-mean traits  
12 favoring no DC had no more than two PCs favoring full DC. However, we found some outliers. For  
13 example, FA of fornix had the second to fifth PC favoring no DC, but the tract-mean trait favored full  
14 DC. Similarly, MO of posterior corona radiata had the second to fifth PC favoring full DC but the tract-  
15 mean trait favored no DC. The latter case is probably because the first PC had extremely high  $h_X^2 =$   
16 4.64%, thus dominating the DC status. As a result, the top five PCs can capture the major genetic  
17 information underlying the DC mechanism for DTI white matter tracts. Overall, heritability analysis for  
18 DTI traits on the X-chromosome shows that functional PCs can provide different dimensions from the  
19 tract-mean traits to explain genetic control.

20

21 Language, secondary visual, and frontoparietal networks had the highest  $h_X^2$  among the mean amplitude  
22 rfMRI G360 traits ( $h_X^2 = 1.67\% \sim 1.79\%$ ), while the average functional connectivity within primary and  
23 secondary visual networks and the one between these two networks surpassed all other connectivity G360  
24 traits of rfMRI ( $h_X^2 = 2.46\% \sim 2.86\%$ ) (Fig. S21A). G360 traits for tfMRI presented different patterns  
25 than rfMRI. The mean amplitudes of frontoparietal, posterior-multimodal, and dorsal-attention networks  
26 were the most heritable for the X-chromosome (maximum  $h_X^2 = 1.13\% \sim 1.53\%$ ), whereas the average  
27 functional connectivity between frontoparietal and posterior-multimodal networks, and that between  
28 language and posterior multimodal networks, as well as that within the language network ( $h_X^2 =$   
29 1.78%~1.94%) surpassed all other G360 traits of tfMRI in terms of  $h_X^2$  (Fig. S21B).

30

31 For rfMRI ICA, we compared the distribution of DC for all networks separately. More than half of  
32 amplitude traits related to attention and visual networks were in favor of no DC. These traits were mostly  
33 located in temporal and occipital regions. Moreover, functional connectivity traits associated with limbic

1 and subcortical-cerebellar networks mostly favored no DC. These traits were mainly located in the  
2 cerebellum, temporal and subcortical regions. we found that more than half of node amplitude traits  
3 related to visual and attention networks were enriched in favor of no DC, while more than half of  
4 functional connectivity traits related to the subcortical cerebellum favored no DC. The consistency and  
5 disparity of DC patterns between G360 and ICA traits indicate that both approaches can capture the major  
6 genetic information of DC, but ICA provides finer resolution to investigate the functional organization  
7 and communication between brain networks.

### 9 **Overview of sex phenotypic differences in complex brain imaging traits**

10 Sex differences in the human brain with respect to cortical and subcortical structures, white matter  
11 microstructures, and functional connectivity were observed in plenty of studies<sup>3</sup>. We evaluated the sex  
12 differences using a wide spectrum of traits using a linear model (**Supplementary Methods**) and adjusted  
13 potential confounding that may bias the sex effect, including age, genetic principal components, head  
14 motion and positions, etc. 2,260 (80.1%) traits were significantly different between sexes after multiple  
15 hypothesis adjustment by the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to control false discovery rate (FDR) at 0.05  
16 level (**Table S15**). Each set of traits had comparable proportion of significant ones, except for rfMRI ICA  
17 trait, for which only 75.6% traits were significant. Set females as reference, 52.6% significant traits had a  
18 positive effect size for sex (proportion test,  $p$ -value = 0.015), which means males had significantly more  
19 traits with larger measures than females. The proportion of positive effect size varied from set to set (**Fig.**  
20 **S22**). For instance, both CT and BV had more than 58% traits with positive effect for sex, but the  
21 proportion for SA was only 47.4%. All DTI traits were of the proportion greater than 50%, where 71.8%  
22 tract-mean traits were of larger values for males. Remarkably, 79.3% G360 traits of rfMRI were larger for  
23 males, while males only surpassed females for 47.1% ICA traits of rfMRI, indicating the proportion  
24 highly depends on brain parcellations and trait generation process.

25  
26 By closely examining the sex differences within each modality, we found more significant disparities. For  
27 example, males had larger total BV, CSF and total SA relative to females, but had smaller gray and white  
28 matter volume and mean CT. Overall mean traits of DTI were larger for males except for RD. External  
29 capsule and the ratio of fornix to stria terminalis were the only two tracts with negative sex effect  
30 evaluated by AD. For G360 traits of both rfMRI and tfMRI, we discovered that males had greater mean  
31 amplitude for all networks, but females had greater mean functional connectivity related to ventral-  
32 multimodal network. Similarly, for rfMRI ICA traits, males had greater amplitude for majority (83.3%) of  
33 nodes, while females surpassed males in terms of functional connectivity. Most of these discoveries were  
34 consistent with previous studies<sup>4-9</sup>. There is increasing evidence that both the X-chromosome and sex

1 steroid exposures across the lifespan can potentially alter the human brain from many aspects<sup>10-13</sup>, and  
2 therefore, we are motivated to investigate genetic underpinnings of human brain with respect to the X-  
3 chromosome.

4

## 5 CAPTIONS OF SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

### 6 **Supplementary Table 1: Details for complex brain imaging traits.**

7 Sheet 1: This sheet shows trait categories and numbers of traits.

8 Sheet 2: This sheet shows trait abbreviations and full names for DTI traits.

9 Sheet 3: This sheet shows DTI metrics and descriptions.

10 Sheet 4: This sheet shows relevant brain locations and networks for ICA traits.

11

### 12 **Supplementary Table 2: Results of dosage compensation and enrichment analysis for X-linked** 13 **heritability.**

14

15 **Supplementary Table 3: X-linked heritability estimated in sex-stratified analysis.** The heritability  
16 was computed by GCTA (<https://yanglab.westlake.edu.cn/software/gcta/#Overview>). The likelihood-ratio  
17 test (LRT) was conducted by comparing the full model including both the genetic relatedness matrices  
18 (GRMs) of autosomes and of the X-chromosome, with the reduced model including the GRM of  
19 autosomes only. The raw p-values were adjusted for the number of traits by Benjamini-Hochberg  
20 procedure to control the false discovery rate (FDR) at 0.05 level.

21

### 22 **Supplementary Table 4: Basic information of XWAS.**

23

### 24 **Supplementary Table 5: Independent significant SNPs identified by LD pruning.**

25 Sheet 1: Nominal significant SNPs ( $p$ -value  $< 5e-08$ ) in LD  $> 0.6$  were grouped under an independent  
26 significant SNP.

27 Sheet 2: We did a further round of pruning by restricting the adjusted p-values of identified independent  
28 significant SNPs (in Sheet 1) less than  $5e-08$ , where the raw p-values were adjusted by wild bootstrap.

29

### 30 **Supplementary Table 6: Significant loci identified by LD pruning.**

31 Sheet 1: Nominal significant SNPs ( $p$ -value  $< 5e-08$ ) in LD  $> 0.6$  were grouped under an independent  
32 significant SNP. The LD blocks defined by independent significant SNPs with distances less than 250kb  
33 with each other were merged into a single genomic locus.

1 Sheet 2: Based on results in Sheet 1, we further restricted that the top SNP for each locus was significant  
2 after adjusting for multiple hypothesis testing for all the traits using wild bootstrap. Whether the trait-  
3 locus pairs were newly identified and whether they were replicated by UKBE subjects only and by meta-  
4 analysis for UKBE, UKBA and UKBSAC subjects were also marked.

5

6 **Supplementary Table 7: Significant variants of meta-analysis for sex-stratified XWAS results.** The  
7 meta-analysis was performed by METAL ([https://genome.sph.umich.edu/wiki/METAL\\_Documentation](https://genome.sph.umich.edu/wiki/METAL_Documentation)).  
8 The raw p-values were adjusted by wild bootstrap considering the number of traits. The significant  
9 variants were those with adjusted p-values less than  $5e-08$ . The bolded results are new SNPs that were not  
10 identified in the sex-agnostic XWAS.

11

12 **Supplementary Table 8: XWAS replication results.** The top SNP for each locus was presented. A locus  
13 was replicated if the top SNP in the replication study was lower than the Bonferroni threshold ( $0.05/50 =$   
14  $0.001$ ).

15 Sheet 1: The XWAS replication results using phase 4 European-ancestry subjects (UKBE,  $n = 4,181$ ).  
16 Replicated associations are bolded.

17 Sheet 2: The XWAS replication results using phase 1 to 4 African-ancestry subjects (UKBA,  $n = 295$ ).

18 Sheet 3: The XWAS replication results using phase 1 to 4 South Asian-ancestry and Chinese-ancestry  
19 subjects (UKBSAC,  $n = 462$ ).

20 Sheet 4: The individual XWAS replication results were meta-analyzed using Metal  
21 (<https://genome.sph.umich.edu/wiki/METAL>). Replicated associations are bolded.

22

23 **Supplementary Table 9: Significant variants of meta-analysis for XWAS discovery and white**  
24 **replication results.** The meta-analysis was performed by METAL  
25 ([https://genome.sph.umich.edu/wiki/METAL\\_Documentation](https://genome.sph.umich.edu/wiki/METAL_Documentation)). The raw p-values were adjusted by wild  
26 bootstrap considering the number of traits. The significant variants were those with adjusted p-values less  
27 than  $5e-08$ .

28

29 **Supplementary Table 10: NHGRI-EBI GWAS catalog (2023.06) lookup for nominal significant**  
30 **SNPs (p-value <  $5e-08$ ) and significant SNPs after further adjustment.**

31 Sheet 1: The lookups in this sheet are based on nominal significant SNPs (p-value <  $5e-08$ ).

32 Sheet 2: The lookups in this sheet are based on significant SNPs after adjusting for multiple hypothesis  
33 testing for all the traits by wild bootstrap (adjusted p-value <  $5e-08$ ), as well as other SNPs that are in  
34  $LD > 0.6$  with these significant SNPs.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

**Supplementary Table 11: MAGMA gene-based analysis results.** Summary statistics of nominal significant variants ( $p\text{-value} < 5e\text{-}08$ ) were utilized in the analysis. The Bonferroni threshold considering the number of protein-coding genes (747) and the effective number of independent traits (230) were used ( $p\text{-value} < 0.05/747/230 = 2.91e\text{-}07$ ). GRCh37 was used to map SNPs to genes by physical location.

**Supplementary Table 12: Independent significant SNPs mapped to genes based on expression quantitative trait locus (eQTL) mapping.** PAR SNPs had no results.

**Supplementary Table 13: Independent significant SNPs mapped to genes based on functional consequence.** The independent significant SNPs were in  $LD > 0.6$  with the top SNP of each locus.

**Supplementary Table 14: Mapped genes identified in functional mapping using nominal significant SNPs at  $5e\text{-}08$  level.**

**Supplementary Table 15: Gene mapping using chromatin interaction profiles with H-MAGMA.**

**Supplementary Table 16: Biological annotation for prioritized genes using DAVID Bioinformatics Database (<https://david.ncifcrf.gov/home.jsp>).**

**Supplementary Table 17: Biological annotation for prioritized genes using SynGO (<https://syngoportal.org/>).**

**Supplementary Table 18: Summary data-based Mendelian randomization results.** The summary statistics of CAGE whole-blood eQTL analysis were provided by Sidorenko et al.<sup>14</sup>. The analysis was conducted by SMR module in GCTA (<https://yanglab.westlake.edu.cn/software/gcta/#Overview>). We set all parameters as default. Bolded results had FDR-adjusted p-values less than 0.05 and HEIDI p-values greater than 0.05.

**Supplementary Table 19: Sex phenotypic differences in complex brain imaging traits.**

**Supplementary Table 20: Significant variants in sex-stratified XWAS.**



1 **Supplementary Table 21: Significant variants in meta-analysis for sex-stratified XWAS using UKB**  
2 **discovery data and UKB replication data of white subjects.**

3  
4 **Supplementary Table 22: Variants that had significantly different effect sizes between sexes.** The  
5 significant variants were then meta-analyzed across sexes using the Stouffer's method.

6  
7 **Supplementary Table 23: Differences in genetic profiles between subjects classified by phenotypic**  
8 **quantiles.**

9  
10 **REFERENCES**

- 11 1. Chang, C.C. *et al.* Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer  
12 datasets. *Gigascience* **4**, s13742-015-0047-8 (2015).
- 13 2. Yang, J., Lee, S.H., Goddard, M.E. & Visscher, P.M. GCTA: a tool for genome-wide  
14 complex trait analysis. *Am J Hum Genet* **88**, 76-82 (2011).
- 15 3. Ritchie, S.J. *et al.* Sex Differences in the Adult Human Brain: Evidence from 5216 UK  
16 Biobank Participants. *Cereb Cortex* **28**, 2959-2975 (2018).
- 17 4. Gur, R.C. & Gur, R.E. Complementarity of sex differences in brain and behavior: From  
18 laterality to multimodal neuroimaging. *Journal of neuroscience research* **95**, 189-199  
19 (2017).
- 20 5. Gur, R.C. *et al.* Sex differences in brain gray and white matter in healthy young adults:  
21 correlations with cognitive performance. *Journal of Neuroscience* **19**, 4065-4072 (1999).
- 22 6. Gong, G. *et al.* Age-and gender-related differences in the cortical anatomical network.  
23 *Journal of Neuroscience* **29**, 15684-15693 (2009).
- 24 7. Satterthwaite, T.D. *et al.* Linked sex differences in cognition and functional connectivity  
25 in youth. *Cerebral cortex* **25**, 2383-2394 (2015).
- 26 8. Allen, E.A. *et al.* A baseline for the multivariate comparison of resting-state networks.  
27 *Frontiers in systems neuroscience* **5**, 2 (2011).
- 28 9. Kaczkurkin, A.N., Raznahan, A. & Satterthwaite, T.D. Sex differences in the developing  
29 brain: insights from multimodal neuroimaging. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **44**, 71-85  
30 (2019).
- 31 10. Rubinow, D.R. & Schmidt, P.J. Sex differences and the neurobiology of affective  
32 disorders. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **44**, 111-128 (2019).
- 33 11. Raznahan, A. & Disteche, C.M. X-chromosome regulation and sex differences in brain  
34 anatomy. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **120**, 28-47 (2021).
- 35 12. Gegenhuber, B. & Tollkuhn, J. Signatures of sex: Sex differences in gene expression in  
36 the vertebrate brain. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Developmental Biology* **9**, e348  
37 (2020).
- 38 13. Marrocco, J. & McEwen, B.S. Sex in the brain: hormones and sex differences. *Dialogues*  
39 *in clinical neuroscience* (2022).
- 40 14. Sidorenko, J. *et al.* The effect of X-linked dosage compensation on complex trait  
41 variation. *Nat Commun* **10**, 3009 (2019).
- 42