

1 **Preeclampsia prediction with maternal and paternal polygenic risk scores: the TMM**
2 **BirThree Cohort Study**

3

4 Hisashi OHSETO, MD,¹ Mami ISHIKURO, PhD,^{1,2} Taku OBARA, PhD,^{1,2,3} Akira NARITA,
5 PhD,^{1,2} Ippei TAKAHASHI, MMSc,¹ Genki SHINODA, MS,^{1,2} Aoi NODA, PhD,^{1,2} Keiko
6 MURAKAMI, MPH, PhD,² Masatsugu ORUI, MD, PhD,^{1,2} Noriyuki IWAMA, MD, PhD,^{1,2,3}
7 Masahiro KIKUYA, MD, PhD,^{2,4} Hirohito METOKI, MD, PhD,^{2,5} Junichi SUGAWARA,
8 MD, PhD,^{1,2,6} Gen TAMIYA, PhD,^{1,2,7} Shinichi KURIYAMA, MD, PhD,^{1,2,8}

9

10 ¹ Graduate School of Medicine, Tohoku University, Sendai, Miyagi, Japan

11 ² Tohoku Medical Megabank Organization, Tohoku University, Sendai, Miyagi, Japan

12 ³ Tohoku University Hospital, Tohoku University, Sendai, Miyagi, Japan

13 ⁴ Graduate School of Medicine, Teikyo University, Itabashi-ku, Tokyo, Japan

14 ⁵ Graduate School of Medicine, Tohoku Medical and Pharmaceutical University, Sendai,
15 Miyagi, Japan

16 ⁶ Suzuki Memorial Hospital, Iwanuma, Miyagi, Japan

17 ⁷ RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan

18 ⁸ International Research Institute of Disaster Science, Tohoku University, Sendai, Miyagi,
19 Japan

20

21 **Corresponding author**

22 Mami ISHIKURO, PhD

23 2-1 Seiryō-machi, Aoba-ku, Sendai, Miyagi, 980-8573, Japan

24 Phone: +81-22-717-8104

25 Fax: +81-22-717-8106

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 E-mail: m_ishikuro@med.tohoku.ac.jp

27

28 **Total word count:** 6,663 words

29

30 **Short Title:** Preeclampsia prediction with parental genome information

31

32

33 **Abstract (250/250 words)**

34 **Background:** Genomic information from pregnant women and their husbands may provide
35 effective biomarkers for preeclampsia. This study investigated how parental polygenic risk
36 scores (PRSs) for blood pressure (BP) and preeclampsia are associated with preeclampsia
37 onset and evaluated predictive performances of PRSs with clinical predictive variables.

38 **Methods:** In the Tohoku Medical Megabank Project Birth and Three-Generation Cohort
39 Study, participants were genotyped using either Affymetrix Axiom Japonica Array v2 (further
40 divided into two cohorts—the PRS training cohort and the internal-validation cohort—at a
41 ratio of 1:2) or Japonica Array NEO (external-validation cohort). PRSs were calculated for
42 systolic BP (SBP), diastolic BP (DBP), and preeclampsia. Associations between PRSs and
43 preeclampsia, including preeclampsia superimposed on chronic hypertension, were examined
44 using logistic regression analysis; prediction models were developed using a competing-risks
45 approach with clinical predictive variables and PRSs.

46 **Results:** In total, 19,836 participants were included. Hyperparameters for PRS calculation
47 were optimized for 3,384 participants in the training cohort. In internal- and external-
48 validation cohorts, 357 of 6,768 (5.3%) and 269 of 9,684 (2.8%) participants developed
49 preeclampsia, respectively. Preeclampsia onset was significantly associated with maternal
50 PRSs for SBP and DBP in internal- and external-validation cohorts and with paternal PRSs
51 for SBP and DBP only in the external-validation cohort. Maternal PRSs for DBP calculated
52 using “LDpred2” most improved prediction models. Maternal PRSs for DBP provided
53 additional predictive information on clinical predictive variables. Paternal PRSs for DBP
54 improved prediction models in the internal-validation cohort.

55 **Conclusions:** Parental PRS, along with clinical predictive variables, is potentially useful for
56 predicting preeclampsia.

57

58 **Keywords**

59 BirThree Cohort Study, blood pressure, clamping and thresholding, competing risk, family
60 history, genome-wide association study, hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, LDpred2,
61 parametric survival model, Tohoku Medical Megabank Project

62

63 **Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms**

64 ACOG American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

65 BMI body mass index

66 BP blood pressure

67 C+T clumping and thresholding

68 CH chronic hypertension

69 CI confidence intervals

70 DBP diastolic blood pressure

71 DM diabetes mellitus

72 GWAS genome-wide association study

73 HDP hypertensive disorders of pregnancy

74 IVF in vitro fertilization

75 JPA NEO Japonica Array NEO

76 JPA v2 Japonica Array v2

77 log MoM \log_{10} transformed multiple of the median

78 MAP mean arterial pressure

79 OR odds ratio

80 PC principal components

81 PE preeclampsia

82 PRS polygenic risk score

- 83 SBP systolic blood pressure
- 84 SD standard deviation
- 85 SLE systemic lupus erythematosus
- 86

87 **Introduction**

88 Preeclampsia (PE) is a multisystem disorder characterized by de novo hypertension and
89 proteinuria, affecting approximately 3.4% of pregnant women in the USA¹ and 2.7% in
90 Japan.² It causes approximately 45,900 maternal deaths worldwide.³ There are effective
91 interventions, such as moderate exercise,⁴ aspirin,⁵ and calcium supplementation.⁶ Thus, early
92 detection of high-risk pregnancies can lead to better outcomes⁷ for mothers and fetuses.
93 Therefore, developing accurate PE prediction models is critical in clinical practice.

94 More than a hundred prediction models for PE are reported,⁸ with some using
95 genomic information from pregnant women (here, “maternal genomic information”).⁹⁻¹² As
96 the heritability of PE was estimated to be 55% in a family study, with maternal and fetal
97 contributions accounting for 35% and 20%, respectively,¹³ maternal genomic information is
98 expected to provide a good biomarker for PE prediction. Integrating maternal genomic
99 information as a polygenic risk score (PRS) can potentially improve existing predictive
100 models; however, relevant research remains insufficient. In previous studies,⁹⁻¹² PRS for
101 blood pressure (BP) and PE were utilized but some important clinical predictive variables
102 such as actual measured BP values and family history of PE were not simultaneously
103 incorporated into the prediction models. Actual measured BP values in early pregnancy is an
104 effective PE biomarker and is included in many clinical prediction models.^{8, 14} Similarly,
105 family medical history is a predictive variable for diseases and reflects the genetic load and
106 shared environmental factors.^{15, 16} A recent study revealed that the PRS and family medical
107 history provide complementary information on noncommunicable diseases.¹⁷ As actual
108 measured BP values and family history of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy (HDP) are
109 more accessible than PRS, their combined clinical usefulness with genomic information
110 should be explored. A previous study¹⁸ reported no improvement when PRS was incorporated
111 into a prediction model with clinical predictive variables using machine learning. However,

112 this study had a small number of cases (< 100) and was not externally validated.

113 Given that genomic information from pregnant women’s husbands (here, “paternal
114 genomic information”) is transmitted to both fetal and placental tissues, paternal genomic
115 information holds predictive potential for PE. As obtaining fetal genome is difficult,
116 combining the maternal and paternal genomes may capture a comprehensive genetic
117 predisposition to PE. However, no previous studies have employed such information in PE
118 prediction models.

119 Here, we examined the relationship between genomic information from pregnant
120 women and their husbands (here, “parental genomic information”), and PE onset. Moreover,
121 we investigated whether parental PRSs have predictive information in addition to clinical
122 models, including actual measured BP values and family history of HDP.

123

124 **Materials and Methods**

125 **Participants**

126 The Tohoku Medical Megabank Project Birth and Three-Generation Cohort Study (the
127 BirThree Cohort Study)^{19, 20} recruited pregnant women and their families between 2013 and
128 2017. More than 50 obstetric clinics and hospitals in the Miyagi Prefecture, Japan
129 participated, registering 23,406 pregnant women and their 8,823 husbands.

130 We excluded the following pregnant women from the study: those who withdrew
131 consent, had multiple pregnancies, had stillbirth before 20 weeks of gestation, and missed the
132 diagnosis of PE or delivery date. Here, we included only the first-time participations of those
133 who had multiple participations in the TMM BirThree Cohort Study.

134 Participants were genotyped using either the Affymetrix Axiom Japonica Array v2
135 (JPA v2) or Japonica Array NEO (JPA NEO). Those with missing genotyping data were
136 excluded after a standard quality control procedure.²¹ Those genotyped using JPA v2 were

137 divided into two cohorts—the PRS training cohort and the maternal internal validation
138 cohort—at a ratio of 1:2. Those genotyped using JPA NEO were defined as the maternal
139 external validation cohort. The participants’ husbands were genotyped using the same
140 genotyping array platform as the participants. Cohorts with participants’ husbands’ genotypes
141 in the maternal internal and external validation cohorts were defined as the parental internal
142 and external validation cohorts, respectively (Figure 1). Ethical approval was obtained from
143 the Ethics Committee of the Tohoku Medical Megabank Organization (2023-4-025), and
144 informed consent for research participation was obtained from all participants.

145

146 **Predictive variables**

147 Based on previous research on PE prediction models,²²⁻²⁶ we selected following predictive
148 variables: maternal age at conception, pre-pregnancy body mass index (BMI), chronic
149 hypertension (CH), systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), type 1 and 2 diabetes mellitus
150 (DM), maternal family (mother or sisters) history of HDP, conception via in vitro fertilization
151 (IVF), parity (nulliparous, parous with or without previous HDP), gestational age at the
152 previous delivery, the inter-birth interval, and BP at the first antenatal care during 10–13
153 weeks of gestation. We collected BP data at 10–13 weeks of gestation, when the majority of
154 population underwent the first or second antenatal care. Mean arterial pressure (MAP) was
155 calculated and converted to \log_{10} transformed multiple of the median (log MoM) for the
156 prediction model. Paternal age and family history of HDP were obtained for paternal
157 analyses.

158

159 **Polygenic risk score**

160 Genotyping and PRS calculations are described in Supplementary Methods. In brief, PRSs
161 for three phenotypes, systolic BP (SBP), diastolic BP (DBP), and PE, were calculated using

162 two methods, genome-wide clumping and thresholding (C+T) and a Bayesian approach using
163 LDpred2.^{27,28} The hyperparameters were optimized in the PRS training cohort.

164

165 **Outcome measurement**

166 PE was identified based on the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
167 (ACOG) guidelines from 2002²⁹ using medical records at antenatal care. PE superimposed on
168 the CH was included in the definition of PE. PE was automatically diagnosed using an
169 algorithm based on medical record data and validated by a physician. The details are given
170 elsewhere.²³

171

172 **Model development**

173 We applied the competing risk model,³⁰ which has been validated internally and externally in
174 Europe³¹ and yielded comparable results in the TMM BirThree Cohort Study.^{22,23} The
175 competing risks model assumes that all pregnant women will develop PE during pregnancy,
176 but only some will actually develop PE because of competing of delivery without PE. We
177 employed a parametric survival model with a Gaussian distribution.³⁰ Delivery without PE
178 was considered as censored. Missing predictive variables were imputed using k-nearest
179 neighbor imputation with $k = 140$ (square root of the total study population³²). To assess the
180 model discrimination, Harrell's C-statistic was calculated for whole gestational age. To assess
181 model calibration, the calibration slope was calculated by regressing observed survival
182 outcomes on predicted gestational age at delivery with PE in the same parametric survival
183 models.³³

184

185 **Statistical analysis**

186 Baseline characteristics and PE status were compared between cohorts. *P*-values were

187 calculated using the *t*-test for continuous variables and chi-square test or Fisher's exact test
188 for categorical variables. Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated for all
189 combinations of parental PRSs using LDpred2 in the parental internal validation cohort.

190 Association analyses were performed using SBP-PRS, DBP-PRS, and PE-PRS using
191 LDpred2. In the maternal internal and external validation cohorts, the associations between
192 maternal PRSs and PE onset were examined using logistic regression analysis adjusted for
193 maternal age and four genetic principal components (PC). Two models were developed, one
194 with PRSs as continuous values and the other as tertile values. In the parental internal and
195 external validation cohorts, associations between both maternal and paternal PRSs and PE
196 onset were examined using logistic regression analysis adjusted for parental age and four
197 genetic PCs. The results of internal and external validation cohorts were merged using
198 inverse-variance weighting for meta-analysis. Interactions between maternal and paternal
199 PRSs were also examined. As subanalyses, participants with CH were excluded from the
200 study population, and analyses were performed again.

201 The prediction model was developed in two stages: identification of a suitable PRS
202 for prediction models and development of clinical prediction models using parental PRSs. In
203 the first stage, prediction models were developed using each maternal PRS, age, and four
204 genetic PCs. Based on the C-statistics of prediction models, we selected either C+T or
205 LDpred2 as the PRS calculation algorithm, and SBP-PRS, DBP-PRS, or PE-PRS as the PRS
206 phenotype. In the second stage, we created four models: reference model, family-history
207 model, at-pregnancy-confirmation model, and in-early-pregnancy model (Supplementary
208 Method). C-statistics and calibration slopes were calculated for each model. The 95%
209 confidence intervals (CI) and internal validation used the bootstrap method with 1,000
210 resamplings.

211 All analyses were conducted using R (4.1.0) unless otherwise noted. We considered

212 a two-tailed P -value <0.05 as significant.

213

214 **Results**

215 A total of 19,836 participants were eligible for the present study: 3,384 in the PRS training
216 cohort, 6,768 in the maternal internal validation cohort, and 9,684 in the maternal external
217 validation cohort (Figure 1). In the maternal internal and external validation cohorts, 3,673
218 (54.3%) and 2,616 (27.0%) participants, respectively, had paternal genotyping data.

219 In total, 357 of 6,768 (5.3%) participants and 269 of 9,684 (2.8%) participants
220 developed PE in the maternal internal and external validation cohorts, respectively (Table 1).
221 Of the 3,673 and 2,616 participants in the parental internal and external validation cohorts,
222 respectively, 221 (6.0%) and 23 (0.9%) participants developed PE (Supplementary Table 1).
223 Participants with PE tended to have an earlier delivery; were older; had a higher BMI; had a
224 history of CH, DM, and SLE; were nulliparous or parous with previous PE; had a shorter last
225 delivery gestational age; conceived via IVF; and had a higher BP at 10–13 weeks of
226 gestation, with slight variations among the maternal and parental cohorts (Tables 1 and
227 Supplementary Table 1). Notable differences in the characteristics between the internal and
228 external validation cohorts were observed (Supplementary Tables 2 and 3). Strong
229 correlations existed between maternal PRSs or among paternal PRSs, whereas weak
230 correlations existed between maternal and paternal PRSs (Supplementary Figure 1).

231 In association studies for the maternal cohorts (Table 2), maternal SBP-PRS and
232 DBP-PRS were significantly associated with PE onset in the meta-analysis; odds ratio (OR)
233 and 95% CI per 1 standard deviation (SD): 1.17 (1.08–1.27) and 1.21 (1.11–1.31),
234 respectively. In association studies for the parental cohorts (Supplementary Table 4), maternal
235 and paternal PRSs were not related to PE onset in meta-analysis. Only in parental external
236 validation cohort, maternal DBP-PRS, paternal SBP-PRS, and paternal DBP-PRS were

237 associated with PE onset; OR and 95% CI per 1 SD: 1.79 (1.14–2.81), 1.97 (1.28–3.04), and
238 2.04 (1.32–3.17), respectively. Similar results were observed after excluding participants with
239 CH. However, the results did not converge in the parental external validation cohort because
240 of the small number of outcomes (Supplementary Tables 5 and 6). No interaction was noted
241 between the maternal and paternal PRSs (data not shown).

242 After parameter optimization in the PRS training cohort, the predictive performances
243 of SBP-, DBP-, and PE-PRS calculated using the two methods, C+T and LDpred2, were
244 compared in the maternal internal and external validation cohorts (Table 3). The DBP-PRS
245 calculated using LDpred2 improved the discrimination performance the most in both the
246 internal (0.568 in the model with PRS vs. 0.562 in the model without PRS) and external
247 (0.602 in the model with PRS vs. 0.555 in the model without PRS) validation.

248 Thereafter, clinical prediction models were developed with maternal and paternal
249 DBP-PRSs calculated using LDpred2. In the maternal cohort, models including maternal PRS
250 demonstrated superior predictive discrimination compared to models without maternal PRS
251 in the reference and family-history models in internal validation. This was also observed in
252 all four external validation models, namely the reference, family-history, at-pregnancy-
253 confirmation, and in-early-pregnancy models (Table 4). For example, in external validation,
254 the C-statistics of the at-pregnancy-confirmation model were 0.778 without PRS and 0.788
255 with maternal PRS, indicating the utility of maternal PRS at pregnancy confirmation. Even in
256 the in-early-pregnancy model, which included BP in early pregnancy, the C-statistics
257 improved slightly by including maternal PRS (0.841 without PRS vs. 0.844 with maternal
258 PRS), suggesting the utility of maternal PRS in the prediction of early pregnancy. In the
259 parental internal validation cohort (Table 5), paternal PRS, but not maternal PRS, improved
260 the reference, family-history, and at-pregnancy-confirmation models. In the parental external
261 validation cohort, maternal, but not paternal, PRS improved the reference and family-history

262 models, although C-statistics and calibration had a wide 95% CI and the results were not
263 stable. Models with both maternal and paternal PRSs did not demonstrate better
264 discrimination ability than those with either maternal or paternal PRS (Table 5).

265

266 **Discussion**

267 The maternal SBP- and DBP-PRSs were consistently associated with PE onset in the internal
268 and external validation cohorts. The paternal SBP- and DBP-PRSs were associated with PE
269 onset only in the external validation cohort. Maternal DBP-PRS calculated using LDpred2
270 improved prediction models the most. Maternal DBP-PRS improved both at-pregnancy-
271 confirmation and in-early-pregnancy models, indicating the clinical utility of maternal PRS.
272 Paternal PRS improved prediction models in the parental internal validation cohort.

273 The present study shows that maternal PRSs for BP were associated with PE onset in
274 both internal and external validation cohorts, consistent with previous studies in the European
275 population,^{9, 10} indicating cross-ethnicity generalizability. Moreover, maternal PRS improved
276 the prediction model beyond a family history of HDP. While family history provides plentiful
277 information on genetic predisposition and environment,¹⁵ the amount of information is
278 determined by family structure and relationships, as well as by disease prevalence. Owing to
279 the demographic trend toward smaller families³⁴ and the need to obtain data retrospectively
280 because of the transient nature of the condition during pregnancy, obtaining a comprehensive
281 family history of HDP is difficult. Less than 2% of the participants and less than 1% of
282 participants' husbands reported a family history of HDP in our cohort. Moreover, reliance
283 only on binary categorization of family history may result in overlooking of the intricate
284 genetic predisposition. Therefore, incorporating PRSs into risk prediction models in addition
285 to family history is crucial for precision medicine. Maternal PRS improved at-pregnancy-
286 confirmation model and slightly improved the in-early-pregnancy model. This indicates that

287 the maternal PRS is useful in clinical practice at pregnancy confirmation and even in early
288 pregnancy, although its predictive significance is diminished by the fact that some genetic
289 predisposition for high BP may manifest itself as the actual measured BP values in early
290 pregnancy. In contrast, PE-RPS was not associated with the development of PE in this meta-
291 analysis. The GWAS for PE³⁵ used in our study had a relatively small number of cases, and
292 the number of East Asian populations in the GWAS was limited (123 in the BioBank Japan,
293 1031 in the UK Biobank, and 1,324 in the FinnGen), which might result in failure to reflect
294 genetic PE predisposition.

295 Furthermore, in this study, paternal PRSs for BP were associated with PE onset in
296 the external validation cohort. The paternal genetic contribution to PE onset has been
297 predicted in family¹³ and genetic studies.³⁶ However, as of date, the association between
298 paternal PRS and PE onset has not been investigated. Our results were inconsistent between
299 the internal and external validation cohorts. One possible reason for this is the biological
300 differences between the parental internal and external validation cohorts. Placental and
301 maternal factors are involved in the development of PE.³⁷ The baseline characteristics of the
302 parental internal and external cohorts were quite different; the prevalence of CH in
303 participants with PE was much higher in the external validation cohort than in the internal
304 validation cohort (91.3% vs. 24.9%). This may have led to differences between the two
305 cohorts in terms of the ratio of placental to maternal contributions, resulting in different
306 associations between paternal PRSs and PE. Paternal PRS improved the prediction models in
307 the parental internal validation cohort, despite no significant association in the association
308 analyses. The prediction models developed in the parental internal validation cohort did not
309 have predictive power in the parental external validation cohort possibly, because of cohort
310 differences, as mentioned previously. This suggests that the contribution of paternal PRS to
311 PE onset may differ across populations and should be considered when developing predictive

312 models.

313

314 **Strengths and Limitations**

315 Our study is the first to investigate the utility of maternal and paternal PRS for PE prediction.

316 We applied a well-validated prediction model; therefore, our results are close to clinical

317 application. Two cohorts with genomic data from different genotype array platforms and

318 baseline characteristics enabled us to examine the generalizability of the results.

319 Despite these strengths, our study had four limitations. First, our model did not

320 include effective biomarkers specific to PE, such as the uterine artery pulsatility index and

321 placental growth factor,²⁵ which may have improved the performance. However, given the

322 widespread use of genomic information beyond perinatal diseases, prediction models using

323 PRS may be more clinically applicable than those using disease-specific biomarkers. Second,

324 there were several differences between the internal and external validation cohorts. The

325 external validation cohort included more participants with CH, which was the strongest

326 predictive variable, than the internal validation cohort, resulting in calibration slopes >1 in

327 the external validation. Moreover, in the external cohort, a family history of HDP was not

328 associated with PE, limiting the purpose of this study to confirm the predictive value of the

329 PRS in addition to a family history of HDP. Third, because there is no paternal genome-wide

330 association study (GWAS) on PE, we had no choice but to apply the maternal GWAS to the

331 fathers. Fourth, owing to the small number of parental cohorts, the effectiveness of paternal

332 PRS in predicting PE may have been overlooked. Optimization was conducted only for

333 maternal PRS, which may have resulted in an underestimation of the ability of paternal PRS

334 to predict PE.

335

336 **Perspectives**

337 Genomic information remains unchanged and can be used throughout life. This is a crucial
338 difference from other biomarkers,²⁵ which are only reflective of temporary conditions. In
339 addition, PRS is useful for predicting diseases other than those in the perinatal period.^{38, 39}
340 Given the unchangeability of genomic information, our study suggests that genomic
341 information should be obtained during the relatively healthy childbearing age rather than
342 during middle or old age to avoid poor outcomes in pregnant women due to inadequate
343 prediction of PE. We showed that maternal PRS can improve clinical PE prediction models
344 and suggest its application in other perinatal diseases. In addition, we showed that the utility
345 of paternal genomic information in predicting PE is inconsistent across cohorts; therefore,
346 further studies should aim at identifying populations in which paternal PRS has predictive
347 information for PE.

348

349 **Novelty and Relevance**

350 What is New?

- 351 • Maternal and paternal genomic information improves clinical prediction models for
352 preeclampsia.

353 What is Relevant?

- 354 • Preeclampsia is a multisystem disorder characterized by de novo hypertension and
355 proteinuria, affecting approximately 3.4% of pregnant women in the USA and 2.7% in
356 Japan.
- 357 • Early detection of high-risk pregnancies of preeclampsia can lead to better outcomes
358 for mothers and fetuses. Therefore, developing accurate prediction models is critical
359 in clinical practice.

360 Clinical/Pathophysiological Implications

- 361 • This study provides new insights into the utility of parental genomic information for
362 predicting preeclampsia, which facilitates personalized antenatal care and prevention

363 strategies.

364

365 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank all the participants who consented to
366 participate in this study and all the staff at the Tohoku Medical Megabank Organization,
367 Tohoku University, Iwate Tohoku Medical Megabank Organization, and Iwate Medical
368 University. A full list of the members of the Tohoku Medical Megabank Organization is
369 available at <https://www.megabank.tohoku.ac.jp/english/a230901/>.

370 **Sources of Funding:** This work was supported by the Japan Agency for Medical Research
371 and Development (AMED), Japan (Grant Nos. JP19gk0110039, JP17km0105001,
372 JP21tm0124005, and JP21tm0424601) and JSPS KAKENHI (Grant No. JP21K10438).

373 **Disclosures:** KM is an employee of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and
374 Technology, Japan.
375

376 **References**

- 377 1. Ananth CV, Keyes KM, Wapner RJ. Pre-eclampsia rates in the United States, 1980-
378 2010: age-period-cohort analysis. *BMJ*. 2013;347:f6564.
- 379 2. Shiozaki A, Matsuda Y, Satoh S, Saito S. Comparison of risk factors for gestational
380 hypertension and preeclampsia in Japanese singleton pregnancies. *J Obstet Gynaecol*
381 *Res*. 2013;39:492-499.
- 382 3. GBD 2015 Maternal Mortality Collaborators. Global, regional, and national levels of
383 maternal mortality, 1990-2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease
384 Study 2015. *Lancet*. 2016;388:1775-1812.
- 385 4. Davenport MH, Ruchat SM, Poitras VJ, Garcia AJ, Gray CE, Barrowman N, Skow RJ,
386 Meah VL, Riske L, Sobierajski F, et al. Prenatal exercise for the prevention of
387 gestational diabetes mellitus and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: a systematic
388 review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2018;52:1367-1375.
- 389 5. Rolnik DL, Wright D, Poon LC, O’Gorman N, Syngelaki A, de Paco Matallana C,
390 Akolekar R, Cicero S, Janga D, Singh M, et al. Aspirin versus placebo in pregnancies at
391 high risk for preterm preeclampsia. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377:613-622.
- 392 6. Woo Kinshella ML, Sarr C, Sandhu A, Bone JN, Vidler M, Moore SE, Elango R,
393 Cormick G, Belizan JM, Hofmeyr GJ, et al. Calcium for pre-eclampsia prevention: A
394 systematic review and network meta-analysis to guide personalised antenatal care.
395 *BJOG*. 2022;129:1833-1843.
- 396 7. Magee LA, Nicolaides KH, von Dadelszen P. Preeclampsia. *N Engl J Med*.
397 2022;386:1817-1832.
- 398 8. De Kat AC, Hirst J, Woodward M, Kennedy S, Peters SA. Prediction models for
399 preeclampsia: A systematic review. *Pregnancy Hypertens*. 2019;16:48-66.
- 400 9. Kivioja A, Toivonen E, Tyrmi J, Ruotsalainen S, Ripatti S, Huhtala H, Jääskeläinen T,

- 401 Heinonen S, Kajantie E, Kere J, et al. Increased risk of preeclampsia in women with a
402 genetic predisposition to elevated blood pressure. *Hypertension*. 2022;79:2008-2015.
- 403 10. Nurkkala J, Kauko A, Laivuori H, Saarela T, Tyrmi JS, Vaura F, Cheng S, Bello NA,
404 Aittokallio J, Niiranen T. Associations of polygenic risk scores for preeclampsia and
405 blood pressure with hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *J Hypertens*. 2023;41:380-
406 387.
- 407 11. Honigberg MC, Truong B, Khan RR, Xiao B, Bhatta L, Vy HM, Guerrero RF,
408 Schuermans A, Selvaraj MS, Patel AP, et al. Polygenic prediction of preeclampsia and
409 gestational hypertension. *Nat Med*. 2023;29:1540-1549.
- 410 12. Tyrmi JS, Kaartokallio T, Lokki AI, Jääskeläinen T, Kortelainen E, Ruotsalainen S,
411 Karjalainen J, Ripatti S, Kivioja A, Laisk T, et al. Genetic risk factors associated with
412 preeclampsia and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2023;8:674-683.
- 413 13. Cnattingius S, Reilly M, Pawitan Y, Lichtenstein P. Maternal and fetal genetic factors
414 account for most of familial aggregation of preeclampsia: a population-based Swedish
415 cohort study. *Am J Med Genet A*. 2004;130A:365-371.
- 416 14. Wright A, Wright D, Ispas CA, Poon LC, Nicolaides KH. Mean arterial pressure in the
417 three trimesters of pregnancy: effects of maternal characteristics and medical history.
418 *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;45:698-706.
- 419 15. Valdez R, Yoon PW, Qureshi N, Green RF, Khoury MJ. Family history in public health
420 practice: a genomic tool for disease prevention and health promotion. *Annu Rev Public*
421 *Health*. 2010;31:69-87 1 p following 87.
- 422 16. Bennett RL. The family medical history. *Prim Care*. 2004;31:479-495, vii-viii.
- 423 17. Mars N, Lindbohm JV, della Briotta Parolo P, Widén E, Kaprio J, Palotie A, Ripatti S.
424 Systematic comparison of family history and polygenic risk across 24 common
425 diseases. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2022;109:2152-2162.

- 426 18. Kovacheva VP, Eberhard BW, Cohen RY, Maher M, Saxena R and Gray KJ.
427 Preeclampsia Prediction Using Machine Learning and Polygenic Risk Scores From
428 Clinical and Genetic Risk Factors in Early and Late Pregnancies. *Hypertension*.
429 2024;81:264-272.
- 430 19. Kuriyama S, Yaegashi N, Nagami F, Arai T, Kawaguchi Y, Osumi N, Sakaida M,
431 Suzuki Y, Nakayama K, Hashizume H. The Tohoku Medical Megabank Project: design
432 and mission. *J Epidemiol*. 2016;26:493-511.
- 433 20. Kuriyama S, Metoki H, Kikuya M, Obara T, Ishikuro M, Yamanaka C, Nagai M,
434 Matsubara H, Kobayashi T, Sugawara J, et al. Cohort profile: Tohoku Medical
435 Megabank Project Birth and Three-Generation Cohort Study (TMM BirThree Cohort
436 Study): rationale, progress and perspective. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2020;49:18-19m.
- 437 21. Yamada M, Motoike IN, Kojima K, Fuse N, Hozawa A, Kuriyama S, Katsuoka F,
438 Tadaka S, Shirota M, Sakurai M, et al. Genetic loci for lung function in Japanese adults
439 with adjustment for exhaled nitric oxide levels as airway inflammation indicator.
440 *Commun Biol*. 2021;4:1288.
- 441 22. Ohseto H, Ishikuro M, Obara T, Murakami K, Onuma T, Noda A, Ueno F, Iwama N,
442 Kikuya M, Metoki H, et al. Preeclampsia prediction model using the dipstick test for
443 proteinuria during early gestation. *Hypertens Res Pregnancy*. 2022;10:88-96.
- 444 23. Ohseto H, Ishikuro M, Obara T, Murakami K, Onuma T, Noda A, Takahashi I,
445 Matsuzaki F, Ueno F, et al. Dietary calcium intake was related to the onset of pre-
446 eclampsia: the TMM BirThree Cohort Study. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*.
447 2023;25:61-70.
- 448 24. Wright D, Syngelaki A, Akolekar R, Poon LC, Nicolaides KH. Competing risks model
449 in screening for preeclampsia by maternal characteristics and medical history. *Am J*
450 *Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;213:62.e1-62.e10.

- 451 25. O’Gorman N, Wright D, Syngelaki A, Akolekar R, Wright A, Poon LC, Nicolaides KH.
452 Competing risks model in screening for preeclampsia by maternal factors and
453 biomarkers at 11-13 weeks gestation. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;214:103.e1-103.e12.
- 454 26. Bartsch E, Medcalf KE, Park AL, Ray JG, High Risk of Pre-eclampsia Identification
455 Group. Clinical risk factors for pre-eclampsia determined in early pregnancy:
456 systematic review and meta-analysis of large cohort studies. *BMJ*. 2016;353:i1753.
- 457 27. Choi SW, Mak TS, O’Reilly PF. Tutorial: A guide to performing polygenic risk score
458 analyses. *Nat Protoc*. 2020;15:2759-2772.
- 459 28. Privé F, Arbel J, Vilhjálmsson BJ. LDpred2: better, faster, stronger. *Bioinformatics*.
460 2021;36:5424-5431.
- 461 29. ACOG Committee on Obstetric Practice. ACOG practice bulletin. Diagnosis and
462 management of preeclampsia and eclampsia. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 2002;77:67-75.
- 463 30. Wright D, Wright A, Nicolaides KH. The competing risk approach for prediction of
464 preeclampsia. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;223:12-23.e7.
- 465 31. Wright D, Tan MY, O’Gorman N, Poon LC, Syngelaki A, Wright A, Nicolaides KH.
466 Predictive performance of the competing risk model in screening for preeclampsia. *Am*
467 *J Obstet Gynecol*. 2019;220:199.e1-199.e13.
- 468 32. Zhang Z. Introduction to machine learning: k-nearest neighbors. *Ann Transl Med*.
469 2016;4:218.
- 470 33. Rahman MS, Ambler G, Choodari-Oskooei B, Omar RZ. Review and evaluation of
471 performance measures for survival prediction models in external validation settings.
472 *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2017;17:60.
- 473 34. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division.
474 *Patterns and Trends in Household Size and Composition: Evidence from a United*
475 *Nations Dataset 2019:ST/ESA/SER:A/433*.

- 476 35. Sakaue S, Kanai M, Tanigawa Y, Karjalainen J, Kurki M, Koshiha S, Narita A, Konuma
477 T, Yamamoto K, Akiyama M, et al. A cross-population atlas of genetic associations for
478 220 human phenotypes. *Nat Genet.* 2021;53:1415-1424.
- 479 36. Galaviz-Hernandez C, Arámbula-Meraz E, Medina-Bastidas D, Sosa-Macías M,
480 Lazalde-Ramos BP, Ortega-Chávez M, Hernandez-García L. The paternal
481 polymorphism rs5370 in the EDN1 gene decreases the risk of preeclampsia. *Pregnancy*
482 *Hypertens.* 2016;6:327-332.
- 483 37. Burton GJ, Redman CW, Roberts JM, Moffett A. Pre-eclampsia: pathophysiology and
484 clinical implications. *BMJ.* 2019;366:12381.
- 485 38. Briggs SE, Law P, East JE, Wordsworth S, Dunlop M, Houlston R, Hippisley-Cox J,
486 Tomlinson I. Integrating genome-wide polygenic risk scores and non-genetic risk to
487 predict colorectal cancer diagnosis using UK Biobank data: population based cohort
488 study. *BMJ.* 2022;379:e071707.
- 489 39. Wedekind LE, Mahajan A, Hsueh WC, Chen P, Olaiya MT, Kobes S, Sinha M, Baier
490 LJ, Knowler WC, McCarthy MI, et al. The utility of a type 2 diabetes polygenic score
491 in addition to clinical variables for prediction of type 2 diabetes incidence in birth,
492 youth and adult cohorts in an Indigenous study population. *Diabetologia.* 2023;66:847-
493 860.
- 494
- 495
- 496

TABLE 1. Baseline characteristics in the maternal internal and external cohort, stratified by the PE status

	Maternal internal validation cohort				Maternal external validation cohort			
	PE	Not affected	<i>P</i> -value	<i>n</i> of missing	PE	Not affected	<i>P</i> -value	<i>n</i> of missing
	<i>n</i> = 357	<i>n</i> = 6,411			<i>n</i> = 269	<i>n</i> = 9,415		
Gestational age, weeks	38.6 ± 2.1	39.2 ± 1.6	<0.001	0	38.2 ± 2.9	39.1 ± 1.7	<0.001	0
Maternal age at conception, years	31.9 ± 5.5	31.5 ± 5.0	0.194	0	32.1 ± 5.2	31.4 ± 5.0	0.014	0
Pre-pregnancy BMI, kg/m ²	23.5 ± 4.9	21.6 ± 3.4	<0.001	113	23.3 ± 4.9	21.4 ± 3.3	<0.001	124
CH, %	107 (30.0)	174 (2.7)	<0.001	0	104 (38.7)	191 (2.0)	<0.001	0
DM (type 1 or 2), %	8 (2.2)	17 (0.3)	<0.001	2,162	0 (0.0)	9 (0.1)	>0.999	3,818
SLE, %	2 (0.6)	5 (0.1)	0.049	2,162	2 (0.7)	3 (0.0)	0.007	3,818
Maternal family history of HDP, %	13 (3.6)	135 (2.1)	0.081	2,162	3 (1.1)	158 (1.7)	0.632	3,818
Parity			<0.001	30			<0.001	167
Nulliparous, %	182 (51.0)	2,790 (43.5)			108 (40.1)	3,609 (38.3)		

Parous with previous PE, %	29 (8.1)	175 (2.7)			27 (10.0)	262 (2.8)		
Parous with no previous PE, %	146 (40.9)	3,446 (53.8)			134 (49.8)	5,544 (58.9)		
Inter-birth interval, years	3.9 ± 3.4	3.6 ± 2.6	0.267	206	3.8 ± 3.0	3.6 ± 2.6	0.514	399
Last delivery gestational age, weeks	38.5 ± 2.4	39.0 ± 1.5	<0.001	1,257	38.4 ± 1.8	39.0 ± 1.6	<0.001	2,020
Conception by IVF, %	30 (8.4)	301 (4.7)	0.002	62	16 (5.9)	418 (4.4)	0.303	335
MAP at 10–13 weeks of gestation, mmHg	90.0 ± 11.7	80.4 ± 9.4	<0.001	973	91.5 ± 11.6	79.6 ± 9.3	<0.001	1,328

PE: preeclampsia; BMI: body mass index; CH: chronic hypertension; DM: diabetes mellitus; SLE: systemic lupus erythematosus; HDP: hypertensive disorders of pregnancy; IVF: in vitro fertilization; MAP: mean arterial pressure.

Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation for continuous variables and n (%) for categorical variables.

P-values were calculated using the chi-square or Fisher's exact test for categorical variables and the t-test for continuous variables.

Missing values were imputed using the k-nearest neighbor imputation with k = 140 (square root of the total study population).

TABLE 2. Relationship between maternal PRSs and PE onset in the maternal cohorts by logistic regression analysis

	Internal validation cohort		External validation cohort		Meta-analysis	
	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value
PRS for SBP						
Continuous	1.05 (0.94–1.17)	0.399	1.36 (1.20–1.54)	<0.001	1.17 (1.08–1.27)	<0.001
Tertile 1	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Tertile 2	1.09 (0.83–1.45)	0.525	1.06 (0.78–1.44)	0.712	1.08 (0.88–1.33)	0.472
Tertile 3	1.02 (0.78–1.34)	0.867	1.74 (1.30–2.32)	<0.001	1.31 (1.07–1.60)	0.008
PRS for DBP						
Continuous	1.09 (0.98–1.22)	0.119	1.38 (1.22–1.57)	<0.001	1.21 (1.11–1.31)	<0.001
Tertile 1	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Tertile 2	0.77 (0.57–1.03)	0.082	1.39 (1.02–1.88)	0.036	1.02 (0.83–1.26)	0.835
Tertile 3	1.09 (0.84–1.42)	0.498	2.20 (1.63–2.96)	<0.001	1.48 (1.22–1.80)	<0.001
PRS for PE						
Continuous	0.89 (0.80–1.00)	0.047	1.14 (1.01–1.28)	0.030	1.00 (0.92–1.09)	0.961
Tertile 1	Reference		Reference		Reference	

Tertile 2	0.94 (0.73–1.21)	0.625	1.45 (1.07–1.95)	0.016	1.12 (0.92–1.36)	0.241
Tertile 3	0.80 (0.62–1.05)	0.111	1.21 (0.89–1.64)	0.231	0.96 (0.78–1.17)	0.677

PRS: polygenic risk score; PE: preeclampsia; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; SBP: systolic blood pressure; DBP: diastolic blood pressure.

Two models were developed, one with PRS as a continuous value and the other as tertile values.

All results were adjusted for maternal age at conception and four genetic principal components.

498

499

TABLE 3. Prediction performance with maternal PRS derived from three phenotypes using two methods

	Systolic blood pressure		Diastolic blood pressure		Preeclampsia		No PRS
	LDpred2	C+T	LDpred2	C+T	LDpred2	C+T	
C-statistics							
Apparent	0.573 (0.537–0.606)	0.572 (0.537–0.604)	0.575 (0.538–0.607)	0.573 (0.538–0.604)	0.574 (0.537–0.605)	0.573 (0.538–0.604)	0.572 (0.538–0.604)
Internal validation	0.564	0.561	0.568	0.562	0.567	0.562	0.562
External validation	0.591 (0.550–0.629)	0.558 (0.516–0.599)	0.602 (0.564–0.639)	0.563 (0.524–0.604)	0.532 (0.489–0.573)	0.540 (0.498–0.582)	0.555 (0.515–0.597)
Calibration slope							
Apparent	1.004 (0.554–1.383)	1.004 (0.535–1.391)	1.000 (0.564–1.376)	1.006 (0.540–1.399)	1.001 (0.556–1.376)	1.005 (0.554–1.395)	1.003 (0.535–1.406)
Internal	0.823	0.819	0.828	0.811	0.835	0.813	0.846

validation

External	1.105	0.884	1.184	0.921	0.554	0.748	0.861
validation	(0.599–1.537)	(0.339–1.358)	(0.702–1.610)	(0.362–1.405)	(-0.011–1.080)	(0.161–1.249)	(0.300–1.346)

PRS: polygenic risk score.

PRSs were calculated for three phenotypes, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, and preeclampsia, using two methods, LDpred2 and C+T.

Models without PRS included maternal age and four genetic principal components as predictive variables, and the others included additional PRSs.

95% confidence intervals and internal validation used the bootstrap method with 1,000 resamplings.

501

502

TABLE 4. Performance of prediction models with maternal PRS, baseline characteristics, and blood pressure in early pregnancy in the maternal cohorts

	No PRS	M-PRS
C-statistics		
Apparent		
Reference model	0.561 (0.533–0.590)	0.575 (0.538–0.607)
Family-history model	0.567 (0.537–0.596)	0.577 (0.539–0.609)
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	0.733 (0.700–0.766)	0.738 (0.706–0.771)
In-early-pregnancy model	0.779 (0.748–0.810)	0.781 (0.750–0.810)
Internal validation		
Reference model	0.561	0.568
Family-history model	0.566	0.570
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	0.727	0.726
In-early-pregnancy model	0.776	0.775
External validation		
Reference model	0.576 (0.543–0.609)	0.602 (0.564–0.639)

Family-history model	0.571 (0.537–0.602)	0.595 (0.558–0.632)
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	0.778 (0.742–0.813)	0.788 (0.751–0.822)
In-early-pregnancy model	0.841 (0.811–0.869)	0.844 (0.812–0.871)
Calibration slope		
Apparent		
Reference model	1.006 (0.536–1.419)	1.000 (0.564–1.376)
Family-history model	0.995 (0.536–1.407)	0.996 (0.573–1.359)
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	1.001 (0.895–1.105)	1.001 (0.897–1.108)
In-early-pregnancy model	1.002 (0.898–1.097)	1.002 (0.900–1.098)
Internal validation		
Reference model	0.995	0.828
Family-history model	0.963	0.834
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	0.951	0.939
In-early-pregnancy model	0.956	0.946
External validation		
Reference model	1.195 (0.650–1.690)	1.184 (0.702–1.610)

Family-history model	0.857 (0.399–1.285)	0.909 (0.487–1.297)
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	1.210 (1.093–1.320)	1.203 (1.084–1.314)
In-early-pregnancy model	1.168 (1.060–1.278)	1.147 (1.036–1.256)

PRS: polygenic risk score; CI: confidence interval.

“No PRS” indicates models without PRS and “M-PRS” indicates models with maternal PRS for diastolic blood pressure.

Reference models included maternal age.

Family-history models included maternal family history of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and maternal age.

At-pregnancy-confirmation models included variables available at pregnancy confirmation: maternal age, pre-pregnancy body mass index, chronic hypertension, systemic lupus erythematosus, diabetes mellites, maternal family history of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, conception via in vitro fertilization, parity, gestational age at the previous delivery, and the inter-birth interval.

At-early-pregnancy models added blood pressure in early pregnancy to at-pregnancy-confirmation models.

Models with M-PRS also included maternal four genetic principal components.

95% confidence intervals and internal validation used bootstrap method with 1,000 resamplings.

503

504

TABLE 5. Prediction performance with parental PRS, baseline characteristics, and blood pressure in early pregnancy in the parental cohorts

	No PRS	M-PRS	P-PRS	M-PRS and P-PRS
C-statistics				
Apparent				
Reference model	0.573 (0.538–0.610)	0.588 (0.545–0.627)	0.609 (0.566–0.650)	0.609 (0.564–0.650)
Family-history model	0.577 (0.540–0.614)	0.588 (0.543–0.628)	0.612 (0.568–0.655)	0.613 (0.568–0.654)
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	0.718 (0.674–0.756)	0.725 (0.685–0.762)	0.728 (0.685–0.768)	0.731 (0.688–0.770)
In-early-pregnancy model	0.770 (0.733–0.803)	0.770 (0.732–0.802)	0.776 (0.738–0.808)	0.776 (0.739–0.809)
Internal validation				
Reference model	0.574	0.574	0.600	0.597
Family-history model	0.578	0.577	0.602	0.599
At-pregnancy-confirmation	0.706	0.705	0.714	0.712

model				
In-early-pregnancy model	0.761	0.757	0.761	0.759
External validation				
Reference model	0.609 (0.486–0.738)	0.657 (0.525–0.776)	0.525 (0.372–0.686)	0.560 (0.420–0.713)
Family-history model	0.600 (0.480–0.729)	0.647 (0.515–0.765)	0.518 (0.365–0.679)	0.551 (0.414–0.706)
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	0.981 (0.957–0.993)	0.980 (0.953–0.993)	0.981 (0.964–0.991)	0.981 (0.958–0.992)
In-early-pregnancy model	0.985 (0.970–0.993)	0.982 (0.964–0.991)	0.982 (0.968–0.991)	0.979 (0.962–0.989)
Calibration slope				
Apparent				
Reference model	0.989 (0.510–1.414)	0.989 (0.594–1.350)	0.988 (0.635–1.346)	0.992 (0.685–1.301)
Family-history model	0.994	0.992	0.986	0.995

	(0.518–1.411)	(0.596–1.374)	(0.637–1.360)	(0.680–1.302)
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	0.999 (0.845–1.151)	1.000 (0.847–1.151)	1.001 (0.848–1.152)	0.998 (0.847–1.149)
In-early-pregnancy model	1.001 (0.867–1.135)	1.001 (0.870–1.136)	1.000 (0.870–1.137)	0.999 (0.871–1.135)
Internal validation				
Reference model	1.012	0.822	0.837	0.765
Family-history model	0.958	0.822	0.796	0.739
At-pregnancy-confirmation model	0.911	0.890	0.871	0.852
In-early-pregnancy model	0.920	0.900	0.884	0.866
External validation				
Reference model	1.236 (-0.033–2.217)	1.080 (-0.151–2.002)	0.545 (-0.760–1.567)	0.498 (-0.633–1.451)
Family-history model	0.958 (-0.215–1.829)	0.847 (-0.259–1.692)	0.408 (-0.816–1.344)	0.381 (-0.684–1.256)

At-pregnancy-confirmation model	1.796 (1.544–2.198)	1.755 (1.500–2.182)	1.731 (1.457–2.133)	1.691 (1.427–2.116)
In-early-pregnancy model	1.550 (1.313–1.947)	1.479 (1.242–1.877)	1.505 (1.256–1.922)	1.435 (1.196–1.855)

PRS: polygenic risk score; CI: confidence interval.

“No PRS,” “M-PRS,” “P-PRS,” and “M-PRS and P-PRS” indicate models without PRS, models with maternal PRS for diastolic blood pressure, models with paternal PRS for diastolic blood pressure, and models with both maternal and paternal PRS for diastolic blood pressure, respectively.

Reference models included maternal age.

Family-history models included maternal family history of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and maternal age.

At-pregnancy-confirmation models included variables available at pregnancy confirmation: maternal age, pre-pregnancy body mass index, chronic hypertension, systemic lupus erythematosus, diabetes mellitus, maternal family history of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, conception by in vitro fertilization, parity, gestational age at the previous delivery, and the inter-birth interval.


At-early-pregnancy models added blood pressure in early pregnancy to at-pregnancy-confirmation models.

Paternal age at conception was included in all the models with paternal PRS and paternal family history of HDP was included in all the models with paternal PRS except for reference models.

Models with M-PRS and P-PRS also included maternal and paternal four genetic principal components, respectively.

95% confidence intervals and internal validation used the bootstrap method with 1,000 resamplings.

506 **Figures with Figure Legends**



507

508 **FIGURE 1. TMM BirThree Cohort Study flow for three study cohorts**

509 After excluding ineligible participants, the cohort was divided into three cohorts, namely PRS

510 training, maternal internal validation, and maternal external validation. The cohorts with

511 participants' husbands' genotypes in the maternal internal and external validation cohorts

512 were the parental internal and external validation cohorts, respectively.

513 TMM BirThree Cohort Study: The Tohoku Medical Megabank Project Birth and Three-

514 Generation Cohort Study.

515 JPA v2: Affymetrix Axiom Japonica Array v2; JPA NEO: Affymetrix Axiom Japonica Array

516 NEO.

517