Supplemental Figure 1







E. UK Biobank: Mean BMI vs. MC4R PrimateAI score



F. UK Biobank: Mean BMI vs. AlphaMissense MC4R score







D. UK Biobank: Mean BMI vs. MC4R PHRED CADD score



E. UK Biobank: Mean BMI vs. MC4R EVE score





Supp. Figure 1 legend



Supplemental Figure 1: Additional variant pathogenicity predictors do not predict mean phenotype as accurately as ESM1b. Phenotype correlations were also compared against additional variant pathogenicity prediction methods (A-SIFT, B-PolyPhen2, C-RAW CADD, D-PRED CADD, E-PrimateAI, F-EVE, G-AlphaMissense). These methods have lower Pearson correlations with mean BMI compared to ESM1b and do not differentiate between GOF and LOF missense variants in *MC4R*. EVE also does not have full coverage of all *MC4R* missense variants.



Supplemental Figure 2: Carriers of GOF/LOF *PCSK9* missense variants do not have significantly different LDL levels in UKB. Carriers of *PCSK9* GOF (n=216) and LOF (n=398) missense variants were identified. After adjusting for age, sex, and 1st 10 PCs, carrying a GOF or LOF variant was not significantly associated with LDL levels within these carriers.

UKB: Carriers of previously identified GOF/LOF PCSK9 missense variants



Supplemental Figure 3: Mean phenotype-ESM1b correlations replicate in UKB 500k exomes. 5/6 mean phenotype-ESM1b correlations replicate in the 500k exomes: *LDLR* (B), *PCSK9* (C), *APOA5* (D), *LPL* (E), and *GCK* (F). *MC4R* (A) correlation approaches significance in this replication. Replication completed in individuals only in the UKB 500k exomes release and not in the 200k exomes release.

Supplemental Figure 4



Ε. Type 2 Diabetes



Supplemental Figure 4: Comparison of differential definitions of carrier status and noncarriers by 0.1% bins of PRS. Noncarrier 1000th-tile bins with mean phenotype more severe than carriers highlighted in red: (A) monogenic obesity, (B) high HDL, and (C) high triglycerides. Carriers of curated high and low LDL (D) and MODY (E) variants have more severe phenotypes than noncarriers in extremes of PRSs. Identification of additional carriers were based on differing levels of stringency for ClinVar filtering ("ClinVar-weak" or "ClinVar-strong") or ESM1b likely pathogenic scoring (ESM1b<-7.5).

Supplemental Figure 5



BMI PRS

C. Low LDL (APOB, PCSK9) carriers: LDL vs. LDL PRS



E. High triglycerides (*APOA5, LPL*) carriers: triglycerides vs. triglycerides PRS



Supplemental Figure 5: PRS contributes to phenotypic variance even within carriers of pathogenic variants. After adjusting for sex, age, first 10 genetic PCs, and Bonferroni corrections, corresponding carrier PRS for unrelated, European obesity (A; BMI PRS β =1.68, *p*=5.60E-03), high HDL (B; HDL PRS β =9.79, *p*=1.57E-06), low LDL (β =9.87, *p*=3.18E-06), and high triglycerides (β =62.46, *p*=1.33E-05) carriers were significant. High LDL carriers' corresponding LDL PRS approached significance (β =6.76, *p*=0.028). T2D status of MODY carriers was predicted with T2D PRS after adjusting for age, sex, and first 10 genetic PCs; T2D PRS was not significant in this model (β =0.44, *p*=0.15). Pearson correlation test results are shown on each plot.

B. High HDL (CETP) carriers: HDL vs. HDL PRS







Supplemental Figure 6



Supplemental Figure 6: FAME marginal epistasis results are unlikely to be unaffected by LD structure. Pearson correlations were calculated between pseudo-genes and single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in the same region of the curated (A) low LDL, (B) MODY, (C) High HDL, (D) High LDL, (E) high triglycerides, and (F) monogenic obesity carriers. Heat maps shown here represent the absolute value of the correlations.