

## **Figure Index**

### **MAIN FIGURES**

Figure 1. Flowcharts depicting applied methodologies

Figure 2. White matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging mean diffusivity in O'Donnell Research Group Atlas

Figure 3. Grey matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging mean diffusivity of thalamic regions of the Ilinsky and DISTAL atlases

Figure 4. Grey matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging fractional anisotropy of caudate, red nucleus, and pedunclopontine nucleus from Ilinsky and Melbourne atlases

Figure 5. Effect of ET PRS on grey matter cortical, subcortical, brainstem and ventral diencephalon volumes

Figure 6. Effect of ET PRS on cerebellar volumes

Figure 7. Cortical and subcortical volume differences between ET patients and low and high risk healthy controls

Figure 8. Shared transcriptomics of cerebellar posterior lobe grey matter volumes (latent variable F2)

### **SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES**

Figure S1. Histograms ET PRS associations with white matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (ORG Atlas)

Figure S2. White matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging of free water in ORG Atlas

Figure S3. Histograms ET PRS associations with grey matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in LeadDBS – red nucleus

Figure S4. Grey matter fractional anisotropy for red nucleus

Figure S5. Grey matter mean diffusivity for thalamus and hippocampus

Figure S6. Grey matter fractional anisotropy bar plots for red nucleus

Figure S7. Polygenic risk score distribution

Figure S8. Genetic correlation matrix

Figure S9. Ancestry principal component analysis

Figure S10. Principal component screeplot

Figure S11. Framework of ET genetic low and high risk healthy individual groups compared to ET patients analysis through liability distribution of risk model

Figure S12. Boxplots of cortical and subcortical volume differences between ET patients and low and high risk healthy controls

## Figure Legends

Figure 1. (A) Flowchart describing the different processing steps of the white matter processing pipeline from tractoflow derivatives to anatomical tract diffusion metrics. (B) Flowchart describing the different processing steps of the grey matter processing pipeline from tractoflow derivatives to grey matter diffusion metrics. (C) Flowchart describing the different steps taken to construct genomic structural equation model (GenomicSEM) and transcriptome wide structural equation model (T-SEM) for gray matter cerebellar imaging derived phenotypes (IDPs). \*Functional MRI Bayesian (FMRIB) (Woolrich et al. 2009)

Figure 2. Mean diffusivity (MD) across white matter anatomical tracts reveals positive associations with ET polygenic risk scores in cerebellar spinal and frontal projection tracts (O'Donnell Research Group (ORG) anatomically curated fiber clustering atlas, Zhang et al., 2018) (A) Glassbrain representations of the t-statistic projections indicate stronger positive associations in the anterior frontal lobe and cerebellum. A mosaic representation of the t-statistic in the MNI MNI152\_nlin\_asym\_09 template and axial, transverse and coronal slices is shown below. (B) A mosaic representation of the FDR adjusted p-value projections indicate stronger positive associations in the cerebellar and bilateral frontal lobe projections.

Figure 3. ET polygenic risk score associations with mean diffusivity (MD) in each thalamic region of the Ilinsky (Ilinsky et al., 2018) and DISTAL atlas (Ewert et al., 2017). Associations are strongest in the ventral posterior nuclei including ventral intermediate nucleus (VIM). FDR adjusted p-Value projections (above) and T-statistic projections (below).

Figure 4. ET polygenic risk score (PRS) negative associations with fractional anisotropy (FA) in the caudate are strongest in the body and anterior extent of the caudate. Positive associations with ET PRS can be observed in the bilateral red nucleus. Striatal regions derived from Ilinsky (Ilinsky et al., 2018) and Melbourne subcortical atlas (Tian et al, 2020), FDR adjusted p-Value projections (above) and T-statistic projections (below).

Figure 5. ET polygenic risk score (PRS) associations are found in the red nucleus (RN) and caudate as well as negative associations in brainstem volume phenotypes. (A) Fractional anisotropy (FA) in RN and caudate (Lead-DBS Essential Tremor Probabilistic Mapping Nowacki 2022, and Essential Tremor Hypointensity, Neudorfer 2022) showing significant associations with ET PRS. (B) Glassbrain FDR adjusted p-Value projections of significant regions associated in the brainstem, such as the midbrain, pons, medulla and ventral diencephalon, as well as the bilateral subcortical structures caudate and putamen (above). Glassbrain representations of the t-statistic projections indicate stronger positive associations in the posterior and ventral thalamic nuclei (middle). T-statistics in the MNI 152\_nlin\_asym\_09 template and axial, transverse and coronal slices (below).

Figure 6. Cerebellar volumes are negatively associated with ET polygenic risk score (PRS). (A) Glassbrain FDR adjusted p-Value projections. (B) Glassbrain t-statistic and MNI 152 2006 statistic projections (C) Diedrichsen's flatmap statistic projections, illustrating T-statistic, FDR adjusted p-Value and ETA2 effect size projections (Diedrichsen, J., 2006. A spatially unbiased atlas template of the human cerebellum. NeuroImage 33, 127-138)

Figure 7. Cortical and subcortical volume differences between (1:1) matched ET patients and healthy controls (HC) (N:49) reveal regions normally associated with ET pathophysiology. These differences are more prominent in the ET vs low-risk (LR) polygenic risk score (PRS) group. The projections of t-statistics (above) and pFDR (below). (A) Regions with negative volume associations in ET patients vs the HC group LR ET PRS. Extensive differences were found in the motor regions of cerebellum, brainstem and thalamus. (B) Fewer negative volume associations comparing ET vs HC group high-risk (HR) ET-PRS. Distinct areas in the orbitofrontal, corpus callosum, and occipital lobes have lower volume in both HC compared to ET.

Figure 8. Genetic structural equation modeling of identified cerebellar imaging-derived phenotypes (IDPs) and integration of cerebellar transcriptomics of factor F2 are depicted as follows. The F2 factor is selected because it consists of posterior lobe (part of the cerebellum involved in fine motor coordination) phenotypes. (A) Path diagram representing factor model of cerebellar IDPs associated with ET with standardized genetic loadings and standard error reported. Factor F1 largely contains anterior lobe IDPs, F2 contains posterior IDPs, F3 contains flocculonodular lobe IDPs, and F4 contains cerebellar cortex hemisphere IDPs. (B) Miami plot of factor F2 (posterior lobe IDPs) showing significant genes from transcriptome-wide structural equation modeling. Associations between gene expression in the cerebellum and factor F2 built from IDPs corresponding to identified cerebellar ROIs are shown. Horizontal blue lines show the Bonferroni significant threshold (p-value:  $8.23e-6$ ), red line denotes genome-wide significance threshold, the light blue vertical highlight depicts the 17q21.31 locus.

#### # Supplementary Figures

Figure S1. Histograms representing the associations of ET polygenic risk scores (PRS) (coefficients) with white matter microstructure measures in 73 anatomical tracts (ORG atlas). Measures of fractional anisotropy (FA), mean diffusivity (MD), free water (FW), radial diffusivity (RD), and axial diffusivity (AD).

Figure S2. Free water (FW) across white matter anatomical tracts reveals positive associations with ET polygenic risk scores (PRS) in cerebellar spinal and frontal projection tracts (ORG anatomically curated fiber clustering atlas, Zhang et al., 2018). (A) Glassbrain representations of the t-statistic projections indicate stronger positive associations in the cerebellum. ORG atlas representation of the t-statistic in the MNI 152\_nlin\_asym\_09 template and axial, transverse and coronal slices is shown below. (B) Mosaic representation of the FDR-adjusted p-value projections indicate positive associations in the spinal, cerebellar, and bilateral frontal lobe projections.

Figure S3. ET polygenic risk scores (PRS) regression coefficient histograms across Lead\_DBs atlases reveal red nucleus associations in fractional anisotropy (FA) and thalamic, striatal

associations in mean diffusivity (MD). Measures of fractional anisotropy (FA), mean diffusivity (MD), radial diffusivity (RD), and axial diffusivity (AD).

Figure S4. Fractional anisotropy (FA) in red nucleus (RN) and caudate (Lead-DBS Essential Tremor Probabilistic Mapping Nowacki 2022, and Essential Tremor Hypointensity, Neudorfer 2022) showing significant associations with ET polygenic risk score (PRS). (A) Glassbrain representation of the FDR adjusted p-value projections indicate stronger associations of FA and ET PRS in the bilateral RN. (B) Glassbrain representations of the t-statistic projections in these two regions indicate a positive association of FA in the RN and a negative association in the caudate. Mosaic representation of the t-statistic in the MNI I 152\_nlin\_asym\_09c template and axial, transverse and coronal slices is shown below.

Figure S5. Mean diffusivity (MD) in functional thalamus and hippocampus (Lead-DBS Atlas of the Human Hypothalamus, Neudorfer & Germann 2020; Thalamic Functional Atlas Kumar 2017) showing significant associations with ET polygenic risk scores (PRS). (A) Glassbrain representation of the FDR adjusted p-value projections indicate stronger positive associations in the thalamus and weaker hypothalamic and hippocampus. (B) Glassbrain representations of the t-statistic projections indicate stronger positive associations in the posterior and ventral thalamic nuclei. A mosaic representation of the t-statistic in the MNI I 152\_nlin\_asym\_09 template and axial, transverse and coronal slices is shown below. Fig. 5A. ET PRS shows negative associations with cortical volume in superior parietal and superior frontal areas, in addition to precuneus and posterior cingulate areas. Freesurfer DK parcellation (Desikan et al., 2006).

Figure S6. Fractional anisotropy (FA) in red nucleus (RN) and caudate (Lead-DBS Essential Tremor Probabilistic Mapping Nowacki 2022, and Essential Tremor Hypointensity, Neudorfer 2022) showing significant associations with ET polygenic risk scores (PRS).

Figure S7. Distribution of ET polygenic risk scores calculated in UK Biobank (UKB) cohort.

Figure S8. Genetic correlation matrix of the 16 imaging derived phenotypes (IDPs) from BIG40 corresponding to regions of interest identified from ET polygenic risk score (PRS) associations.

Genetic correlations of 1 indicate perfect overlap of genetic factors. The factors the IDPs were loaded onto are labeled and colored. Summary statistics from the factor F2 IDPs were used in Transcriptome-wide Structural Equation Modeling (T-SEM).

Figure S9. Genetic principal component analysis. (A) The first and second principal components of a random subset of 1000 samples from the cohort is taken and is compared to 1000 genomes reference panel. Samples overlap with references of European ancestry, showing that only samples of European ancestry were considered in the analysis. (B) The first and second principal components of all samples of the cohort are depicted, the lack of any substructures suggests individuals are of a similar genetic background which reduces the risk of confounding due to subpopulations or stratification.

Figure S10. Scree plot of top 15 genetic principal components of cohort. Polygenic scores were then corrected by regressing out the top 15 principal components.

Figure S11. The liability distribution of a healthy population's liability towards developing ET remains below disease threshold. However, as risk accumulates, healthy individuals shift towards and may even surpass the disease threshold and develop ET. Healthy individuals with the lowest polygenic risk scores (PRS) are in the lowest risk group and will likely never develop ET. On the other side of the distribution, healthy individuals with the largest PRS are in the highest risk group and are at the greatest risk of developing ET yet remain subthreshold for disease. This model provides the framework for comparisons of brain morphometry between the genetically low-risk group and patients, and comparisons between the genetically high-risk group and patients provide unique insights into what vulnerability regions are necessary for ET development.

Figure S12. Boxplots of cortical and subcortical volume differences between (1:1) matched ET patients and healthy controls (HC) (N:49) reveal regions normally associated with ET pathophysiology. These differences are more prominent in the ET vs low risk (LR) PRS group while fewer differences were found in the ET vs HR PRS group. (A) Depicts differences between the high risk group and patients. (B) Depicts differences between the low risk group and patients.

## **Table Index**

Main Text Table Index

Supplemental Table Index

ET\_PRS Associations with WM DMRI

Tables S1-5 include statistics from the O'Donnell Research Group (ORG) Atlas (34):

Table S1. ET PRS Association with White Matter Mean Diffusivity (MD) - O'Donnell Research Group (ORG) Atlas

Table S2. ET PRS Association with White Matter Free Water (FW) - O'Donnell Research Group (ORG) Atlas

Table S3. ET PRS Association with White Matter Fractional Anisotropy (FA) - O'Donnell Research Group (ORG) Atlas

Table S4. ET PRS Association with White Matter Radial Diffusivity (RD) - O'Donnell Research Group (ORG) Atlas

Table S5. ET PRS Association with White Matter Axial Diffusivity (AD) - O'Donnell Research Group (ORG) Atlas

ET PRS Associations with GM DMRI

Tables S11-14 include statistics from the following atlases:

Cerebellar\_Functional\_Networks\_17 Networks (42), DBS\_targets (40), Essential\_Tremor\_Hypointensity (39), Essential\_Tremor\_Probabilistic\_Mapping (38), subcortical parcellation (56), Nigral organization atlas (37)

Table S6. ET PRS Associations with grey matter fractional anisotropy (FA) - LeadDBS\_Atlas\_compendium (Zhang's 2017 substantia nigra segmentation & Buckner's 2011 functional Cerebellum)

Table S7. ET PRS Associations with grey matter mean diffusivity (MD) - LeadDBS\_Atlas\_compendium (Buckner's 2011 functional Cerebellum)

Table S8. ET PRS Associations with grey matter radial diffusivity (RD) - LeadDBS\_Atlas\_compendium

Table S9. ET PRS Associations with gray matter axial diffusivity (AD) - LeadDBS\_Atlas\_compendium

Tables S10-13 include statistics from the following Atlases:

Atlas\_of\_the\_Human\_Hypothalamus (43), Brainstem\_Connectome\_Atlas (47), DBS\_targets (40), DBS\_Tractography\_Atlas (41), Dystonia\_Response\_Tract\_Atlas (42), Nigral\_organization\_atlas (37), Striatal\_Functional\_Networks\_17Networks (46), Thalamic\_Functional\_Atlas (7), TOR\_PSM\_dystonia (45), TOR\_signPD (44), Zona\_Incerta\_Atlas (48).

Table S10. ET PRS Associations with grey matter fractional anisotropy (FA) - LeadDBS\_Atlas\_compendium\_extendedTable

S11. ET PRS Associations with grey matter – mean diffusivity (MD) - LeadDBS\_Atlas\_compendium\_extended (Zhang's 2017 substantia nigra segmentation)

Table S12. ET PRS Associations with grey matter radial diffusivity (RD) - LeadDBS\_Atlas\_compendium\_extended

Table S13. ET PRS Associations with grey matter axial diffusivity (AD) - LeadDBS\_Atlas\_compendium\_extended

Tables S14-17 include statistics from the following Atlases:

Atlas\_Basal\_Ganglia\_and\_Thalamus (53), DISTAL (49), Human\_Motor\_Thalamus (50), HybraPD\_Atlas (55), Melbourne\_Subcortex\_Atlas (51), MNI\_PD25\_subcortical (56), THOMAS\_Atlas (52), AHEAD (54)



Table S14. ET\_PRS Lead\_DBS Extended Associations with grey matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (dMRI) – Mean Diffusivity (MD)

Table S15. ET\_PRS Lead\_DBS Extended Associations with grey matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (dMRI) – Fractional Anisotropy (FA)

Table S16. ET\_PRS Lead\_DBS Extended Associations with grey matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (dMRI) – Radial Diffusivity (RD)

Table S17. ET\_PRS Lead\_DBS Extended Associations with grey matter diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (dMRI) – Axial Diffusivity (AD)

ET PRS Associations with GM morphometry

Tables S18-23 include statistics from the following Atlases:

Desikan-Killiany cortical atlas (22), Freesurfer subcortical segmentations (24-26). The Harvard-Oxford cortical and subcortical atlases (20-23) and Diedrichsen cerebellar atlas (9)

Table S18. Cortical Surface Area

Table S19. Cortical Volume

Table S20. Cortical Thickness

Table S21. Subcortical Volume

Table S22. Subcortical Volume\_extended\_1

Table S23. Subcortical Volume\_extended\_2

PRS HR and LR Groups vs Patients:

Table S24. Summary of ET patient samples, high genetic risk, and low genetic risk matched healthy control samples.

Table S25. Cortical and subcortical volume associations in matched ET vs healthy control groups of low (LR PRS) and high (HR PRS) genetic risk

GenomicSEM

Table S26. Significant transcriptomic associations from Transcriptomic Structural Equation Modeling (TSEM)