

1 Supplement to ‘HORNET: Tools to find
2 genes with causal evidence and their
3 regulatory networks using eQTLs’

4 Noah Lorincz-Comi^{1*}, Yihe Yang¹, Jayakrishnan
5 Ajayakumar¹, Makaela Mews¹, Valentina
6 Bermudez², William Bush¹ and Xiaofeng Zhu¹

7 ^{1*}Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences,
8 Case Western Reserve University.

9 ^{2*}Department of Neurosciences, Case Western Reserve University.

10 *Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): njl96@case.edu;

11 **Contents**

12	1 Missing data	3
13	1.1 Demonstration of missingness	3
14	1.2 Support from cis-eQTLs in a larger window	5
15	1.3 Multivariate Imputation	5
16	1.3.1 Procedure	5
17	1.3.2 Simulations with generated data	7
18	1.3.3 Simulations with real data	9
19	1.4 Power after imputing missing values	10
20	2 Accounting for LD in eQTL-MVMR	11
21	2.1 CHP bias from LD	11
22	2.1.1 Notation	11
23	2.1.2 Models	12
24	2.1.3 CHP bias in traditional MR methods	14
25	2.1.4 HORNET CHP correction	19
26	2.2 MRBEE bias-correction under LD	20
27	2.3 Heritability estimation	22
28	2.4 Source of bias in MRBEE from a misspecified LD matrix	22

2 CONTENTS

29	2.5	Misspecified LD	25
30	2.5.1	Background	25
31	2.5.2	Inflation correction (IFC)	25
32	2.5.3	Simulation setup	28
33	2.5.4	Type I error	29
34	2.5.5	Power	30
35	3	Estimating bias-correction terms	31
36	4	Gene Selection	32
37	5	Prioritizing tissues	33
38	5.1	Heritability scores	34
39	5.2	Running <code>tissue_chooser.py</code> to prioritize tissues	35
40	5.3	Limitations	36
41	6	Software	36

1 Missing data

1.1 Demonstration of missingness

As mentioned in the main text, the set of instrumental variables (IVs) used in multiple exposure Mendelian Randomization (MVMR) is the union set of exposure-specific IV sets. In summary data from cis-eQTL GWAS in which each exposure is the expression of gene, not all SNPs are tested for an association with each gene. Generally, only SNPs within $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ of a gene are tested for an association with the expression of that gene. This means that the union set may contain at least some SNPs for which there is no estimate of association between them and each gene in a locus under study. Visual representations of this are displayed in Figures 1 and 2. To avoid introducing missing data by using the union set of gene-specific IV sets in MVMR, one may consider using the intersection set of gene-specific IV sets, guaranteeing no missing data. However, for a locus containing a moderately large number of genes (e.g., ~ 10 or more), the intersection set may actually be of very small size or even empty. This could respectively introduce a $p > n$ scenario or even prevent MVMR from performed.




Fig. 1 This is an example representation of the data that is available in the summary-level eQTLGen [33] and GTEx [9] cis-eQTL public data sets. Only associations between SNPs and the expression of genes within $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ of those SNPs have estimates included in the available data. Since in multivariable MR, we select as the IV set the union of gene-specific IV sets, this union set may contain no SNPs with association estimates observed for all genes in a group. Put another way, the intersection of all gene-specific IV sets that is restricted only to SNPs with no non-missing values may be empty.




Fig. 2 Determinations of missing values for each SNP (in order by BP position on y-axis) that was used in multivariable MR with the 30 genes ordered by BP position on CHR 22 (x-axis), as an example. These genes were grouped using the procedure described in **Methods**. It was stated in **Methods** that the nature of the *cis*-eQTL data is such that only SNPs within ± 1 Mb of a gene center have estimates of association with the gene expression available in the data. In our analyses, we included multiple genes in causal estimation. Denote the set of SNPs used as IVs in multivariable MR for a group of genes of size p_k as \mathcal{M}_k , which is the union set $\cup_{\ell=1}^{p_k} \mathcal{M}_k^\ell$ of the gene-specific IV sets $\mathcal{M}_k^1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k^{p_k}$. This union set is the set of SNPs whose ordered positions are on the y-axis. As Figure 1 demonstrated, restricting this union set to only non-missing association estimates between each SNP and gene expressions may make the set empty. In the figure above, this scenario would correspond to being unable to draw any horizontal line through the plot such that the line never touches a 'Missing' area.

Tissue	Minimum % missing eQTL associations across genes in a locus		Maximum % missing eQTL associations across genes in a locus		Locus size (Mb)		
	Minimum across all loci	Mean across all loci	Mean across all loci	Maximum across all loci	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Basal ganglia	0.00	0.11	0.16	0.60	1.04	3.32	1.81
Blood	0.00	0.20	0.31	0.72	0.26	3.89	1.95
Cerebellum	0.00	0.06	0.10	0.58	0.35	3.25	1.58
Coronary artery	0.00	0.09	0.14	0.58	0.64	3.05	1.82
Cortex	0.00	0.05	0.08	0.59	0.33	3.87	1.57
Hippocampus	0.00	0.12	0.17	0.45	0.82	2.91	1.71
Lung	0.00	0.08	0.12	0.55	0.51	3.27	1.59
Spinal cord	0.00	0.06	0.09	0.49	1.23	2.61	1.80

Fig. 3 This figure presents a high-level summary of the rates of missing eQTL associations in gene groups formed while applying HORNET to the study of schizophrenia (see main text). Values in the first four columns after tissue type correspond to missingness rates; values in the final three columns correspond to the sizes, from the smallest base pair position of an eQTL used as an IV, to the largest, of loci analyzed by HORNET. Missingness rates are first aggregated from the gene level to the locus level, then again from the locus level to the genome level. For example, the ‘0.00’ value in the first row and second column indicates that the smallest rate of missingness observed for any gene that was analyzed by HORNET in basal ganglia tissue was 0.00, the next column indicates the mean rate of missingness across all loci analyzed by HORNET in the same tissue, and so on. eQTL GWAS data for basal ganglia, cerebellum, cortex, hippocampus, and spinal cord tissues were from [10]; coronary artery and lung tissue data were from [8]; blood tissue data were from [33]. The complete set of commands given to HORNET to perform these analyses is available at https://github.com/noahlorinczcomi/HORNET/real_data.

1.2 Support from cis-eQTLs in a larger window

Since most publicly available summary data from cis-eQTL GWAS contain association estimates between SNPs and the expression of genes within $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ of each them, we wanted to better understand the pattern of association between gene expression and SNPs $>1\text{Mb}$ away. For this, we used individual-level data from 236 non-Hispanic unrelated White individuals. We estimated associations between gene expression and all available SNPs within $\pm 5\text{Mb}$ using the TensorQTL pipeline [32]. Displayed in Figure 4 are these association estimates for 25 genes on chromosome 1 that had eQTLs with corresponding P-values less than 5×10^{-8} . These results demonstrate that, on average, the most significant eQTL signals are near the transcription start site and that significant eQTLs are unlikely to be observed outside of a 1Mb window but within 5Mb.

1.3 Multivariate Imputation

1.3.1 Procedure

In this subsection, we describe the procedure that we used to impute missing data in the set $\cup_{\ell=1}^p \mathcal{M}^\ell$ that is the union of p gene-specific IV sets each denoted as \mathcal{M}^ℓ . Our imputation method is similar to the soft imputation method using matrix completion [22] but corrects for measurement error in the eQTL GWAS




Fig. 4 Displayed are Z-statistics for eQTLs that are within $\pm 5\text{Mb}$ around 25 genes on chromosome 1 in blood tissue and non-Hispanic unrelated White individuals. The shaded blue regions represent the $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ region around the transcription start site (TSS) for each gene. Horizontal dashed lines represent $\pm F^{-1}(1 - 5 \times 10^{-8})$, where $F^{-1}(\alpha)$ is the quantile function of the standard normal distribution evaluate at α . These results indicate that eQTL Z-statistics are highly likely to be considered not genome-wide significant, i.e., to have a corresponding P-value greater than 5×10^{-8} outside of the $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ window from the TSS.

78 and accounts for LD structure. ‘Measurement error in the eQTL GWAS’ here
 79 refers to the nonzero variance of $\hat{\beta}_{j\ell}$, the *estimated* association of the j th SNP
 80 with the ℓ th gene in a select tissue. Only when $\hat{\beta}_{j\ell} = \beta_{j\ell}$, the *true* association,
 81 is there no measurement error in $\hat{\beta}_{j\ell}$. Let $\Sigma_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ denote the $p \times p$ variance-
 82 covariance matrix of $\hat{\beta}_j$, the p -length vector of associations between the j th
 83 SNP and p genes in a locus. Let $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ be the $m \times p$ matrix of estimated associations
 84 between m SNPs and the expression of p genes, \mathbf{B} denote the corresponding
 85 matrix of true associations, and \mathcal{O} be the set of non-missing values in $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$, of
 86 which there are $|\mathcal{O}|$.

87 The main principle of soft imputation is to iteratively apply soft thresh-
 88 olding to the singular values of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ until convergence. Since $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ contains missing
 89 values, we first impute the missing values in $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ with 0, a reasonable estimate
 90 of their true value given the results from individual-level data presented in
 91 Figure 4. Our matrix completion algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1 in the
 92 main text. This algorithm modifies the traditional soft impute method [22] by
 93 subtracting the singular values of $\Sigma_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ from the singular values of an ini-
 94 tialized $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$. This method requires the tuning parameter λ to be used in soft
 95 thresholding and will only accept solutions in which the rank of the imputed
 96 matrix is less than a user-defined value. Below, we evaluate the performance of

97 this imputation method in simulation in Figure 6 and provide some examples
 98 using real data in Figure 7.

99 1.3.2 Simulations with generated data

100 First, we simulated true associations between $m = 150$ SNPs and $p = 10$ genes,
 101 which formed the matrix \mathbf{B} . Next, we randomly drew association estimates $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$
 102 from the matrix normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R}, \Sigma_{W_\beta W_\beta})$, where \mathbf{R} is the matrix
 103 of LD correlations between the 100 SNPs. In our simulations \mathbf{R} had a first-
 104 order autoregressive structure with correlation parameter ρ which was in the
 105 set $\{0.0, 0.1, \dots, 0.8, 0.9\}$. The matrix $\Sigma_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ representing measurement error
 106 covariance between the rows of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ had a Toeplitz structure and was multiplied
 107 by the factor $\sqrt{m \log p} \approx 5.3$. We then applied our matrix completion algo-
 108 rithm to these data, searching over a grid of λ parameter values and fixing the
 109 maximum acceptable rank of the solution at 5.

110 The simulation results in Figure 6 demonstrate that our imputation method
 111 well-approximates the true underlying distribution of the observed association
 112 values when the true mean of the missing association values is 0, and that LD
 113 structure does not appear to affect these results. An example of the imputation
 114 for a single case is presented in Figure 7. Results from individual level data
 115 presented in Figure 4 demonstrate that the true mean is likely to be 0 for almost
 116 all areas outside of the $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ window of a gene's center. Results from real data
 117 presented in Figure 8 demonstrate that this imputation method can capture
 118 the variance in association estimates at the boundaries of the observed windows
 119 well, and that association estimates further from the gene center approach 0
 120 with decreasing variance. The data used in these results are described in the
 121 caption of Figure 8.




Fig. 5 This figure displays the data we generated to perform simulation using our eQTL imputation method described in Algorithm 1 in the main text. Positions on the x-axis correspond to unique SNPs. Each gene is represented by a different color, where gray always represents missing values. For each gene, y-axis values are arbitrary but the relative magnitude corresponds to the magnitude of association with the SNP at that base pair position with the expression of the specific gene. The base pair locations of missingness for each gene depend on the base pair position of the gene center, which is located at the peak of its distribution. Gene centers/distribution peaks are staggered for each gene to replicate the real data. The left panel displays true association values and the right panel displays an example of estimated association values.




Fig. 6 These are the results of simulations in which LD structure among the 150 SNPs varied from an AR1 structure with correlation parameter $\rho = 0$ to $\rho = 0.9$. Y-axis display the relative strength of association between a SNP indexed on the x-axis and the expression of the first gene of 10 in simulation. The true distributions of the true and observed associations are respectively represented by red and black lines. All imputed values across all 100 simulations are represented by black points.




Fig. 7 These are the results of simulations which are described in the text above this figure when \mathbf{R} has an AR1 structure with correlation parameter $\rho = 0.5$. These results demonstrate that our imputation method well approximates the true underlying association values when the data is missing, which in this simulation are each 0. Observed values are equal to the true values plus measurement error from finite GWAS sample size.

122 1.3.3 Simulations with real data

123 We also performed simulations using GWAS summary statistics from 236 unrel-
 124 lated non-Hispanic White individuals whose gene expression in blood tissue
 125 were measured. These data provided estimates of association between SNPs
 126 and the expression of genes whose transcription start sites (TSSs) were within
 127 $\pm 5\text{Mb}$ of them. We selected the *CCDC163* locus in the 1p34.1 region and con-
 128 sidered the eight genes closest to *CCDC163* to form the completely observed
 129 matrix of Z-statistics \mathbf{Z} which was of dimension 526×9 . For each gene, we then
 130 set all GWAS association estimates outside of a $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ region of the TSS to
 131 be missing. We set the true LD correlation matrix (\mathbf{R}) between the 526 SNPs
 132 to be of a first-order autoregressive structure with correlation parameter 0.50,
 133 and true genetic covariance (\mathbf{S}) between genes to that which was observed
 134 empirically from \mathbf{Z} . For each of 50 iterations, we performed the following steps:

- 135 1. Draw \mathbf{E}^* from $\text{Normal}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{R})$
- 136 2. Calculate $\mathbf{Z}^* = \mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{E}^*$
- 137 3. Set values in \mathbf{Z}^* from the set Ω to be missing
- 138 4. Impute missing values to form complete matrix \mathbf{Z}_I^*
- 139 5. Calculate $\|\mathbf{Z}_I^* - \mathbf{Z}\|_F$.

140 The results of this procedure are presented in Panel C of Figure 2 in the
 141 main text and show comparisons between four imputation methods: (i) the
 142 matrix completion method we introduced in Algorithm 1 in the main text ('MV
 143 imp.'), (ii) imputation of missing values with 0's ('Zero imp'), (iii) imputation

144 using the soft impute method ('Soft impute') [16], and (iv) an imputation
 145 method based on the multivariate normal distribution ('Normal imp.'). We now
 146 briefly describe the Normal imp. method, since the Zero imp. is obvious, MV
 147 imp. is described above, and soft impute is described in [16]. Consider the
 148 following models for two SNPs for which n individual genotypes have been
 149 sampled and placed into the $n \times 1$ vectors \mathbf{g}_1 and \mathbf{g}_2 , for which $\mathbf{g}_1^\top \mathbf{g}_1 = n$
 150 and $\mathbf{g}_2^\top \mathbf{g}_2 = n$. Let \mathbf{x} be the corresponding n -length vector of gene expression
 151 measurements standardized to have variance 1. The Z-statistics for association
 152 between the two SNPs and gene expression are $Z_1 = \mathbf{g}_1^\top \mathbf{x} / \sqrt{n}$ and $Z_2 =$
 153 $\mathbf{g}_2^\top \mathbf{x} / \sqrt{n}$, and it immediately follows that $E(Z_2|Z_1) = r_{12}Z_1$ where r_{12} is the
 154 LD correlation between the two SNPs. This can be shown to easily extend
 155 to a multivariate case in which $E(\mathbf{z}_2|\mathbf{z}_1) = \mathbf{R}_{12}^\top \mathbf{R}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_1$ where \mathbf{z}_2 is a vector
 156 of Z-statistics of arbitrary length, \mathbf{z}_1 is correspondingly similar for a different
 157 set of SNPs, \mathbf{R}_{12} is the matrix of LD correlations between the two sets of
 158 SNPs, and \mathbf{R}_{11} is the matrix of LD correlations between SNPs corresponding
 159 to \mathbf{z}_1 . In practice, where \mathbf{Z} represents a matrix of arbitrary dimensions with
 160 missing values, the Normal imp. procedure imputes missing values using their
 161 conditional expectation from the most fully observed column vector of \mathbf{Z} .

162 1.4 Power after imputing missing values

163 As mentioned above and in the main text, current eQTL-MVMR approaches
 164 are restricted to using IVs for which associations between all SNPs and tar-
 165 get genes have been observed in the summary eQTL GWAS data. In this
 166 section, we present the results of a simulation in which we compare the power
 167 of our multivariate imputation method and current methods that use only
 168 completely observed data for testing the causal null hypothesis. We simulated
 169 summary-level data using the same procedure described in Section 1.3.2 but
 170 varying proportions of total missingness in the true 100×10 design matrix
 171 \mathbf{B} , ranging from 19% to 85%. This was accomplished by varying the propor-
 172 tion of missingness that was present for each gene. We compared the power
 173 of the IVW method [5] with correlated IVs when we excluded IVs with any
 174 missing to power when we imputed missing using our IFC approach. The full
 175 R code used to perform these simulations and generate its results are present
 176 at <https://github.com/noahlorinczcomi/HORNET/simulations>.

177 These results indicate that using imputed vs fully observed data can result
 178 in tests of the causal null hypothesis that are up to approximately 4 times as
 179 powerful when the proportion of missingness is large. When the proportion
 180 of missingness is moderate around 52%, which is consistent with the results
 181 observed in real data analyses (see Figure 3 in Section 1.1), still applying
 182 imputation to the observed eQTL summary statistics can result in approxi-
 183 mately 1.27x more power. The gains in power continue to become larger after
 184 approximately 35% or more of the eQTL associations are imputed.




Fig. 8 This figure displays differences in the power of eQTL-MVMR using IVW with completely observed vs imputed eQTL summary statistics. The x-axis is the proportion of missingness in the working design matrix $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ and the y-axis the the power when using imputed data divided by the power when using the fully observed data (a ‘complete SNP’ analysis). ‘Power’ in this setting refers to the power of rejecting the causal null hypothesis. Each point is a number which indicates the gene. For example, ‘1’ corresponds to the first gene and ‘0’ to the 10th. The horizontal line is placed at 1, below which the complete SNP analysis is more powerful than the analysis using imputed data and above which the converse is true by the factor displayed on the y-axis. Displayed are the power ratios after smoothing power estimates within each analysis type using quadratic regression.

185 2 Accounting for LD in eQTL-MVMR

186 2.1 CHP bias from LD

187 2.1.1 Notation

188 A $m \times p$ matrix \mathbf{X} with normally-distributed elements will be denoted as
 189 $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{R})$, where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} : p \times p$ represents covariance between columns of \mathbf{X}
 190 and $\mathbf{R} : m \times m$ covariance between rows. \mathbf{X} can also be written in vectorized
 191 form as $\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\mu}), \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \otimes \mathbf{R})$.

192 Consider two loci (denoted as locus 1 and 2), where locus 1 contains p_1
 193 genes that use m_1 SNPs as instruments (IVs) and locus two contains m_2 SNPs,
 194 where all of the m_1 SNPs are *cis*-eQTLs for at least one gene in their locus.
 195 Denote $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_1 = (\beta_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{m_1,p_1} : m_1 \times p_1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_2 : m_2 \times p_2$ as the GWAS estimates
 196 for association with the expressions of the p_1 genes in locus 1 and the p_2 genes
 197 in locus 2. Denote $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_1$ as outcome GWAS estimates for m_1 SNPs in locus
 198 1. Assume all GWAS estimates are standardized to have variance 1 and let
 199 $\mathbf{R}_1 : m_1 \times m_1$ and $\mathbf{R}_2 : m_2 \times m_2$ denote the true LD correlation matrices

200 for SNPs in loci 1 and 2, where $\mathbf{R}_{12} : m_2 \times m_1$ is the LD correlation matrix
 201 between the m_1 and m_2 SNPs. Define $\mathbf{x}_1 : p_1 \times 1$ as the vector of total gene
 202 expression in a tissue for p_1 genes in locus 1 and $\mathbf{g}_1 : m_1 \times 1$ as the genotype
 203 vector for the m_1 SNPs in locus 1.

204 2.1.2 Models

Consider that the causal effects $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of the p_1 gene expressions in locus 1 on the outcome trait y are of interest and we want to use MR to estimate them. First, we can specify a model for the relationship between \mathbf{g}_1 and \mathbf{g}_2 . Assume that the elements of \mathbf{g}_1 and \mathbf{g}_2 are approximately normally distributed, or there is some underlying normal distribution from which their realizations are drawn. It follows that $\mathbf{g}_2 = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{12}^\top \mathbf{g}_1 + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_2$ where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{12} \approx \mathbf{R}_{12} \mathbf{R}_1^{-1}$. Now we specify the following models for the expression values for the p_1 genes in locus 1 and their causal effects on the outcome trait:

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^\top \mathbf{g}_1 + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2^\top \mathbf{g}_2 + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1 \quad (1)$$

$$= (\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^\top + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{12}^\top) \mathbf{g}_1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_1, \quad (2)$$

$$= \mathbf{B}_1^\top \mathbf{g}_1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_1 \quad (3)$$

$$y = \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{x}_1 + \boldsymbol{\pi}^\top \mathbf{g}_2 + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_y \quad (4)$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{B}_1^\top \mathbf{g}_1 + \boldsymbol{\pi}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{12}^\top \mathbf{g}_1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_y \quad (5)$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1^\top \mathbf{g}_1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_y, \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_y$ represents uncorrelated error in a simplified notation. The above results imply that

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 = \mathbf{B}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{12} \boldsymbol{\pi}, \quad (7)$$

205 where we want to use MR to estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Figure 9 shows these models in a
 206 directed acyclic graph (DAG).




Fig. 9 DAG representing the models specified in section 3.1. $\mathbf{g}_1 : m_1 \times 1$ is a vector of SNP genotypes used as IVs in MR to estimate θ , $\mathbf{g}_2 : m_2 \times 1$ is a generic vector of genotypes for other SNPs no in \mathbf{g}_1 , $\mathbf{x} : p \times 1$ is a vector of expressions for p genes in a tissue, Y is the outcome trait, and U is a generic confounding. If \mathbf{g}_1 and \mathbf{g}_2 are in LD, $\Lambda_{12} \neq \mathbf{0}$. If \mathbf{g}_2 is associated with Y conditional on \mathbf{x} , $\pi \neq \mathbf{0}$.

In practice, we only have access to GWAS estimates of (α, \mathbf{B}) , which we denote as $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{B}})$. Therefore, we use the following model to estimate θ :

$$\hat{\alpha} = \hat{\mathbf{B}}\theta + \Lambda_{12}^\top \pi + \tilde{\epsilon}, \tag{8}$$

207 where $\tilde{\epsilon}$ contains the measurement errors $\hat{\alpha} - \alpha$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \mathbf{B}$. When estimating θ
 208 in Equation 7 using only $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$, there will be horizontal pleiotropy bias if $\Lambda_{12}^\top \pi \neq$
 209 $\mathbf{0}$, which may be considered unbalanced if $m^{-1} \mathbf{1}_m^\top \Lambda_{12}^\top \pi \neq 0$ and correlated
 210 horizontal pleiotropy (CHP) if the correlation between $\Lambda_{12}^\top \pi$ and $\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{B}})$ is not
 211 $\mathbf{0}$. It was shown above that π is the association of \mathbf{g}_2 with Y conditional on \mathbf{g}_1 .
 212 Next we aim to provide an expression for the joint distribution of $(\hat{\mathbf{B}}, \Lambda_{12}^\top \pi)$
 213 to identify the potential sources of CHP bias in Equation 7.

First, we state the marginal distribution of $\hat{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{W}_\beta$ where $\mathbf{B} = (\beta_k)_{k=1}^p$ and \mathbf{W}_β are random. As in [3], let

$$\beta_k \sim \epsilon_k N\left(\mathbf{0}, \frac{h_k^2}{\tilde{m}_k} \mathbf{I}_{m_1}\right) + (1 - \epsilon_k) N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) \tag{9}$$

be a mixture of \tilde{m}_k SNPs that are associated with the expression of gene k and $m_1 - \tilde{m}_k$ that are not. We specify this mixture explicitly because in the data it is true since the total set of m SNPs used in MR is not a set of SNPs associated

with the expression levels of *all* genes in a group and tissue, but typically only a subset of genes. The estimation error $\mathbf{W}_\beta = (\mathbf{w}_{\beta_k})_{k=1}^p$ is uncorrelated with \mathbf{B} and has the distribution

$$\mathbf{w}_{\beta_k} \sim \mathbf{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{n_k} \mathbf{R}_1\right) \quad (10)$$

for all m_1 SNPs where n_k is the sample size in the GWAS for the expression of the k th gene. In MR, we have $\hat{\mathbf{B}} = (\hat{\beta}_k)_{k=1}^p$, whose columns will have the distribution

$$\hat{\beta}_k \sim \epsilon_k \mathbf{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \left[\frac{h_k^2}{\tilde{m}_k} \mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{n_k} \mathbf{R}_1\right]\right) + (1 - \epsilon_k) \mathbf{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{n_k} \mathbf{R}_1\right). \quad (11)$$

214 Recall that CHP bias can arise when $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ is correlated with $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{12}^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}$. Let $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{12}^\top (\boldsymbol{\tau}^\top \otimes$
 215 $\mathbf{R}_{12}^\top) := \text{Cov}(\text{vec}[\mathbf{B}], \mathbf{\Lambda}_{12}^\top \boldsymbol{\pi})$ where $\boldsymbol{\tau}^\top : p \times 1$ represents genetic covariance
 216 between $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and the columns of \mathbf{B} . For example, consider $\text{Cov}(\beta_k, \boldsymbol{\pi}) :=$
 217 $\tau_k \mathbf{R}_{12}^\top = [\mathbb{E}(\beta_{jk} \pi_s r_{js})]_{j,s=1}^{m_1, m_2}$. Since this covariance has a kronecker product
 218 structure, it can be zero if either one of two conditions are met, namely if (i)
 219 $\boldsymbol{\tau} = \mathbf{0}$ or (ii) $\mathbf{R}_{12}^\top = \mathbf{0}$. In principle, these conditions are met if either (i) the
 220 association between \mathbf{g}_2 and Y conditional on \mathbf{g}_1 is independent of the *total*
 221 association between \mathbf{g}_1 and Y or (ii) \mathbf{g}_1 and \mathbf{g}_2 are not in LD.

2.1.3 CHP bias in traditional MR methods

Summary-based MR (SMR) [38] and MR-Robin [15], MR methods incorporating eQTLs that can only include a single gene in causal estimation, may suffer from UHP and/or CHP bias because of nonzero \mathbf{R}_{12} and $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ for neighboring genes. In this section, we aim to better understand the extent to which SMR (a simpler version of MR-Robin more popularly used) is vulnerable to UHP and CHP bias when considering Alzheimer’s disease (AD) as the outcome trait and the expressions in blood of genes on chromosome (CHR) 19 using the real data that we used in the main text. First, we identified mutually exclusive groups of genes using the procedure described in **Methods**. First we define some notation within a group of genes. Let \mathcal{M} denote the set of M SNPs used as IVs for the entire group of p genes, \mathcal{M}_k denote the set of m_k SNPs that are IVs for the k -th gene, \mathbf{R}_k be the LD matrix for this gene, \mathcal{M}_k^\perp be the set of SNPs in \mathcal{M} but not in \mathcal{M}_k that are in LD with SNPs in \mathcal{M}_k via $\mathbf{R}_{k,-k}$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{k,-k} \approx \mathbf{R}_{k,-k}^\top \mathbf{R}_k^{-1}$, and $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-k}$ be the association between SNPs in \mathcal{M}_k^\perp and AD risk conditional on SNPs in \mathcal{M}_k . We estimated the following quantities:

$$I_1 = \|\mathbf{R}_k^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{k,-k}^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-k}\|_2^2, \quad (12)$$

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{m_k} \mathbf{1}_{m_k}^\top \mathbf{R}_k^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{k,-k}^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-k}, \quad (13)$$

$$I_3 = \theta_k - (\boldsymbol{\theta})_k, \quad (14)$$

where θ_k is estimated in univariable (single-gene) MR and $(\boldsymbol{\theta})_k$ is the multivariable (multiple-gene) MR estimate for the corresponding k th gene. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k := \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{B}}_k \hat{\theta}_k$. Below we list estimands for each of these quantities and their corresponding distributions under specified null hypotheses:

$$\hat{I}_1 = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\Delta k}^{-1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k\|_2^2 \sim \chi^2(m_k) \quad \text{under } H_0 : \mathbf{A}_{k,-k}^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-k} = \mathbf{0} \quad (15)$$

$$\hat{I}_2 = \frac{1}{m_k} \mathbf{1}_{m_k}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\Delta k}^{-1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \eta) \quad \text{under } H_0 : \frac{1}{m_k} \mathbf{1}_{m_k}^\top \mathbf{A}_{k,-k}^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-k} = \mathbf{0} \quad (16)$$

$$\hat{I}_3 = \|\hat{\sigma}_\Theta^{-1/2} [\hat{\theta}_k - (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})_k]\|_2^2 \sim \chi^2(1) \quad \text{under } H_0 : \theta_k = (\boldsymbol{\theta})_k, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\eta := \frac{1}{m_k^2} \mathbf{1}_{m_k}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\Delta \mathbf{1}_{m_k} \approx \frac{1}{m_k}, \quad (18)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\Delta = \text{Cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k) \quad (19)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\Delta = \mathbf{R}_k + \hat{\theta}_k^2 \sigma_{\mathbf{W}_\beta}^{2(k)} \mathbf{W}_\beta \mathbf{R}_k - 2\hat{\theta}_k \sigma_{\mathbf{W}_\beta}^{(k)} \mathbf{R}_k \quad (20)$$

and

$$\hat{\sigma}_\Theta^2 = \widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\theta}_k) + \widehat{\text{Var}}[(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})_{k,k}] - 2\widehat{\text{Cov}}[\hat{\theta}_k | \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_k, (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})_k | \hat{\mathbf{B}}]. \quad (21)$$

223 Where $\hat{\sigma}_k$ and $(\hat{\sigma})_k$ represent the estimated standard deviations of the resid-
 224 uals during estimation of $\hat{\theta}_k$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k$ and $\mathbf{R}_{k(k)}$ is the LD matrix between
 225 valid IVs (see below for criteria) used in their respective estimators, $\hat{\sigma}_\Theta^2 =$
 226 $\mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \hat{\sigma}_k (\hat{\sigma})_k \mathbf{R}_{k(k)} \mathbf{A}_{(k)}^{-\top}$ for constant matrices \mathbf{A}_k and $\mathbf{A}_{(k)}$. Regarding I_2 , since
 227 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k$ is the estimated residual from linear regression by MR using the expres-
 228 sion of gene k as the exposure, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ is guaranteed to have a sample mean of $\mathbf{0}$.
 229 However, for each of p genes in a group, we used the MRBEE estimator [21]
 230 with IMRP adjustment [37]. This method can estimate θ_k without bias from
 231 horizontal pleiotropy using a subset of the m_k IVs, after which $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k$ will become
 232 a reliable estimator for $\boldsymbol{\delta}_k$ (see []) and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_k$ is not guaranteed to have a sample
 233 mean of $\mathbf{0}$.

234 To obtain an unbiased estimate for θ_k , we also applied the following restric-
 235 tions on the IV set: (i) P-value for association with gene expression less than
 236 5×10^{-5} , (ii) absolute LD between SNPs used to instrument expression of the
 237 k th gene less than 0.9, (iii) ≥ 10 candidate IVs evaluated by MRBEE (some of
 238 which may have been further excluded due to evidence of nonzero horizontal
 239 pleiotropy at $P < 0.05$ using the tests in [21, 37]), and (iv) LD between the
 240 j th of m_k SNPs and the $M - m_k$ other SNPs in the group less than 0.2. The
 241 latter worked to reduce bias from CHP via nonzero $\mathbf{R}_{k,-k}$ while still retain-
 242 ing enough SNPs for efficient estimation of $\hat{\theta}_k$. Regarding I_3 , rejection of the
 243 corresponding null hypothesis is evidence of omitted-variable bias (OVB) (see
 244 [21]), which can be due to mediation or confounding (CHP). Both may be

245 considered biased causal estimates, although where this bias is due to CHP or
 246 mediation cannot be determined by the test for $I_3 \neq 0$.

247 Under these restrictions to obtain a valid IV set, univariable MR using bias-
 248 corrected SMR (i.e., single-exposure MRBEE [21]) could only be performed for
 249 194 of the 752 (25%) total genes with *cis*-eQTLs on CHR 19. This is another
 250 major limitation of univariable MR - the valid IV set can be reduced so small
 251 that causal estimation becomes unreliable and therefore should not even be
 252 performed. Figures 10, 11, 12, and 13 provide some inference for I_1 , I_2 , and I_3 ,
 253 respectively. These results indicate substantial nonzero unbalanced horizontal
 254 pleiotropy across CHR 19. Subsequently, there is widespread evidence of
 255 differences in causal estimates made using univariable vs multivariable causal
 256 estimates, suggesting the presence off OV bias that may be due to CHP. We
 257 found that 37.6% of genes tested using univariable MR on CHR 19 (73/194)
 258 had evidence ($P < 5 \times 10^{-5}$) of nonzero horizontal pleiotropy ($I_1 \neq 0$), 13.7%
 259 of which had evidence of imbalance ($I_2 \neq 0$), and 48.2% of genes had multivariable
 260 causal estimates that differed from univariable causal estimates ($I_3 \neq 0$
 261 where the test was available [see Figure 13 caption]). See the corresponding
 262 figure captions for more details.




Fig. 10 These results display χ^2 test statistics for testing $H_0 : I_1 = 0$ as stated above. Each point represents a gene. This is a test for nonzero horizontal pleiotropy in the IV set in univariable MR using MRBEE [21], which can be considered a version of SMR [35, 38] corrected for bias from horizontal pleiotropy, weak instruments, sample overlap, and measurement/estimation error. This test was performed for each gene in CHR 19 that was put into a gene group in the main text. Different point colors represent distinct gene groups (see main text for how these groups were formed), with colors alternating from bottom to top on the y-axis from blue to red to yellow. Triangles represent genes for which H_0 is rejected at the level of genome-wide significance (i.e., $P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$); crosses represent genes for which H_0 is not rejected. The genomic region surrounding the *APOE* gene (known to be highly relevant for Alzheimer’s disease risk) is labelled with a horizontal grey line. These results indicate substantial horizontal pleiotropy for many genes on this chromosome, where the strongest evidence of horizontal pleiotropy is observed in the *APOE* region. Only results for which univariable MR could be reliably performed are displayed (see text above figure).




Fig. 11 This is a test for unbalanced (i.e., nonzero mean) horizontal pleiotropy in univariable MR with MRBEE [21], which can be considered a version of SMR [35, 38] corrected for bias from horizontal pleiotropy, weak instruments, sample overlap, and measurement/estimation error. Each point represents a gene. This test was performed for each gene in CHR 19 that was present in a gene group in the main text. Genome-wide ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) and marginal ($P < 5 \times 10^{-5}$) significance thresholds are displayed by black and gray horizontal lines, respectively. Different point colors represent distinct gene groups (see main text for how these groups were formed), with colors alternating from left to right on the x-axis from blue to red to yellow. The genomic region surrounding the *APOE* gene (known to be highly relevant for Alzheimer’s disease risk) is labelled with a vertical grey line. These results indicate that many genes have evidence of unbalanced horizontal pleiotropy in univariable MR, including genes in the *APOE* region. Only results for which univariable MR could be reliably performed are displayed (see text above Figure 10).




Fig. 12 These results display differences between causal estimates made for each gene on chromosome (CHR) 19 using univariable MR vs multivariable MR. Each pair of points (paired by horizontal grey lines) corresponds to a single gene. Causal estimates were made using MRBEE [21], which can be considered a version of SMR [35, 38] corrected for bias from horizontal pleiotropy, weak instruments, sample overlap, and measurement/estimation error. Blue points represent multivariable MR estimates and red points represent univariable MR estimates. An absence of omitted variable (OV) bias across CHR 19 would be observed if all red and blue points overlapped. Differences between these points for each gene, represented by horizontal grey lines, indicates OV bias, which is observed for many genes across CHR 19. The *APOE* gene region is highlighted by the yellow horizontal line, in which OV bias is observed. Only results for which univariable MR could be reliably performed are displayed (see text above Figure 10).




Fig. 13 These results display the bivariate association between univariable MR and multivariable MR causal estimates and indications of the significance in testing $H_0 : I_3 = 0$ from the text above. Red and blue points respectively represent genes for which this null hypothesis was rejected and not rejected at $P < 5 \times 10^{-5}$. Grey points correspond to genes for which the test could not be reliably performed because of imprecise variance estimation in \hat{I}_3 . For these genes, we could not estimate a positive $\hat{\sigma}_\Theta^2$ (see Equation 21) because of very small valid IV counts in univariable MR. ‘Pearson correlation’ corresponds to the linear correlation between univariable and multivariable MR causal estimates. This value will be 1 if there is no omitted variable (OV) bias (due either to CHP or mediation effects) and will approach 0 as OV bias becomes stronger.

263 2.1.4 HORNET CHP correction

264 The method of protecting against CHP bias from eQTLs from other loci that
 265 are in LD with eQTLs in a target locus is outlined in Figure 14.




Fig. 14 Visual depiction of how the final IV sets were pruned based on their LD with non-IVs within surrounding Mb windows of defined size (1Mb as the example in this figure). It was shown above that horizontal pleiotropy bias may be present in MR if the IVs used are in LD with SNPs that are conditionally associated with the outcome trait given the exposures. To reduce the potential for this bias, we subsetted the original IV set to only those SNPs that were not in LD $r^2 > 0.1$ with any SNPs within a 1Mb window outside of the BP range of the original IV set. This is displayed graphically as the green and red points in the figure, where **A** and **B** are sets of SNPs within 1Mb of the minimum and maximum BP positions of the original IV set, respectively.

2.2 MRBEE bias-correction under LD

We now aim to demonstrate the validity of the MRBEE bias-correction in the case of correlated IVs (i.e., SNPs in LD used as IVs in MR). The original MRBEE theory [] was based on independent IVs, but we demonstrate here that the bias-correction in that case is the same as in our case of correlated IVs under a fixed-effects model for **B**. Let $\hat{\mathbf{B}} = (\hat{\beta}_j)_{j=1}^m = (\hat{\beta}_{jk})_{j=1, k=1}^{m, p}$ be the $m \times p$ matrix of GWAS estimates of the m IVs on the expressions of p genes in a tissue (MR exposures), $\hat{\alpha}_j = (\hat{\alpha}_j)_{j=1}^m$ be the m -length vector of IV estimates of association with the outcome, and the IVs have the $m \times m$ positive definite LD correlation matrix $\mathbf{R} = (r_{js})_{j,s=1}^m$, where $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{R}^{-1}$. We now assume a fixed effects model for (α, \mathbf{B}) for the purposes of causal estimation. This may be considered equivalent to causal estimation using MR conditional on the true causal SNPs used to instrument the exposures. We defined measurement error

models for $(\hat{\beta}_j, \hat{\alpha}_j)$ as in [21] in the following way:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\beta}_j \\ \hat{\alpha}_j \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_j + \mathbf{w}_{\beta_j} \\ \alpha_j + w_{\alpha_j} \end{pmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} \beta_j \\ \alpha_j \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{\Lambda} := \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{\mathbf{w}_{\beta_j} \mathbf{w}_{\beta_j}} & \sigma_{\mathbf{w}_{\beta_j} w_{\alpha_j}} \\ \sigma_{\mathbf{w}_{\beta_j} w_{\alpha_j}} & \sigma_{w_{\alpha_j}}^2 \end{bmatrix}\right), \quad (22)$$

where the errors in our measurements of $(\hat{\beta}_j, \hat{\alpha}_j)$ were due only to sampling error introduced by finite GWAS sample sizes, and (β_j, α_j) are fixed. MRBEE [20] makes a bias-correction to the IVW [5] estimating equation, which we denote as $S_{IVW}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Let $\mathbf{W}_{\beta} = (\mathbf{w}_{\beta_j})_{j=1}^m$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\alpha} = (w_{\alpha_j})_{j=1}^m$. It is shown in [21] that

$$E[S_{IVW}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = -E(\mathbf{W}_{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{W}_{\beta}) + E(\mathbf{W}_{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{w}_{\alpha}). \quad (23)$$

MRBEE subtracts from $S_{IVW}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ the quantities in Equation 23 to produce an unbiased estimate of the causal parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Our goal now is to show that the quantity in Equation 23 is equal to $-E(\mathbf{W}_{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{W}_{\beta}) + E(\mathbf{W}_{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{w}_{\alpha})$. Under the normality assumption in Equation 22,

$$\bar{\mathbf{W}} := (\mathbf{W}_{\beta}, \mathbf{w}_{\alpha}) \sim \text{MatrixNormal}(\mathbf{0}_{m \times (p+1)}, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{\Lambda}), \quad (24)$$

where \mathbf{R} represents covariance between rows and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ covariance between columns. By the positive-definiteness of $\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{R}^{-1}$,

$$\mathbf{P}^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{W}} \sim \text{MatrixNormal}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_m, \mathbf{\Lambda}) \quad (25)$$

and

$$\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\top} \mathbf{P} \bar{\mathbf{W}} \sim \text{Wishart}(m, \mathbf{\Lambda}). \quad (26)$$

The proof for $E(\mathbf{W}_{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{W}_{\beta})$ follows immediately from the properties of the Wishart distribution. Define the permutation matrix $\mathbf{C}_1 := (\mathbf{I}_{p \times p}, \mathbf{0}_{p \times 1})_{p \times (p+1)}$ such that

$$\mathbf{C}_1 \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\top} \mathbf{P} \bar{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_1^{\top} = \mathbf{W}_{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{W}_{\beta}. \quad (27)$$

It follows that

$$E(\mathbf{C}_1 \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\top} \mathbf{P} \bar{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_1^{\top}) = m \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{C}_1^{\top} = m \Sigma_{\mathbf{w}_{\beta} \mathbf{w}_{\beta}}, \quad (28)$$

which is the desired result. For $E(\mathbf{W}_{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{w}_{\alpha})$, we will show the proof element-wise also following the properties of the Wishart distribution. Consider the following:

$$\left[(\mathbf{P}^{1/2} \mathbf{W}_{\beta})^{\top} (\mathbf{P}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_{\alpha}) \right]_k \sim \sigma_{\beta \alpha}^{[k]} \chi^2(m), \quad (29)$$

267 for $k = 1, \dots, p$, which has expectation $m\sigma_{\beta\alpha}^{[k]}$ and since $m\sigma_{\beta\alpha} = m(\sigma_{\beta\alpha}^{[k]})_{k=1}^p$
 268 the result is proven.

269 2.3 Heritability estimation

Assume the random model for $\beta_k : M \times 1$ as in Equation 9 holds for associations between M SNPs and the expression of gene k in a tissue (here M is the total number of SNPs tested for association with gene expression). Let $\tilde{m}_k \leq M$ denote the total number of SNPs causally related to the expression of this gene in tissue which has SNP heritability h_k^2 . In our analyses, all association estimates were standardized by estimated standard error in GWAS such that $\hat{\zeta}_k \approx \sqrt{n_k}\hat{\beta}_k$ for GWAS sample size n_k and $\hat{\zeta}_k$ was the unit of analysis. Under the assumptions in model 9,

$$h_k^2 = \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\zeta}_k^\top \hat{\zeta}_k)}{M} - 1 \right] \frac{\tilde{m}_k}{n_k}. \quad (30)$$

This is seen immediately from the following result

$$\mathbb{E}(\hat{\zeta}_k^\top \hat{\zeta}_k) = \text{trace} \left(n_k \left[\frac{h_k^2}{\tilde{m}_k} \mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{n_k} \mathbf{R} \right] \right) \quad (31)$$

from the original model in Equation 11. A natural estimate of h_k^2 is

$$\hat{h}_k^2 = \left[\frac{\hat{\zeta}_k^\top \hat{\zeta}_k - \frac{1}{n_k}}{M} - 1 \right] \frac{\hat{m}_k}{n_k} \quad (32)$$

270 where the $-1/n_k$ term is introduced as a measurement/estimation error bias-
 271 correction [21]. In practice, \tilde{m}_k is rarely known and so must be estimated from
 272 the data. We estimated this quantity using a procedure similar to that used
 273 by PLINK [27] where we let $2\hat{m}_k$ be the number of SNPs of the total M with
 274 association $P < 5 \times 10^{-5}$ for $\hat{\zeta}_{jk}$ that are independent ($r^2 < 0.05$) of all other
 275 $M - 1$ SNPs for the gene group. We assume the factor 2 on \tilde{m}_k consistent with
 276 results in [25, 26, 34] that *cis*-eQTLs explain approximately 1/3rd of the SNP
 277 heritability and *trans*-eQTLs explain the rest. Note that whether you assume
 278 a random or fixed effects model for β_k , the result in Equation 30 is the same.
 279 To see this, let $\hat{\zeta}_k \sim N(\zeta_k, n_k^{-1}\mathbf{R})$ and use the same technique as in Equation
 280 31 then rearrange to arrive at the result in Equation 32.

281 2.4 Source of bias in MRBEE from a misspecified LD 282 matrix

283 In MR with gene expression as the exposure(s) of interest, we use eQTLs
 284 as instrumental variables (IVs). Standard methods of performing MR assume
 285 that these eQTLs will be independent of each other. However, there may only
 286 be very few (e.g., less than 5) IVs in a *cis*-region that are significant eQTLs

287 and also independent of each other. If we only have, for example, 5 IVs to
 288 perform MR, there may be little power to detect causal effects. A more powerful
 289 approach would include IVs that are in LD with each other, assuming that a
 290 larger set of correlated IVs can explain more variance in the expression of a
 291 gene than a smaller set of independent IVs. Performing MR with m correlated
 292 IVs requires estimating their LD matrix \mathbf{R} , which is usually accomplished in
 293 practice by using an external LD reference panel from approximately the same
 294 population, such as the 1000 Genomes reference panels [12]. It is well-known
 295 that the IVW estimator, equivalent to a generalized least squares estimator,
 296 will not be biased by misspecification of \mathbf{R} . That is, if in practice we use $\hat{\mathbf{R}} \neq \mathbf{R}$,
 297 the IVW estimator will not be biased because of it. The IVW estimator is
 298 generally biased from other sources as described above and in [21].

MRBEE makes a bias-correction to IVW for these other sources of bias which include measurement error/weak IVs and sample overlap. The MRBEE estimator with a set of m IVs with no evidence of horizontal pleiotropy is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MRBEE}} = \left(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{B}} - m \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{B}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}. \quad (33)$$

In contrast to IVW, if each $\hat{\alpha}_j$ is standardized such that it represents the Z-statistic for association between the j th IV and the outcome trait, then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{R})$. If $\hat{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{R}$, then MRBEE is not biased by $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$. This follows from Equation 24 under the assumption that $\text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) = \mathbf{R}$. However, if $\hat{\mathbf{R}} \neq \mathbf{R}$ then the bias-correction to IVW that MRBEE makes is not correct and therefore $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MRBEE}}$ may be biased. This can be seen by the following. In Equation 23, it was stated that the bias in the IVW estimating equation is

$$-\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{W}_\beta^\top \hat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \mathbf{W}_\beta) \boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{W}_\beta^\top \hat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \mathbf{w}_\alpha) \quad (34)$$

299 which MRBEE assumes to be $-m(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta} \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{W_\beta w_\alpha})$. If $\hat{\mathbf{R}} \neq \mathbf{R}$, then the bias
 300 in Equation 34 is more complex and MRBEE does not correctly adjust for it.

We now aim to investigate the extent to which MRBEE will be biased by a misspecified value of $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$. In this section, we consider a simple case in which $\hat{\mathbf{R}} = \xi \mathbf{R} + (1 - \xi) \mathbf{I}$ for some constant $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$. In section 2.5, we consider more complex cases in which the size of the LD reference panel also varies. We performed simulations with generated GWAS summary statistics for 100 IVs using the following models

$$(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{B}) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{R}\right) \quad (35)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{D} \begin{pmatrix} 1.0 & 0.2 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 1.0 & 0.5 \\ 0.2 & 0.5 & 1.0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{D} \quad (36)$$

$$\mathbf{D} = 0.1 \mathbf{I}_3 \quad (37)$$

$$\mathbf{R} = \text{AR1}(0.5) \quad (38)$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{B}, \frac{1}{50}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{R}\right) \quad (39)$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}} = \text{AR1}(\xi), \quad \xi \in \{0.0, 0.1, \dots, 0.8, 0.9\} \quad (40)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{IVW}} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} -\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\theta})^{\top} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (41)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MRBEE}} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} -\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\theta})^{\top} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{W_{\beta} W_{\beta}} \boldsymbol{\theta}, \quad (42)$$

$$(43)$$

301 where the constants 1/4 and 1/50 respectively represent minor allele frequency
 302 and the proportion of measurement error variance to the total signal variance.
 303 These simulation models implicitly assume no measurement error in the out-
 304 come associations $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, which is irrelevant for our purpose here because neither
 305 IVW nor MRBEE will have any more or less bias as measurement error is
 306 added or removed from $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. We performed 10,000 simulations for each scenario
 307 in which ξ varied and the results are presented in Figure 15.

308 These results indicate that IVW is consistently biased irrespective of how
 309 close the working LD matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}$ is to the true LD matrix \mathbf{R} . On the other
 310 hand, MRBEE is unbiased when $\widehat{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{R}$, but incurs a small upward bias when
 311 $\xi < \rho = 0.5$ and a small downward bias when $\xi > \rho = 0.5$. Each of these
 312 biases are smaller than the bias incurred by IVW, except when an extremely
 313 dense AR1(0.9) structure is assumed to fit data that were generated from
 314 AR1(0.5), which is unlikely to ever occur in practice. Interestingly, MRBEE is
 315 unbiased when the LD matrix is assumed to be equal to the identity matrix,
 316 although its variance in this setting is greater than in other settings when a
 317 denser LD structure is assumed.




Fig. 15 These are the results of 10,000 simulations, the settings for which are fully described in the text above. Displayed are boxplots of causal estimates made by IVW (left) and MRBEE (right) in different scenarios of assumed LD structure. The horizontal blue lines are positioned at the true causal effect, 0.2. The vertical blue lines are positioned at the value of ρ which was used to generate the data.

318 2.5 Misspecified LD

319 2.5.1 Background

320 We mentioned in Section 2.4 that using a LD matrix in MR that is not equal
 321 to the true LD matrix representative of the discovery population can introduce
 322 bias in causal estimates using MRBEE. In this section, we demonstrate that
 323 misspecified LD of this type can cause inflation of test statistics corresponding
 324 to tests of the causal null hypothesis. MR methods that can allow for IVs
 325 that are in LD with each other are IVW [6], principal components analysis
 326 (PCA) [7], the conditional and joint (CoJo) algorithm [36], single-SNP [29,
 327 31], LD pruning [11, 28], effective-median [19], and the JAM algorithm (joint
 328 analysis of marginal summary statistics) [23]. An estimate of the LD matrix
 329 between IVs is generally made using a reference panel and not the actual
 330 disease GWAS individual-level data. This is because reference panels are widely
 331 publicly available and individual-level data from many disease GWAS are not.

332 Using an independent reference panel to estimate LD between IVs used in
 333 MR may inflate test statistics and lead to a large false positive rate [19] if the
 334 reference population differs from the discovery (Figure 16) or if the reference
 335 panel is relatively small (Figure 3 in the main text). In the literature, only a
 336 single solution to this problem has been documented [19], but it is only avail-
 337 able for univariable MR with gene expression, which may be highly vulnerable
 338 to bias and its own inflation because of complex regulatory networks between
 339 the expression levels of multiple nearby genes. Additionally, this correction
 340 relies on resampling methods that cannot be scaled genome-wide because of
 341 the computational burden. There is currently no solution to this problem of
 342 inflation from misspecified LD that can be applied to multivariable MR with
 343 gene expression.

344 We demonstrate that inflation in MR with gene expression is the result
 345 of relatively small reference panel sample sizes and systematic differences in
 346 genetic architecture between reference panel and discovery GWAS samples.
 347 Current methods with straightforward extensions to MVMR such as PCA
 348 and LD pruning are not guaranteed to control this inflation. We considered
 349 many potential solutions to this problem, the simulation results of which are
 350 presented in Sections 2.5.4 and 2.5.5.

351 2.5.2 Inflation correction (IFC)

352 In the main text, we proposed a method to correct for inflation in MR test
 353 statistics due to misspecified LD structure amongst the IVs used in MR that
 354 is presented in Figure 17. Here, we describe that method in greater detail. We
 355 propose to correct for inflation by using a data-driven approach by using the
 356 degree of inflation in surrounding null regions to adjust the standard errors for
 357 causal estimates in the target region. Here, ‘target region’ refers to a locus in
 358 which there is a hypothesized causal relationship between the expression of one
 359 or more genes and the disease trait; ‘null region’ refers to a locus in which there
 360 is no evidence of any association between the genetic variants and the disease




Fig. 16 This figure demonstrates inflation in the Type I error rate of the IVW method [5] when applied to correlated IVs in simulation following a procedure similar to that described in Section 2.5.3. In this simulation, the size of the reference panel was fixed at 1,000 but the similarity in the true LD in the reference and discovery population varies. The true LD matrix \mathbf{R} was of $\text{AR1}(\rho)$ structure and the true LD matrix in the reference panel was of $\text{AR1}(\hat{\rho})$ structure. We display the false positive rate of IVW (left) for different value pairs of ρ and $\hat{\rho}$, which are observed to surpass the nominal 0.05 level in many scenarios. We also display the IVW-estimated (middle) and corresponding true standard error (right) for the causal estimate in each of these scenarios. These results demonstrate that the estimated and true SEs are often unequal, which explains the inflation that is observed in the left panel.




Fig. 17 Visual description of the IFC method to correct for inflation in MVMR from misspecified LD. [1]: The causal effect θ_k can be estimated using any parametric multivariable MR method that allows the instrumental variables to be in LD. This should also be the same method that will later be used for inference in target gene regions. [2]: The variance of $\hat{\theta}_k$ should generally be estimated using robust methods, since it is unlikely to be true that the working LD matrix $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ is exactly equal to the true LD matrix \mathbf{R}_0 . This is because working LD matrices are typically estimated from reference samples of finite size and which may be ancestrally different from the discovery population.

361 trait or the expression of genes. In the truly null regions, the causal effects of
 362 gene expression on the outcome trait are each 0. This is because in Equation 7,
 363 all elements in α and \mathbf{B} are 0, implying that $\theta = \mathbf{0}$ in the MR equation $\alpha = \mathbf{B}\theta$.
 364 By calculating inflation in these null regions, we are calculating inflation under
 365 $H_0 : \theta = \mathbf{0}$. Any inflation that is observed in these regions is at least partially
 366 due to misspecified LD, and we assume that the same degree of inflation will
 367 be present in target regions. Under this assumption, we can adjust standard
 368 errors of causal estimates in target regions by the inflation observed in null
 369 regions. Figure 18 demonstrates that this assumption is reasonable using AD

370 and eQTLs in blood tissue, evidenced by stable inflation across multiple null
 371 regions within chromosome 2 and across the entire genome.




Fig. 18 Left: observed inflation in null regions on chromosome 2. The horizontal black line is at the $\lambda_{H0} = 1$ position. The horizontal red line is at the position of the median of λ_{H0} values across null regions on chromosome 2, which is 1.85. Right: observed inflation in null regions on all chromosomes. The horizontal black line is at the $\lambda_{H0} = 1$ position. The horizontal blue line is at the position of the median of λ_{H0} across all chromosomes, which is at 1.29. These data are from eQTLs in blood tissue from [33] and AD GWAS summary statistics from [18].

Let $\hat{\theta}$ denote a causal estimate for the expression of a gene in a target region and λ_{H0} denote the inflation observed in null regions. The corrected standard error estimate for $\hat{\theta}$ is the following:

$$\widehat{SE}_\lambda(\hat{\theta}) = \widehat{SE}(\hat{\theta})\sqrt{\lambda_{H0}}. \tag{44}$$

372 The obvious challenge lies in distinguishing truly null regions from those
 373 containing genes with extremely small causal effects. We therefore propose to
 374 use strict criteria for considering a genomic region as a null region. Firstly,
 375 it should be noted that we do not necessarily need to calculate inflation in
 376 null regions using multiple genes simultaneously in an MVMR framework. We
 377 may use one gene at a time to produce a set of causal estimate test statistics
 378 to be used in determining inflation. This is because under the condition that
 379 $\alpha = \beta = \mathbf{0}$ necessarily implies $\theta = 0$, no negative confounding of (α_j, β_j) could
 380 exist to provide an alternative explanation for $E(\hat{\theta}) \neq 0$. We therefore require
 381 that each gene to be used in determining inflation meet the following criteria:
 382 the SNPs within $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ of the transcription start site are (i) not associated
 383 with the outcome, namely all P-values are greater than 0.05, (ii) not associated
 384 with the expression of the gene in the target tissue (all $P > 0.05$), (iii) not within
 385 $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ of any other genes, and (iv) the SNP associations with the outcome
 386 and gene expression are uncorrelated ($P > 0.05$). In practice, conditions (i)-(iii)
 387 can be verified using the raw outcome phenotype and gene expression GWAS
 388 data. Condition (iv) can be verified by selected a set of SNPs for which *cis*-
 389 SNP association estimates are available for gene expression and the outcome,
 390 and calculating the empirical correlation. Generally, conditions (i)-(iv) should
 391 be satisfied after applying pruning to the raw LD matrix estimated by the

reference panel. In our simulations below, we only consider SNPs that have LD coefficients less than 0.5 in absolute value.

2.5.3 Simulation setup

In this section, we perform simulation to demonstrate the roles of $n_{\text{ref.}}$ and Ψ in inflating test statistics corresponding to causal effect estimates made using MVMR. These simulations used real data wherever possible. These data came from the Alzheimer’s disease (AD) GWAS by [18] (n=455k) for the outcome trait and from the eQTLGen Consortium [33] (n=32k) for cis-eQTLs in blood tissue. We first identified a gene regulatory network in the 2q37.1 region that contained 7 genes and selected 484 candidate IVs for these genes using the following procedures. These IVs were jointly associated with the expression of at least one of the seven genes in blood tissue and were not in LD of $r^2 > 0.1$ with any other SNPs $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ away from the network. We then estimated LD for these IVs using the 438k non-related European individuals in the UK Biobank [30] using the PLINKv1.9 software [27]. These data respectively provided the following quantities: $\hat{\alpha} : 484 \times 1$, $\hat{\mathbf{B}} : 484 \times 7$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 : 484 \times 484$. The values in $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ were Z-scores, i.e., association estimates divided by their standard errors. The original LD matrix for the 484 SNPs estimated using UKBB was not positive definite. We applied LD pruning to $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_0$ using the threshold $|\tilde{r}_{ij}| < 0.85$ to generate the positive definite matrix \mathbf{R}_0 . This subsetted our data from 484 to 168 SNPs.

From these data, we estimated genetic correlation between the columns of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ denoted as \mathbf{S} . We fixed heritability of gene expression at 0.05 [25] for each gene and at 0.01 for AD. We then perturbed the true LD matrix \mathbf{R}_0 and randomly drew it from a Wishart distribution to emulate real world conditions in which \mathbf{R}_0 is estimated from an external and sometimes relatively small reference panel. We did using the models:

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}} \sim \text{Wishart}(n_{\text{ref.}}, \mathbf{R}) \quad (45)$$

$$\mathbf{R} = \xi \mathbf{R}_0 + (1 - \xi) \mathbf{I}_m \quad (46)$$

$$\xi \in \{0.0, 0.1, \dots, 0.9, 1.0\} \quad (47)$$

$$n_{\text{ref.}} \in \{350, 450, \dots, 950\}, \quad (48)$$

The minimum value in the set $n_{\text{ref.}}$ was chosen to be equal to the smallest population-specific sample size in 1000 Genomes Phase 3 [8], which corresponds to Hispanic individuals.

We therefore drew GWAS summary data for gene expression and AD from the following matrix normal distribution:

$$(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{B}}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma, \hat{\mathbf{R}}), \quad m \times (1 + p) \quad (49)$$

where

$$\Sigma = \mathbf{D} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sigma_{\mathbf{x}Y}^\top \\ \sigma_{\mathbf{x}Y} & \mathbf{S} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}, \quad (1+p) \times (1+p) \quad (50)$$

$$\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(0.01, 0.05, \dots, 0.05), \quad (1+p) \times (1+p) \quad (51)$$

416 and the quantity $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}Y}$ was controlled to reflect the degree of causality between
 417 gene expressions \mathbf{x} and AD Y . For example, $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}Y} = \mathbf{0}$ implies no causality
 418 between \mathbf{x} and Y and was used to evaluate Type I error.

419 For each $(\xi, n_{\text{ref.}})$ pair, we drew $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{B}})$, applied the causal estimation meth-
 420 ods of PCA [7], LD pruning [11], single SNP [29, 31], and our proposed IFC
 421 and recorded power and Type I error. For our IFC method, we require addi-
 422 tional data beyond that which is provided by the 484 IVs. These data were
 423 the remaining gene expression and AD GWAS summary data on chromosome
 424 2 that met the criteria for null regions as described in Section 2.5.2. We esti-
 425 mated Type I error when $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}Y} = \mathbf{0}$ and power when $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}Y} = (\rho\sqrt{0.01 \times 0.05})$
 426 where $\rho \in \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$.

427 2.5.4 Type I error

428 The results of these simulations suggest that the IVW [6] method has inflated
 429 Type I error when the true LD in the reference panel is sparser than that
 430 in the discovery population. IVW also has deflated Type I error when the
 431 reference and discovery populations have the same LD structure but the size
 432 of the reference panel is less than 1,000 individuals. Pruning at the $|r| < 0.5$
 433 level reduced some of the Type I error inflation and deflation that was present
 434 in IVW, but did not bring Type I error to nominal levels (i.e., 0.05) in all
 435 simulation scenarios. Pruning at the $|r| < 0.3$ level removed the Type I error
 436 deflation, but not the inflation. The PCA method [7] had drastically inflated
 437 Type I error rates in all simulation scenarios. Using pruning at the $|r| < 0.3$
 438 level then applying IFC controlled Type I error better than any other method
 439 or combination of methods and did not deflate Type I error below the nominal
 440 0.05 level. This approach only had inflation of Type I error when the true LD
 441 matrix in the reference panel was much more dense than the true LD matrix
 442 in the discovery population, a situation which is unlikely to occur in practice.
 443 Importantly, pruning + IFC also controls Type I error when the size of the
 444 LD reference panel is small. Jackknifing methods generally still had inflated
 445 Type I error, though to a lesser extent than IVW, pruning alone, or PCA.




Fig. 19 These results display Type I error for different methods for performing MR with instrumental variables that are in LD with each other. Full simulation settings are described in the text. Type I error is displayed for the first of 3 exposures. The PCA methods use univariable MR with only the first exposure; the other methods use multivariable MR with all three.

446 2.5.5 Power

447 We also investigated power of each method when $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}Y} = \boldsymbol{\theta} = (0.1)$ the results
 448 of which are displayed in Figure 20. These results demonstrate that the IVW
 449 method is generally most powerful at very specific combinations of the adjust-
 450 ment factor ξ and reference panel sample size (see Figure 20). The power of
 451 IVW is low even when the true LD structure in the reference panel is the
 452 same as in the discovery population (i.e., $\xi = 1$), but the size of the reference
 453 panel is less than 1k. Only as the size of the reference panel increases can the
 454 IVW method achieve greater power when $\xi = 1$. Pruning at the $|r| < 0.5$ the
 455 $|r| < 0.3$ thresholds have similar power which increases as ξ approaches 1 and
 456 the reference panel sample size increases. These methods can achieve greater
 457 power than IVW when the reference panel is relatively small. PCA methods
 458 actually have lower power as the reference panel sample size increases, and
 459 greater power as LD in the reference panel approaches the identity matrix,
 460 i.e. ξ approaches 0. Our pruning and IFC corrective method generally has
 461 power than increases with ξ approaching 1 and the reference panel sample size
 462 increasing. This approach generally has less power than alternative methods,
 463 which is the sacrifice made for controlling Type I error. Jackknife methods can
 464 generally be more powerful than all methods except pruning at $|r| < 0.5$ when
 465 LD in the reference panel is sparser than LD in the discovery population (i.e.,
 466 $\xi < 0.5$). Overall, these results confirm that our corrective method of pruning
 467 and IFC does not sacrifice substantial power to achieve controlled Type I error.




Fig. 20 These results display power for different methods for performing MR with instrumental variables that are in LD with each other and $\theta = 0.1$. Full simulation settings are described in the text. Power is displayed for the first of three exposures. The PCA methods use univariable MR with only the first exposure; the other methods use multivariable MR with all three.

468 3 Estimating bias-correction terms

GSscreen is an extension of the MR with unbiased estimating equations (MRBEE) method [21] to the high dimensional setting. MRBEE corrects for bias from weak instruments [1] that is introduced by measurement error in the GWAS associations. Let $(\hat{\alpha}_j, \hat{\beta}_{j1}, \hat{\beta}_{j2}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{jp}) = (\hat{\alpha}_j, \hat{\beta}_j^\top)$ be a pair of associations between the j th IV and the outcome and expression of p genes, respectively. It was shown in [21] that when estimating θ from

$$\hat{\alpha}_j = \hat{\beta}_j^\top \theta + \varepsilon_j \tag{52}$$

469 using the standard IVW method [5], there is downward bias due to nonzero
 470 variance of $\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j$, which we denote as $\Sigma_{W_\beta W_\beta}$. MRBEE estimates $\Sigma_{W_\beta W_\beta}$,
 471 denoted as $\hat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$, to correct for bias in IVW [5]. The estimate $\hat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ is
 472 highly precise when there are many SNPs available that have no evidence of
 473 association with the expression of any of the p genes in the locus. However,
 474 when there are relatively few SNPs available that meet this criteria for any pair
 475 of genes, the corresponding estimate in $\hat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ may be imprecise. When the
 476 total number of SNPs available to estimate $\Sigma_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ is less than 50, HORN
 477 automatically treats the corresponding elements in $\hat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ as missing and
 478 employs the maximum determinant method (MaxDet; [14]) to impute the miss-
 479 ing values. In practice, $\hat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ is converted to its corresponding correlation
 480 matrix before MaxDet is applied.

481 Consider that $\hat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ is a $p \times p$ correlation matrix with 2 missing values cor-
 482 responding to the correlation between measurement errors for a single pair of
 483 genes. MaxDet estimates the missing value in $\hat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ as that which maximizes
 484 the determinant of $\hat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ while retaining positive definiteness. The method
 485 is essentially an imputation procedure for the correlation matrix. In the real

486 data, there may be missing measurement error correlation estimates for k pairs
 487 of genes. In this case, HORNET applies MaxDet to each of k sub-matrices of
 488 $\widehat{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$ that contains only non-missing and non-imputed values.

489 4 Gene Selection

490 The HORNET software estimates causal effects of gene expression using a two-
 491 step procedure. First, genes with evidence of causality are identified using a
 492 screening tool called GScreen. Second, causal estimates of the selected genes
 493 are made using MRBEE [21].

G-Screen aims to perform gene selection while remaining robust to horizontal pleiotropy by using Huber weights to approximate quantile regression [17] and a SCAD [13] penalty to perform gene selection. Quantile regression is well-known to be robust in the presence of horizontal pleiotropy [2], which effectively indicates the presence of relatively large outliers in multiple regression, and the SCAD penalty will automatically exclude some genes from causal estimation, thereby selecting others. This procedure also includes the MRBEE bias-correction to prevent incorrect inference from weak instrument/measurement error biases during gene selection. Algorithm 1 summarizes this procedure. This algorithm requires the tuning parameters γ and λ , which respectively control the degrees of penalization of horizontal pleiotropy and the number of genes selected. To choose an optimal (γ, λ) pair, we search a grid of values and calculate the following BIC:

$$\text{BIC}_\gamma = \sum_j \xi(\varepsilon_j, \gamma) \log(\sigma_\xi^2) + \left[\log(m - |\mathcal{S}_\eta|) + \log(p) \right] |\mathcal{S}_\eta| \quad (53)$$

494 where σ_ξ^2 is the sum of squared and Huber-weighted residuals, $|\mathcal{S}_\eta|$ is the
 495 number of selected genes, $\xi(\varepsilon_j, \gamma)$ is the normalized Huber weight for the j th
 496 SNP (normalized to the range 0-1), m is the number of SNPs, and p is the
 497 total number of genes under study in a locus. In practice, weights (w_j) are
 498 continually normalized such that the maximum value is always 1.

499 Figure 21 shows the performance G-Screen in screening genes for evidence
 500 of causality using eQTL GWAS data from the cortex [10] and AD GWAS
 501 data from [18] as an example. Of the 441 genes selected by G-Screen during
 502 screening, 49.7% were prioritized. Here, ‘prioritized’ refers to the condition
 503 when the gene has a corresponding causal effect P-value less than 5×10^{-5}
 504 and its Pratt index value is larger than 0.1.




Fig. 21 Displayed in the top panel is a volcano plot for HORNET analyses that were completed using eQTL GWAS data from cortex tissue [10] and Alzheimer’s disease (AD) GWAS data from [18]. The x-axes represent the test statistics for testing the null hypothesis that a given gene does not have a causal effect on AD risk when expressed in the cortex. The y-axes represent Pratt index values. Each point in these figures corresponds to a single gene that was selected by G-Screen. The gray shaded areas are those in which the gene is not prioritized (i.e., the Z-statistic *and* Pratt index values are each not of sufficient magnitude). Prioritized genes are therefore those highlighted in green. The bottom panel displays counts and proportions of each classification of genes that are presented in the volcano plots in the top panel.

505 5 Prioritizing tissues

506 In this section, we describe how to use the `tissue_chooser.py` command-line
 507 tool to identify tissues in which a pre-defined candidate set of genes have the
 508 strongest eQTL signals. From GTEx data of 54 tissues [9], we estimated her-
 509 itability scores for the expression of each available gene in each tissue using
 510 all significant cis-eQTLs. These heritability scores were calculated from cis

Algorithm 1 Pseudo-code of G-Screen

Require: $m \times p$ eQTL-MVMR design matrix $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_0$ of SNP-gene expression associations for genes in set \mathcal{S} , $m \times 1$ vector of corresponding SNP associations with the disease phenotype $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_0$, $m \times m$ inverse LD matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ between SNPs, MRBEE bias-correction terms $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{W_\beta W_\beta}$, Huber weight tuning parameter γ for UHP/CHP in $\xi(\cdot, \gamma)$, SCAD tuning parameter λ for gene selection, initial causal estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^0$, tolerance ϵ

Transform: $\hat{\mathbf{B}} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{B}}_0$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_0$

while $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^{(t+1)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^{(t)}\|_2 > \epsilon$ **do**

Determine weights: $w_j = \xi(\hat{\alpha}_j - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^{(t)}, \gamma)$

Define $m_w = \sum_j w_j$, $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(w_j)_{j=1}^m$

Update $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t+1)} = \left(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^\top \mathbf{D} \hat{\mathbf{B}} - m_w \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{W_\beta W_\beta} + \rho \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^\top \mathbf{D} \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} + \rho \mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)} \right)$

Penalize $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_j^{(t+1)} = S_\lambda(\hat{\theta}_j^{(t+1)})$

Update $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t+1)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)} + \rho(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t+1)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^{(t+1)})$

Find $\epsilon = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^{(t+1)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^{(t)}\|_2^2$

end while

Ensure: Set $\mathcal{S}_\eta = \{k : \hat{\eta}_k \neq 0\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$ of genes with evidence of causality

511 SNPs within $\pm 1\text{Mb}$ and are proportional to SNP heritability. We then created
 512 a matrix in which each row was a gene, each column was a tissue, and each
 513 value was a heritability score. The `tissue_chooser.py` tool simply receives
 514 a comma-separated list of gene IDs, or a header-less file in which each row
 515 is a gene ID, and returns the tissues for which the eQTLs in GTEx v8 are
 516 the strongest. We first show how heritability scores were calculated, then
 517 demonstrate how to use the tool from the command line.

518 5.1 Heritability scores

519 Heritability scores are calculated in the following way. First, GTEx v8 associ-
 520 ations between SNPs and gene expression in each tissue were calculated using
 521 fastQTL [24]. All associations that were significant at a corrected threshold
 522 were recorded and placed into the `GTEx_Analysis_v8_eQTL.tar` file available
 523 at <https://gtexportal.org/home/datasets> [9]. These data provided us with Z-
 524 statistics for association between the k SNP and the G th gene in the \mathcal{T} th
 525 tissue, denoted here as $z_k^G(\mathcal{T})$. From these association estimates, we created
 526 the vectors $\mathbf{z}^G(\mathcal{T}) = [z_k^G(\mathcal{T})]_{k=1}^{p_G}$ of varying length p_G that were gene-specific.
 527 In other words, these vectors contained all SNP-gene association estimates that
 528 were significant at a specific threshold in a specific tissue, and we created them
 529 for each gene-tissue pair. It was shown in [39] that $\text{Cov}[\mathbf{z}^G(\mathcal{T})] = \mathbf{R}$, which is
 530 the LD matrix between the SNPs whose associations with gene expression are
 531 stored in $\mathbf{z}^G(\mathcal{T})$.

We calculated heritability scores as

$$H_S(G, \mathcal{T}) = \left[\mathbf{z}^G(\mathcal{T}) \right]^\top \widehat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \left[\mathbf{z}^G(\mathcal{T}) \right], \quad (54)$$

532 where $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}$ is an estimate of the corresponding LD matrix between the SNPs
 533 whose association estimates are in $\mathbf{z}^G(\mathcal{T})$, which we made using the full 1000
 534 Genomes Phase 3 reference panel [8]. The heritability scores $H_S(G, \mathcal{T})$ were
 535 previously shown to be proportional to SNP heritability [4]. Since the tissue
 536 prioritizing tool that we present in this section is only intended to provide a
 537 ranked list of tissues in which the strongest eQTL signals for a pre-specified list
 538 of genes are, the heritability scores $H_S(G, \mathcal{T})$ are sufficient for accomplishing
 539 this task. Heritability scores for each gene-tissue pair were then stored in the
 540 file `hscores.txt`, which can be found in the `tissue_priority` directory of
 541 the HORNET software (see <https://github.com/noahlorinczcomi/HORNET>).

542 5.2 Running `tissue_chooser.py` to prioritize tissues

543 In this subsection, we demonstrated how to use our `tissue_chooser.py` tool to
 544 automatically search `hscores.txt` for tissues with the strongest eQTLs. Please
 545 see the ‘Choosing tissues’ branch at <https://github.com/noahlorinczcomi/HORNET>
 546 for a complete demonstration of how to use this tool. Briefly,
 547 this tool receives either a comma-separated list or file of gene IDs to its
 548 `--candidateGenes` flag, a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to its `--saveAsFile` flag indicating if
 549 the results should be saved in a file in addition to being printed to the console,
 550 and the output filepath to `--outFile` if you put ‘yes’ to the `--candidateGenes`
 551 flag. Note, the top results will always be printed to the console, unless you want
 552 to suppress them by setting the `--printResults` flag to be ‘no’. An example
 553 of output that could be generated by this tool for the *HMGC*, *CETP*, and
 554 *FES* genes is displayed in Figure 22.

The top 10 tissues for these genes are the following:

Tissue	Genes	GeneCount	nSignifSNPs	Maxh2Score
Lung	ENSG00000087237, ENSG00000182511	2	16, 35	1208.473765
Cells_Cultured_fibroblasts	ENSG00000087237, ENSG00000182511	2	6, 23	2949.393100
Muscle_Skeletal	ENSG00000113161	1	76	1548.315195
Whole_Blood	ENSG00000182511	1	25	837.521937
Thyroid	ENSG00000182511	1	19	1983.885576
Pancreas	ENSG00000182511	1	18	1139.772883
Heart_Atrial_Appendage	ENSG00000087237	1	9	230.349358
Small_Intestine_Terminal_Ileum	ENSG00000087237	1	9	227.685715
Stomach	ENSG00000087237	1	8	184.174806
Adipose_Visceral_Omentum	ENSG00000113161	1	3	28.204502

Fig. 22 This is the output of running the

```
python tissue_chooser.py --candidateGenes ENSG00000113161,ENSG00000087237,ENSG00000182511
```

command in the HORNET directory. All values are aggregated within tissues. `Maxh2score` is the maximum heritability score for the tissue. `nSignifSNPs` is the number of SNPs significantly associated with gene expression after adjustment for multiple comparisons in GTEX v8 [9]. `TissueCount` represents the number of genes for which the specific tissue is in the top 5 tissues with the strongest cis-eQTLs. `Genes` represents the genes for which each tissue contains one of the top 5 strongest eQTLs.

5.3 Limitations

This tool has the following limitations. First, this tool relies solely on GTEx v8 data for the inferences it intends to supply. Second, these heritability scores are proportional to SNP heritability but are also proportional to the true total number of causal SNPs, which in this case may not be reliably estimated from only the cis-eQTL data. The tool therefore implicitly assumes constant numbers of causal SNPs across all genes in all tissues. In this context, 'causal SNPs' refers to those SNPs that cause variation in gene expression in a specific tissue. Thirdly, any prioritization of certain tissues over others is completely agnostic to the outcome phenotype. It therefore may be true that a gene with a very strong causal effect on a disease when expressed in one particular tissue may not have strong enough eQTLs in that tissue to give it a relatively high ranking by our `tissue_chooser.py` tool. Researchers should therefore only consult this tool as one of many forms of guidance in choosing the most appropriate tissues for their analysis. Fifthly, we used strictly GTEx summary data [9] when constructing the reference data set `hscores.txt` on which the `tissue_chooser.py` relies. The GTEx v8 sample size for whole blood tissue is 670, whereas the sample size for cis-eQTLs in the eQTLGen Consortium [33] is 31k, which provides more statistical power for detecting cis-eQTLs than GTEx v8. Since whole blood tissue is generally considered in all analyses anyway, we omitted calculation of heritability scores using eQTL GWAS in whole blood from the eQTLGen Consortium.

6 Software

The HORNET software is available as a command line tool and desktop application for Linux, Windows, and Mac machines. Complete tutorials demonstrating how to download and use the HORNET software are present at <https://github.com/noahlorinczcomi/HORNET> under the `README.md` and `HORNET_Desktop.md` files for the command line and desktop versions, respectively.

References

- [1] Isaiah Andrews, James H Stock, and Liyang Sun. Weak instruments in instrumental variables regression: Theory and practice. *Annu. Rev. Econom.*, 11(1), 2019.
- [2] Jack Bowden, George Davey Smith, Philip C Haycock, and Stephen Burgess. Consistent estimation in mendelian randomization with some invalid instruments using a weighted median estimator. *Genet. Epidemiol.*, 40(4):304–314, 2016.
- [3] Brendan Bulik-Sullivan, Hilary K Finucane, Verneri Anttila, Alexander Gusev, Felix R Day, Po-Ru Loh, Laramie Duncan, John RB Perry, Nick

- 594 Patterson, Elise B Robinson, et al. An atlas of genetic correlations across
595 human diseases and traits. *Nat. Genet.*, 47(11):1236–1241, 2015.
- 596 [4] Brendan K Bulik-Sullivan, Po-Ru Loh, Hilary K Finucane, Stephan Ripke,
597 Jian Yang, Nick Patterson, Mark J Daly, Alkes L Price, and Benjamin M
598 Neale. Ld score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in
599 genome-wide association studies. *Nat. Genet.*, 47(3):291–295, 2015.
- 600 [5] Stephen Burgess and Jack Bowden. Integrating summarized data from
601 multiple genetic variants in mendelian randomization: bias and cover-
602 age properties of inverse-variance weighted methods. *arXiv preprint*
603 *arXiv:1512.04486*, 2015.
- 604 [6] Stephen Burgess, Adam Butterworth, and Simon G Thompson.
605 Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple genetic variants using
606 summarized data. *Genet. Epidemiol.*, 37(7):658–665, 2013.
- 607 [7] Stephen Burgess, Verena Zuber, Elsa Valdes-Marquez, Benjamin B Sun,
608 and Jemma C Hopewell. Mendelian randomization with fine-mapped
609 genetic data: choosing from large numbers of correlated instrumental
610 variables. *Genetic epidemiology*, 41(8):714–725, 2017.
- 611 [8] 1000 Genomes Project Consortium et al. A global reference for human
612 genetic variation. *Nature*, 526(7571):68, 2015.
- 613 [9] GTEx Consortium, Kristin G Ardlie, David S Deluca, Ayellet V Segrè,
614 Timothy J Sullivan, Taylor R Young, Ellen T Gelfand, Casandra A Trow-
615 bridge, Julian B Maller, Taru Tukiainen, et al. The genotype-tissue
616 expression (gtex) pilot analysis: multitissue gene regulation in humans.
617 *Science*, 348(6235):648–660, 2015.
- 618 [10] Niek de Klein, Ellen A Tsai, Martijn Vochteloo, Denis Baird, Yunfeng
619 Huang, Chia-Yen Chen, Sipko van Dam, Roy Oelen, Patrick Deelen,
620 Olivier B Bakker, et al. Brain expression quantitative trait locus and
621 network analyses reveal downstream effects and putative drivers for
622 brain-related diseases. *Nature genetics*, 55(3):377–388, 2023.
- 623 [11] Frank Dudbridge and Paul J Newcombe. Accuracy of gene scores when
624 pruning markers by linkage disequilibrium. *Human heredity*, 80(4):178–
625 186, 2016.
- 626 [12] Susan Fairley, Ernesto Lowy-Gallego, Emily Perry, and Paul Flicek. The
627 international genome sample resource (igsr) collection of open human
628 genomic variation resources. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 48(D1):D941–D947,
629 2020.

- 630 [13] Jianqing Fan and Runze Li. Variable selection via nonconcave penalized
631 likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical*
632 *Association*, 96(456):1348–1360, 2001.
- 633 [14] Dan I Georgescu, Nicholas J Higham, and Gareth W Peters. Explicit
634 solutions to correlation matrix completion problems, with an application
635 to risk management and insurance. *Royal Society open science*, 5(3):
636 172348, 2018.
- 637 [15] Kevin J Gleason, Fan Yang, and Lin S Chen. A robust two-sample
638 mendelian randomization method integrating gwas with multi-tissue eqtl
639 summary statistics. *bioRxiv*, pages 2020–06, 2020.
- 640 [16] Trevor Hastie, Rahul Mazumder, Jason D Lee, and Reza Zadeh. Matrix
641 completion and low-rank svd via fast alternating least squares. *The*
642 *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):3367–3402, 2015.
- 643 [17] Xuming He, Xiaou Pan, Kean Ming Tan, and Wen-Xin Zhou. Smoothed
644 quantile regression with large-scale inference. *Journal of Econometrics*,
645 2021.
- 646 [18] Iris E Jansen, Jeanne E Savage, Kyoko Watanabe, Julien Bryois, Dylan M
647 Williams, Stacy Steinberg, Julia Sealock, Ida K Karlsson, Sara Hägg,
648 Lavinia Athanasiu, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis identifies new loci
649 and functional pathways influencing alzheimer’s disease risk. *Nature*
650 *genetics*, 51(3):404–413, 2019.
- 651 [19] Lin Jiang, Lin Miao, Guorong Yi, Xiangyi Li, Chao Xue, Mulin Jun Li,
652 Hailiang Huang, and Miaoxin Li. Powerful and robust inference of com-
653 plex phenotypes’ causal genes with dependent expression quantitative loci
654 by a median-based mendelian randomization. *The American Journal of*
655 *Human Genetics*, 109(5):838–856, 2022.
- 656 [20] Noah Lorincz-Comi, Yihe Yang, Gen Li, and Xiaofeng Zhu. Mrbee:
657 A novel bias-corrected multivariable mendelian randomization method.
658 *bioRxiv*, 523480, 2023.
- 659 [21] Noah Lorincz-Comi, Yihe Yang, Gen Li, and Xiaofeng Zhu. Mrbee:
660 A novel bias-corrected multivariable mendelian randomization method.
661 *bioRxiv*, pages 2023–01, 2023.
- 662 [22] Rahul Mazumder, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Spectral regu-
663 larization algorithms for learning large incomplete matrices. *The Journal*
664 *of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2287–2322, 2010.
- 665 [23] Paul J Newcombe, David V Conti, and Sylvia Richardson. Jam: a scalable
666 bayesian framework for joint analysis of marginal snp effects. *Genetic*

- 667 *epidemiology*, 40(3):188–201, 2016.
- 668 [24] Halit Ongen, Alfonso Buil, Andrew Anand Brown, Emmanouil T Der-
669 mitzakis, and Olivier Delaneau. Fast and efficient qtl mapper for
670 thousands of molecular phenotypes. *Bioinformatics*, 32(10):1479–1485,
671 2016.
- 672 [25] Klaasjan G Ouwens, Rick Jansen, Michel G Nivard, Jenny van Dongen,
673 Maia J Frieser, Jouke-Jan Hottenga, Wibowo Arindrarto, Annique Clar-
674 ingbould, Maarten van Iterson, Hailiang Mei, et al. A characterization
675 of cis-and trans-heritability of rna-seq-based gene expression. *European*
676 *Journal of Human Genetics*, 28(2):253–263, 2020.
- 677 [26] Alkes L Price, Agnar Helgason, Gudmar Thorleifsson, Steven A McCar-
678 roll, Augustine Kong, and Kari Stefansson. Single-tissue and cross-tissue
679 heritability of gene expression via identity-by-descent in related or
680 unrelated individuals. *PLoS genetics*, 7(2):e1001317, 2011.
- 681 [27] Shaun Purcell, Benjamin Neale, Kathe Todd-Brown, Lori Thomas,
682 Manuel AR Ferreira, David Bender, Julian Maller, Pamela Sklar, Paul IW
683 De Bakker, Mark J Daly, et al. Plink: a tool set for whole-genome asso-
684 ciation and population-based linkage analyses. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.*, 81
685 (3):559–575, 2007.
- 686 [28] Amand F Schmidt, Chris Finan, Maria Gordillo-Marañón, Folkert W
687 Asselbergs, Daniel F Freitag, Riyaz S Patel, Benoît Tyl, Sandesh Chopade,
688 Rupert Faraway, Magdalena Zwierzyna, et al. Genetic drug target val-
689 idation using mendelian randomisation. *Nature communications*, 11(1):
690 3255, 2020.
- 691 [29] Reecha Sofat, Aroon D Hingorani, Liam Smeeth, Steve E Humphries,
692 Philippa J Talmud, Jackie Cooper, Tina Shah, Manjinder S Sandhu,
693 Sally L Ricketts, S Matthijs Boekholdt, et al. Separating the mechanism-
694 based and off-target actions of cholesteryl ester transfer protein inhibitors
695 with cetp gene polymorphisms. *Circulation*, 121(1):52–62, 2010.
- 696 [30] Cathie Sudlow, John Gallacher, Naomi Allen, Valerie Beral, Paul Burton,
697 John Danesh, Paul Downey, Paul Elliott, Jane Green, Martin Landray,
698 et al. Uk biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a
699 wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS Med.*, 12(3):
700 e1001779, 2015.
- 701 [31] Daniel I Swerdlow, David Preiss, Karoline B Kuchenbaecker, Michael V
702 Holmes, Jorgen EL Engmann, Tina Shah, Reecha Sofat, Stefan Stender,
703 Paul CD Johnson, Robert A Scott, et al. Hmg-coenzyme a reductase inhi-
704 bition, type 2 diabetes, and bodyweight: evidence from genetic analysis
705 and randomised trials. *The Lancet*, 385(9965):351–361, 2015.

- 706 [32] Amaro Taylor-Weiner, François Aguet, Nicholas J Haradhvala, Sager
707 Gosai, Shankara Anand, Jaegil Kim, Kristin Ardlie, Eliezer M Van Allen,
708 and Gad Getz. Scaling computational genomics to millions of individuals
709 with gpus. *Genome biology*, 20(1):1–5, 2019.
- 710 [33] Urmo Vösa, Annique Claringbould, Harm-Jan Westra, Marc Jan Bonder,
711 Patrick Deelen, Biao Zeng, Holger Kirsten, Ashis Saha, Roman Kreuzhu-
712 ber, Seyhan Yazar, et al. Large-scale cis-and trans-eqtl analyses identify
713 thousands of genetic loci and polygenic scores that regulate blood gene
714 expression. *Nature genetics*, 53(9):1300–1310, 2021.
- 715 [34] Fred A Wright, Patrick F Sullivan, Andrew I Brooks, Fei Zou, Wei Sun,
716 Kai Xia, Vered Madar, Rick Jansen, Wonil Chung, Yi-Hui Zhou, et al.
717 Heritability and genomics of gene expression in peripheral blood. *Nature*
718 *genetics*, 46(5):430–437, 2014.
- 719 [35] Yang Wu, Jian Zeng, Futao Zhang, Zhihong Zhu, Ting Qi, Zhili Zheng,
720 Luke R Lloyd-Jones, Riccardo E Marioni, Nicholas G Martin, Grant W
721 Montgomery, et al. Integrative analysis of omics summary data reveals
722 putative mechanisms underlying complex traits. *Nature communications*,
723 9(1):918, 2018.
- 724 [36] Jian Yang, Teresa Ferreira, Andrew P Morris, Sarah E Medland,
725 Genetic Investigation of ANthropometric Traits (GIANT) Consortium,
726 DIAbetes Genetics Replication, Meta analysis (DIAGRAM) Consortium,
727 Pamela AF Madden, Andrew C Heath, Nicholas G Martin, Grant W
728 Montgomery, et al. Conditional and joint multiple-snp analysis of
729 gwas summary statistics identifies additional variants influencing complex
730 traits. *Nature genetics*, 44(4):369–375, 2012.
- 731 [37] Xiaofeng Zhu, Xiaoyin Li, Rong Xu, and Tao Wang. An iterative approach
732 to detect pleiotropy and perform mendelian randomization analysis using
733 gwas summary statistics. *Bioinformatics*, 37(10):1390–1400, 2021.
- 734 [38] Zhihong Zhu, Futao Zhang, Han Hu, Andrew Bakshi, Matthew R Robin-
735 son, Joseph E Powell, Grant W Montgomery, Michael E Goddard,
736 Naomi R Wray, Peter M Visscher, et al. Integration of summary data
737 from gwas and eqtl studies predicts complex trait gene targets. *Nature*
738 *genetics*, 48(5):481–487, 2016.
- 739 [39] Yuxin Zou, Peter Carbonetto, Gao Wang, and Matthew Stephens. Fine-
740 mapping from summary data with the “sum of single effects” model. *PLoS*
741 *Genetics*, 18(7):e1010299, 2022.