Estimating the causal effect of adiposity on carpal tunnel syndrome: a Mendelian randomization study

Iyas Daghlas, BS[1]; Nathan Varady, BS[1]

[1] Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston, MA, 02115, USA

Correspondence:

Iyas Daghlas, BS, Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston, MA, 02115, USA

(iyas_daghlas@hms.harvard.edu)

Manuscript word count: 2,879 / 3,000

Abstract

Background We aimed to examine evidence for a causal effect of overall and abdominal adiposity on carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) using two-sample Mendelian randomization (MR).

Methods The exposure included genetic instruments comprising independent variants associated with body mass index (BMI) (n=322,154), a proxy for overall adiposity, and waist-hip ratio adjusted for BMI (WHRadjBMI) (n=210,082), a proxy for abdominal adiposity. Associations of these variants with CTS were obtained from a genome-wide association study (GWAS) conducted in UK Biobank (12,312 CTS cases / 389,344 controls). Causal effects were estimated using inverse-variance weighted regression and conventional MR sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess for horizontal pleiotropy. In follow-up analyses we determined whether type 2 diabetes (T2D) or hyperlipidemia mediated the observed effects.

Results A 1-standard deviation (SD, ~4.7kg/m^2) increase in genetically instrumented BMI increased the risk of CTS (OR 1.73, 95% CI 1.48-2.02, p=2.68e-12), with consistent effects across sensitivity analyses. This effect translates to an absolute increase of 17 CTS cases per 1000 person years amongst US working populations [95% CI 11.0-23.5]. Univariable MR was consistent with a causal effect of T2D (OR 1.08, 95% CI 1.03-1.11, p=5.20e-05), and the effect of BMI was partially attenuated (OR 1.53, 95% CI 1.38-1.68, p=2.85e-08) when controlling for T2D liability in multivariable MR. In contrast, no effect was observed of WHRadjBMI on CTS (OR 1.03, 95% CI 0.74-1.33, p=0.83).

Conclusion These data support a causal effect of overall adiposity on susceptibility to CTS that is only partially mediated through T2D, suggesting that efforts to reduce obesity may mitigate the population burden of CTS.

Key words: Mendelian randomization, carpal tunnel syndrome, body mass index, obesity, neuroepidemiology

Key messages

- A one-standard deviation increase in body mass index, a proxy for overall adiposity, increased risk of carpal tunnel by 73%. In contrast, no effect of waist-to-hip ratio adjusted for BMI, a proxy for abdominal adiposity, was observed on risk of carpal tunnel syndrome.
- The effects of BMI on carpal tunnel syndrome risk were partially attenuated when accounting for mediation through type 2 diabetes, suggesting that the majority of the causal effect operates independently of diabetes risk.
- These data suggest that efforts to reduce rates of obesity could reduce the incidence of carpal tunnel syndrome.

Introduction

Carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) is the most common entrapment neuropathy, with an estimated prevalence ranging from 1-5%[1]. CTS accounts for a large proportion of lost work time related to disabling injuries, and medical care for CTS has been estimated to cost more than $2 billion annually[2]. In light of this clinical and economic burden of disease, efforts have been made to delineate factors contributing to risk of CTS[3].

Elevated body-mass index (BMI), a proxy for overall adiposity[4], has consistently emerged as a modifiable risk factor for CTS[3,5]. A meta-analysis of 58 observational studies related obesity to a doubling in odds of CTS, and a 1 kg/m^2 increase in BMI to an adjusted odds ratio of 1.07[6]. Associations were also observed of waist circumference with CTS, suggesting additional contributions of abdominal adiposity. However, given the observational nature of these studies, it is unclear whether the association of BMI with CTS is causal[7]. For instance, BMI is strongly influenced by underlying health conditions such as hypothyroidism[8], which may confound the relationship of obesity with CTS. Understanding causality has important clinical implications for the prevention of morbidity associated with CTS, as well as for reducing the population burden of work-related disability and healthcare costs.

Some of the limitations to observational research may be overcome by an instrumental variable method termed 'Mendelian randomization' (MR)[9]. MR uses genetic variants as proxies for epidemiologic exposures to test for causal effects on outcomes. This method leverages the random assortment of genetic variants at gametogenesis which, at the population level, randomizes individuals to different levels of any given heritable exposure. This substantially

reduces confounding and minimizes the impact of reverse causality[7,10]. To date, no MR study has examined potential causality between adiposity and CTS. We thus aimed to leverage MR to determine whether effects of overall adiposity (proxied through BMI) and abdominal adiposity (proxied through waist-hip ratio adjusted for BMI) were causally linked to CTS. We further assessed the extent to which these effects were explained by the metabolic consequences of adiposity, including diabetes and hyperlipidemia.

Methods

Exposure datasets

The genetic instrumental variable comprised genetic variants relating to BMI and WHRadjBMI. Associations of these variants with the phenotypes were obtained from genome-wide association studies (GWAS) conducted by the Genetic Investigation of ANthropometric Traits (GIANT) consortium on participants of European ancestry. For BMI, this comprised a meta-analysis across 80 cohorts, collectively contributing data on up to 322,154 participants of European ancestry[11]. For WHRadjBMI, this comprised a meta-analysis across 101 cohorts, collectively contributing data on up to 210,088 participants of European ancestry[12]. The effects in both studies are provided in relation to a 1-standard deviation (SD) increase in the respective adiposity measures. For BMI, this represents a 4.7 kg/m^2 increase, which approximately represents the transition from overweight to obesity[13]. For WHR, this represents a change of 0.08 units. Both genetic instruments have been shown to strongly associate with BMI and WHRadjBMI in independent cohorts[14,15].

Outcome dataset

The outcome data source was a GWAS of carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) conducted using the population-based UK Biobank (UKB) cohort. Extensive details of UKB have been previously reported[16]. In short, approximately 500,000 participants were recruited across 22 assessment centers from 2006-2010. At baseline assessment, the volunteers completed a standardized questionnaire and interview with a study nurse, and blood was collected for genotyping. Cases of CTS were defined as participants meeting any of the following criteria: self-reported history of CTS, ICD-10 code for CTS, operation code for carpal tunnel release or revision of carpal tunnel release, and self-reported history of carpal tunnel surgery. In total, 12,312 CTS cases and 389,344 controls of White British ancestry with suitable genetic data were identified for analysis. The contribution of each data source to the total case count is given in Supplementary Table 1 of the GWAS[17], with the primary ICD-10 code G560 contributing the greatest number of cases (n=9,139). GWAS was conducted using BOLT-LMM to account for relatedness within the UKB cohort, with LMM beta coefficients converted to log-odds using the prevalence of CTS in UKB[17].

Data harmonization and power calculation

Using raw summary statistics files, we extracted variants associated with BMI and WHRadjBMI at genome-wide significance ($p < 5e-08$, representing a Bonferonni correction for all independent comparisons across the genome). This threshold is selected to satisfy the assumption of MR that the instrument is strongly associated with the exposure. Moreover, this threshold approximately corresponds to an F-statistic of 30, which is greater than the F-statistic cutoff of 10 to mitigate weak instrument bias[7,18]. From this variant list, we identified variants also present in the CTS GWAS that could be matched on the basis of allele frequency (using the 'harmonise_data'

function in the TwoSampleMR package). To generate a set of independent genetic variants, we clumped this set of variants at an R^2 (measure of linkage disequilibrium) of 0.001 using the 1000 Genomes European reference panel (using the 'clump_data' function in the TwoSampleMR package).

Power was calculated using the mRnd power calculator (http://cnsgenomics.com/shiny/mRnd/). We utilized previously described methods for calculating percent variance explained using summarized data[19]. Notably, the percent variance explained of the genetic instrument relates to the power, but not validity, of the MR analysis.

Primary MR analyses

To obtain an estimate of the causal effect of the adiposity exposures on CTS, we regressed the SNP-outcome associations on the SNP-exposure associations, and weighted the effects by the inverse of the variance (IVW) in the SNP-outcome association under a random-effects model[20] (utilizing the 'mr_ivw' function in the TwoSampleMR package). Heterogeneity was assessed using Cochran's Q. We compared the genetically instrumented effects of BMI to previously reported observational estimates[6] using a formal test of heterogeneity. We converted effect estimates to absolute risk increases using the following equation[15]: absolute risk increase = (OR-1)*absolute incidence. Incidence estimates were obtained from a pooled analysis of US working populations, as part of the upper-extremity musculoskeletal disorder consortium (23 CTS cases per 1000 person-years[21]).

Assessment of mediation through cardiometabolic risk factors

To determine whether any observed associations were mediated through hyperlipidemia or T2D, both putative risk factors for CTS[22,23], we first tested for associations of these risk factors with CTS. Association statistics for T2D were obtained from a GWAS meta-analysis of 26,676 T2D cases and 132,532 controls of European ancestry[24]. Consistent with prior work, the effect of diabetes liability on CTS was scaled to represent a doubling in the odds of diabetes[25]. Associations with low-density lipoprotein (LDL), high-density lipoprotein (HDL), and triglycerides were obtained from GWAS conducted by the Global Lipid Genetics Consortium (GLGC, n~180,000). Associations identified in univariable MR, were followed by multivariable[26] MR to determine whether the effect of BMI was attenuated when controlling for the putative mediator (i.e. T2D). This regression was fit with both exposures simultaneously using the default parameters in the TwoSampleMR 'mv_multiple' function. As previously recommended for multivariable MR analyses of dichotomous outcomes in MR[27], we report the total (unadjusted) and direct (adjusted) effects of BMI, but not the indirect effect.

Model-based sensitivity analyses

The strongest assumption made in an MR analysis is the absence of horizontal pleiotropy, where genetic variants influence the outcome through pathways independent of the exposure of interest. We therefore conducted a range of model-based sensitivity analyses that produce valid estimates under weaker assumptions. In concordance with prior recommendations, we only conducted these sensitivity analyses when conventional univariable MR provided evidence of a causal effect[28]. Technical details of the assumptions made in these models can be found in their respective reports. These models included: robust, heterogeneity-penalized IVW analysis, MR Egger[29], the weighted median estimator[30], the robust adjusted profile score (RAPS)[31], and a

recently developed Bayesian weighted MR (BWMR) method[32]. In addition to producing an effect estimate, the MR Egger intercept provides a measure of unbalanced horizontal pleiotropy. Finally, we utilized the Mendelian Randomization Pleiotropy RESidual Sum and Outlier (MR-PRESSO) method to detect and remove potentially pleiotropic variants[33]. Given the varying assumptions regarding pleiotropy in these models, we considered consistent effects across the sensitivity analyses to greatly strengthen evidence for causality.

Non-model-based sensitivity analyses

We conducted three additional non-model-based sensitivity analyses to assess the causal effect of BMI on CTS. First, we re-estimated associations after removing the highly pleiotropic variant in the 'Fat mass and obesity-associated protein' (*FTO*) gene[34]. To further examine confounding, we utilized the PhenoScanner[35] database to identify genetic variants associating with height[17] or with grip strength at $p < 1e\text{-}05$ (default setting), and re-estimated IVW associations after removing those variants. Height was selected on the basis of evidence that height causally impacts CTS in prior MR analyses[17]. Grip strength was selected as a proxy for lean mass to mitigate confounding of adiposity by muscle mass. Finally, we plotted IVW estimates after systematically removing one variant at a time in the instrument to determine whether outliers were driving the causal effect.

Software and statistical analysis

All analyses were conducted using R version 3.5.0. We utilized the TwoSampleMR[36], MendelianRandomization[37], and PhenoScanner[35] packages. All summary statistic data used for

analysis are available at the corresponding consortia websites. All statistical tests were two-sided.

Results

The BMI instrument comprised 69 SNPs which collectively explained 2.27% of the variance in BMI. The WHRadjBMI instrument comprised 36 SNPs and explained 1.19% of the variance in WHRadjBMI. On the basis of these estimates, we had 80% power to detect a causal OR of 1.17 for a SD increase in BMI, and 1.19 for a SD increase in WHRadjBMI.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

A 1-SD increase in BMI was associated with an increased risk of CTS (OR 1.73, 95% CI 1.48-2.02, p=2.68e-12; Table 1, Figure 1). This effect translates to an absolute risk increase of 16.8 additional CTS cases per 1000 person years [95% CI 11.0-23.5]. This effect was stronger than the previously reported meta-analytic effect size across 58 observational studies (p=0.03). Moderate heterogeneity was observed in the MR estimate (Q=112, p=6.7e-04). In contrast, a 1-SD increase in WHRadjBMI was not associated with CTS, however estimates were less precisely estimated relative to effects of BMI (OR 1.03, 0.77-1.39, p=0.83; Table 1, Figure 1).

[Insert Table 1 here]

We examined mediation for the effect of BMI on CTS by first testing for univariable MR effects of T2D and circulating lipids on CTS (Table 1). A doubling in the odds of T2D was associated

with increased risk of CTS (OR 1.08, 95% CI 1.03-1.11, p=5.20e-05). Model-based sensitivity analyses provided consistent causal effect estimates (Figure 2). In contrast, effect estimates for a 1-SD increase in LDL (OR 1.04, 95% CI 0.96-1.12, p=0.35), HDL (OR 1.02, 95% CI 0.93-1.13, p=0.62), and triglycerides (OR 1.04, 95% CI 0.93-1.16, p=0.53) were all consistent with the null. The direct effect of BMI on CTS was partially attenuated in multivariable MR adjusting for T2D, suggesting partial mediation through T2D (OR 1.53, 95% CI 1.38-1.68, p=2.85e-08; Table 1).

[Insert Figure 2 here]

Six lines of evidence support the robustness of the causal effect of BMI on CTS. First, the MR Egger intercept, a measure of horizontal pleiotropy, did not differ from the null (Beta = -0.009, p=0.21). Second, a range of sensitivity analyses with varying instrumental variable assumptions produced highly consistent effect estimates (Figure 2). Third, no pleiotropic variants were detected by MR-PRESSO. Fourth, estimates were materially unchanged when removing the variant within the highly pleiotropic FTO gene (OR 1.67, 95% CI 1.41-1.97, p=1.36e-09). Fifth, IVW effects were consistent when removing variants from the BMI instrument nominally associated with height (13 SNPs; OR 1.72, 95% CI 1.44-2.05, p=1.49e-09) or with grip strength (5 SNPs; OR 1.70, 1.44-2.00, p=1.76e-10), suggesting minimal pleiotropy by these traits (Figure 2). Six, leave-one-out analyses did not indicate that results were driven by a single outlier variant (Figure 3).

[Insert Figure 3 here]

Discussion

In this large-scale MR study utilizing data from 12,312 CTS cases and 389,344 controls, we identified evidence for a causal effect of BMI, but not of WHRadjBMI on CTS. These effects were consistent across a range of sensitivity analyses for horizontal pleiotropy, and were partially mediated through T2D but not through circulating lipids. These results support several conclusions.

First, these results provide the strongest evidence to date for a causal effect of greater BMI on development of CTS. Moreover, we found that, relative to observational estimates, genetically instrumented BMI had a stronger effect for a given unit increase in the exposure. This difference may be a consequence of the impact of genetic variation on lifelong increases in levels of an exposure[7]. This is in contrast to phenotypically measured BMI, which may be more reflective of one particular time point in an individual's life. However, caution should also be taken in interpreting this difference in effects, due to the impact of non-collapsibility of the odds ratio on instrumental variable analysis[38]. It is important to note that these findings relate to CTS etiology rather than progression. While it is highly plausible that BMI is also a causal risk factor for progression of CTS, testing this hypothesis would necessitate a GWAS of CTS progression[39], which is not presently available. Taken together, these findings collectively support clinical investigation of weight loss as a potential tool to mitigate the burden of CTS in high-risk occupations[40].

Next, our results suggest that effect of BMI on CTS is partially mediated through T2D, but not through hyperlipidemia. We demonstrated through univariable MR that liability to T2D has a

causal effect on CTS. Diabetes has long been associated with CTS[22], with putative mediators including oxidative stress and extracellular protein glycation[6]. More broadly, neuropathy is a well-established complication of T2D. In multivariable MR, the point estimate of BMI on CTS was reduced from 1.73 to 1.53, suggesting that the majority of the BMI effect is not accounted for by increased liability to T2D. Importantly, since genotypes are precisely estimated, there is unlikely to be residual mediation due to measurement error in the mediator. These results suggest that efforts to reduce the population burden of T2D will only partially mitigate the causal effect of BMI on CTS, and that obese individuals remain at elevated risk for CTS regardless of their T2D status. Given the strong causal effect of WHRadjBMI on liability to T2D and cardiometabolic health[15], it is surprising that there was no association between WHRadjBMI and CTS. However, the confidence intervals of the effect estimate are potentially consistent with a small causal effect that may be revealed in future analyses. Triangulating this result with the strong effect of BMI on CTS suggests that, apart from T2D, metabolic dysfunction is not a strong contributor to CTS risk. As further support for this conclusion, genetically instrumented elevations in circulating lipids had no causal effect on odds of CTS. Insofar as CTS is representative of peripheral neuropathies, these results also suggest that LDL lowering is unlikely to be a causal risk factor for neuropathy[41]. These null effects suggest that associations reported in prior studies may have been driven by residual confounding, potentially by BMI or T2D[23].

Apart from the partially mediated effect through T2D, precise mechanisms for the link of overall adiposity to CTS remain speculative. A direct compressive effect of adipose tissue within the carpal tunnel, or of increased hydrostatic pressure throughout the carpal canal[42], has been

suggested[6]. Alternatively, the link may be explained through increased endoneurial edema[43] or through increased rates of hand osteoarthritis[44] in obese patients[45]. Additionally, one may intuit that BMI is not a direct measure of adiposity and thus lean mass could be a primary causal factor. This concern was explicitly addressed in a prior study utilizing data from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children[4]. Here, the authors found that BMI is tightly correlated with objective measures of adiposity, and that the health effects of BMI closely mirror the effects of more precisely measured adiposity; on the basis of these results, they concluded that BMI is a highly suitable metric for assessing the health effects of adiposity. Moreover, the MR effects of BMI on CTS were consistent when removing variants nominally associated with grip strength, a proxy for lean body mass. At present, all GWAS data available on grip strength and CTS are from the same dataset (UKB) which precludes the use of two-sample MR; however, as additional cohorts become available, future studies may be able to more accurately characterize what, if any, causative role lean mass has on the development of CTS.

The major strength of this analysis is the use of Mendelian randomization, with consistent results identified across a range of sensitivity analyses. Given the random allocation of variants at gametogenesis[7,10], these results are unlikely to be strongly biased by confounding or reverse causality. Additionally, the use of two independent samples for measurement of exposure and outcome associations avoids bias due to sample overlap. Due to the use of large sample sizes, we were powered to detect small effect sizes in both univariable and multivariable MR. Finally, the exposure and outcome SNP associations were both measured in participants of European ancestry, minimizing the potential for confounding by population stratification. There are also limitations to acknowledge. Although results were highly consistent across a range of sensitivity

analyses, horizontal pleiotropy may account for the observed associations[7]. As a consequence of the low response rate for study participation, volunteers in UKB are generally healthier than the general population[46]. This may reduce generalizability of disease associations or induce collider bias[47]. Despite a similar prevalence of CTS (3.2%) relative to prior estimates[1], this phenotype may be underascertained due to the lack of availability of primary care diagnostic codes at the time of the CTS GWAS. The resulting contamination of the control group would be expected to dilute the estimated causal effect. Finally, replication of these results in an independent cohort, and in participants of non-European ancestry, will strengthen confidence in the causal effect of BMI on CTS.

In conclusion, the present results are consistent with a causal effect of higher BMI, but not of WHRadjBMI, on odds of carpal tunnel syndrome. These results further the understanding of the pathophysiology of carpal tunnel syndrome.

Acknowledgements

We are thankful to the genomics community - particularly the GIANT consortium, the GLGC consortium, the DIAGRAM consortium, and authors of the CTS GWAS - for their culture of data sharing. We also thank the participants of UKB for making this study possible.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Atroshi I. Prevalence of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome in a General Population. *JAMA*. 1999 Jul 14;**282**(2):153.
2. Calandruccio JH, Thompson NB. Carpal Tunnel Syndrome: Making Evidence-Based Treatment Decisions. *Orthop Clin North Am*. Elsevier Inc; 2018;**49**(2):223–229.
3. Padua L, Coraci D, Erra C, et al. Carpal tunnel syndrome: clinical features, diagnosis, and management. *Lancet Neurol*. Elsevier Ltd; 2016;**15**(12):1273–1284.
4. Bell JA, Carslake D, O'Keeffe LM, et al. Associations of Body Mass and Fat Indexes With Cardiometabolic Traits. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;**72**(24):3142–3154.
5. Reeves GK, Balkwill A, Cairns BJ, Green J, Beral V. Hospital admissions in relation to body mass index in UK women: A prospective cohort study. *BMC Med*. BMC Medicine; 2014;**12**(1):1–12.
6. Shiri R, Pourmemari MH, Falah-Hassani K, Viikari-Juntura E. The effect of excess body mass on the risk of carpal tunnel syndrome: A meta-analysis of 58 studies. *Obes Rev*. 2015;**16**(12):1094–1104.
7. Davies NM, Holmes M V., Davey Smith G. Reading Mendelian randomisation studies: A guide, glossary, and checklist for clinicians. *BMJ*. 2018;**362**.
8. Bland JDP. The relationship of obesity, age, and carpal tunnel syndrome: More complex than was thought? *Muscle and Nerve*. 2005;**32**(4):527–532.
9. Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. 'Mendelian randomization': can genetic epidemiology contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *Int J Epidemiol*. 2003

Feb;**32**(1):1–22.

10. Smith GD, Ebrahim S. 'Mendelian randomization': Can genetic epidemiology contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *Int J Epidemiol*. 2003;**32**(1):1–22.

11. Locke AE, Kahali B, Berndt SI, et al. Genetic studies of body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. *Nature*. 2015 Feb 12;**518**(7538):197–206.

12. Shungin D, Winkler TW, Croteau-Chonka DC, et al. New genetic loci link adipose and insulin biology to body fat distribution. *Nature*. 2015 Feb 12;**518**(7538):187–196.

13. Mokry LE, Ross S, Timpson NJ, Sawcer S, Davey Smith G, Richards JB. Obesity and Multiple Sclerosis: A Mendelian Randomization Study. *PLoS Med*. 2016;**13**(6):1–16.

14. Lyall DM, Celis-Morales C, Ward J, et al. Association of Body Mass Index With Cardiometabolic Disease in the UK Biobank: A Mendelian Randomization Study. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2017;

15. Emdin CA, Khera A V., Natarajan P, et al. Genetic Association of Waist-to-Hip Ratio With Cardiometabolic Traits, Type 2 Diabetes, and Coronary Heart Disease. *JAMA*. 2017 Feb 14;**317**(6):626.

16. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. 2018;

17. Wiberg A, Ng M, Schmid AB, et al. A genome-wide association analysis identifies 16 novel susceptibility loci for carpal tunnel syndrome. *Nat Commun*. Springer US; 2019;**10**(1):1–12.

18. Pierce BL, Ahsan H, Vanderweele TJ. Power and instrument strength requirements for Mendelian randomization studies using multiple genetic variants. *Int J Epidemiol*.

2011;**40**(3):740–752.

19. Valdes-Marquez E, Parish S, Clarke R, Stari T, Worrall BB, Hopewell JC. Relative effects of LDL-C on ischemic stroke and coronary disease: A Mendelian randomization study. *Neurology*. 2019;**92**(11):E1176–E1187.

20. Burgess S, Small DS, Thompson SG. A review of instrumental variable estimators for Mendelian randomization. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2017;**26**(5):2333–2355.

21. Dale AM, Harris-Adamson C, Rempel D, et al. Prevalence and incidence of carpal tunnel syndrome in US working populations: pooled analysis of six prospective studies. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2013 Sep;**39**(5):495–505.

22. Pourmemari MH, Shiri R. Diabetes as a risk factor for carpal tunnel syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabet Med*. 2016;**33**(1):10–16.

23. Nakamichi KI, Tachibana S. Hypercholesterolemia as a risk factor for idiopathic carpal tunnel syndrome. *Muscle and Nerve*. 2005;**32**(3):364–367.

24. Scott RA, Scott LJ, Mägi R, et al. An Expanded Genome-Wide Association Study of Type 2 Diabetes in Europeans. *Diabetes*. 2017;**66**(11):2888–2902.

25. Burgess S, Labrecque JA. Mendelian randomization with a binary exposure variable: interpretation and presentation of causal estimates. *Eur J Epidemiol*. Springer Netherlands; 2018;**33**(10):947–952.

26. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Multivariable Mendelian randomization: The use of pleiotropic genetic variants to estimate causal effects. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2015;**181**(4):251–260.

27. Burgess S, Thompson DJ, Rees JMB, Day FR, Perry JR, Ong KK. Dissecting causal pathways using mendelian randomization with summarized genetic data: Application to age at menarche and risk of breast cancer. *Genetics*. 2017;**207**(2):481–487.

28. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Interpreting findings from Mendelian randomization using the MR-Egger method. *Eur J Epidemiol*. Springer Netherlands; 2017;**32**(5):377–389.

29. Bowden J, Smith GD, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: Effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015;**44**(2):512–525.

30. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. *Genet Epidemiol*. 2016;**40**(4):304–314.

31. Zhao Q, Wang J, Hemani G, Bowden J, Small DS. Statistical inference in two-sample summary-data Mendelian randomization using robust adjusted profile score. 2018;

32. Zhao J, Ming J, Hu X, Chen G, Liu J, Yang C. Bayesian weighted Mendelian randomization for causal inference based on summary statistics. *Bioinformatics*. 2019;**00**(00):1–9.

33. Verbanck M, Chen C-Y, Neale B, Do R. Detection of widespread horizontal pleiotropy in causal relationships inferred from Mendelian randomization between complex traits and diseases. *Nat Genet*. Springer US; 2018 May 23;**50**(5):693–698.

34. Pickrell JK, Berisa T, Liu JZ, Ségurel L, Tung JY, Hinds DA. Detection and interpretation of shared genetic influences on 42 human traits. *Nat Genet*. Nature Publishing Group; 2016;**48**(7):709–717.

35. Staley JR, Blackshaw J, Kamat MA, et al. PhenoScanner: A database of human genotype-phenotype associations. *Bioinformatics*. 2016;**32**(20):3207–3209.

36. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, et al. The MR-Base platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. *Elife*. 2018;**7**:e34408.

37. Yavorska OO, Burgess S. MendelianRandomization: an R package for performing Mendelian randomization analyses using summarized data. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017 Dec 1;**46**(6):1734–1739.

38. Burgess S. Identifying the odds ratio estimated by a two-stage instrumental variable analysis with a logistic regression model. *Stat Med*. 2013;**32**(27):4726–4747.

39. Paternoster L, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Genetic epidemiology and Mendelian randomization for informing disease therapeutics: Conceptual and methodological challenges. *PLoS Genet*. 2017;**13**(10):1–9.

40. Kleopa KA. Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015 Sep 1;**163**(5):ITC1.

41. Backes JM, Howard PA. Association of HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors with neuropathy. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2003;**37**(2):274–278.

42. Werner RA, Albers JW, Franzblau A, Armstrong TJ. The relationship between body mass index and the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Muscle Nerve*. 1994;**17**(6):632–636.

43. Werner RA, Jacobson JA, Jamadar DA. Influence of body mass index on median nerve function, carpal canal pressure, and cross-sectional area of the median nerve. *Muscle and Nerve*. 2004;**30**(4):481–485.

44. Yusuf E, Nelissen RG, Ioan-Facsinay A, et al. Association between weight or body mass index and hand osteoarthritis: A systematic review. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2010;**69**(4):761–765.

45. Pourmemari M-H, Heliövaara M, Viikari-Juntura E, Shiri R. Carpal tunnel release: Lifetime prevalence, annual incidence, and risk factors. *Muscle Nerve*. 2018 Oct;**58**(4):497–502.

46. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, et al. Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants with the General Population. *Am J*

Epidemiol. 2017;

47. Munafò MR, Tilling K, Taylor AE, Evans DM, Smith GD. Collider scope: When selection bias can substantially influence observed associations. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2018;**47**(1):226–235.

Table 1. Inverse-variance weighted MR effects of exposures on odds of CTS.

Exposure	Number of SNPs in instrument	Odds ratio [95% CI]	P value
Univariable MR - Exposures			
BMI	69	1.73 [1.48-2.02]	2.68e-12
WHRadjBMI	38	1.03 [0.77-1.39]	0.83
Univariable MR - Mediators			
T2D[b]	37	1.08 [1.04-1.11]	5.20e-05
LDL	77	1.04 [0.96-1.12]	0.35
HDL	87	1.02 [0.93-1.13]	0.62
Triglycerides	56	1.04 [0.93-1.16]	0.53
Multivariable MR			
BMI[a] (adj. T2D)	97	1.53 [1.38-1.68]	2.85e-08
T2D[a,b]	97	1.07	7.83e-05

	(adj. BMI)	[1.04-1.10]

BMI: body mass index; CI: confidence interval; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism; T2D: type 2 diabetes; WHRadjBMI: waist-to-hip ratio adjusted for BMI

[a]Multivariable MR was only conducted when univariable MR demonstrated evidence of a causal effect.

[b]Units of the exposure are a doubling in the odds of T2D.

Figure 1. Scatter-plots of individual BMI (a) and WHRadjBMI (b) variant effects on Carpal Tunnel Syndrome liability. X-axis represents the SNP effect on BMI or WHRadjBMI (SD units), and the y-axis represents the SNP effect on CTS (log-odds). The regression line represents the inverse-variance weighted regression of CTS on the exposures.



Figure 2. MR sensitivity analyses for the effect of genetically instrumented BMI (per SD kg/m^2 increase) and T2D[a] liability on odds of CTS. Bars represent 95% confidence intervals.



BMI: body mass index; CI: confidence interval; CTS: carpal tunnel syndrome; OR: odds ratio; SD: standard deviation; T2D: type 2 diabetes

[a]Units of the exposure are a doubling in the odds of T2D.

Figure 3. Leave-one-out plot reveals no undue influence of a single variant on the effect of BMI on Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. The x-axis represents the causal effect (in log-odds) of BMI on CTS. The y-axis shows the SNP removed in each leave-one-out analysis. Bars represent 95% confidence intervals