Association of 25 hydroxyvitamin D concentration with risk of COVID-19: a Mendelian randomization study

Di Liu[1#], Qiuyue Tian[1#], Jie Zhang[1], Haifeng Hou[2], Wei Wang[1,2,3], Qun Meng[1], Youxin Wang[1,2,4]

[1]Beijing Key Laboratory of Clinical Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Capital Medical University, Beijing, 100069, China;

[2]School of Public Health, Shandong First Medical University & Shandong Academy of Medical Sciences, Tai'an 271016, Shandong Province, China.

[3]School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Perth 60127, Australia

[4]Inner Mongolia Comprehensive Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Hohhot, Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, China.

#These authors contributed equally to this study.

Youxin Wang, PhD, Professor

School of Public Health, Capital Medical University

No.10 Xitoutiao, Youanmenwai Street, Fengtai District, Beijing, 100069, China

Tel: +8613581719105; wangy@ccmu.edu.cn

Abstract

Background In observational studies, 25 hydroxyvitamin D (25OHD) concentration has been associated with an increased risk of Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). However, it remains unclear whether this association is causal.

Methods We performed a two-sample Mendelian randomization (MR) to explore the causal relationship between 25OHD concentration and COVID-19, using summary data from the genome-wide association studies (GWASs) and using 25OHD concentration-related SNPs as instrumental variables (IVs).

Results MR analysis did not show any evidence of a causal association of 25OHD concentration with COVID-19 susceptibility and severity (OR=1.168, 95% CI 0.956-1.427; OR=0.889, 95% CI 0.549-1.439). Sensitivity analyses using different instruments and statistical models yielded similar findings, suggesting the robustness of the causal association. No obvious pleiotropy bias and heterogeneity were observed.

Conclusion The MR analysis showed that there might be no linear causal relationship of 25OHD concentration with COVID-19 susceptibility and severity.

Key words: Coronavirus disease 2019; vitamin D deficiency; 25 hydroxyvitamin D; Mendelian randomization

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has become a global pandemic [1]. Aimed at delaying disease onset by modulating modifiable risk factors, primary prevention has been proposed as a potentially effective and feasible tool to address the global challenge posed by COVID-19.

Vitamin D is a hormone, produced in the skin during exposure to sunlight, helped regulate the amount of calcium and phosphate in the body, which are needed to keep bones, teeth, and muscles healthy, and played a critical role in the immune system [2-4]. Vitamin D deficiency is a candidate risk factor for a range of adverse health outcomes, such as cancer, cardiovascular diseases, metabolic disorders, infectious diseases, as well as autoimmune diseases [5,6]. There were well recognized evidences that vitamin D deficiency contributes to the seasonal increase of virus infections of the respiratory tract, from the common cold to influenza , and now possibly also COVID-19 [7,8]. Some systematic reviews indicated that vitamin D deficiency may increase infection risk of COVID-19 by discussing the biological mechanism of virus infection[4,9,10]. In addition, numerous population-based studies have evaluated the Vitamin D deficiency in COVID-19 patients relative to controls; however, the findings have been inconsistent. Some studies showed that COVID-19 patients had a lower 25 hydroxyvitamin D (25OHD) concentration compared with healthy controls [7,11-13], while others found no association [14-16]. The inconsistent findings from these epidemiological studies may be due to differences in the study

design, study population, assays used for measuring Vitamin D deficiency. It is important to note that as the nature of the above studies is observational, such traditional epidemiological studies are particularly vulnerable to reverse causality and residual confounding.

A promising approach known as Mendelian randomization (MR), which uses inherited genetic variants as instrumental variables, provides stronger evidence for the causal effect of exposure on the diseases largely overcoming the traditional limitations due to confounding and reverse causality [17,18]. Summary based MR is an excellent strategy to evaluate the causality using summary statistics from Genome Wide Association Study (GWAS) data[19,20]. Therefore, we conducted MR analysis to assess whether 25OHD concentration was causally associated with risk of COVID-19.

Methods

Data sources

Genetic association datasets for COVID-19 susceptibility and severity

The summarized data was obtained from the most recent version of GWAS analyses from the COVID-19 host genetics initiative from UK Biobank individuals, which released on July 1, 2020 (https://www.covid19hg.org/results/)[21]. Summarized data on COVID-19 included 3523 patients and 36634 control participants, and summarized data on severe COVID-19 included 536 patients and 329391 control participants.

Selection of 25OHD concentration -associated single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs)

We selected 143 SNPs as instrumental variables (IVs) for 25OHD concentration based on the recent large-scale GWAS [22]. In addition, we retained independent variants from each other (Linkage disequilibrium [LD], $r^2 < 0.001$) for sensitivity analysis. When we encountered genetic variants in LD, the SNP with the lowest *p*-value was selected. The LD proxies were defined using 1000 genomes European samples.

MR analysis

In the analyses, the inverse-variance weighted (IVW) method was used to estimate the overall causal association of 25OHD concentration on COVID-19 susceptibility and severity. We additionally conducted the weighted median, penalized weighted median, and MR-Egger regression to account for potential violations of valid instrumental variable assumptions. The MR-Egger analysis was performed to evaluate pleiotropy based on the intercept. We conducted a heterogeneity test in MR analyses using the IVW Q test. Then, sensitivity analyses were performed to examine the stability of the causal estimate. Firstly, we performed a “leave one out” analysis to further investigate the possibility that the causal association was driven by a single SNP. Then, we retained independent variants from each other (LD, $r^2 < 0.001$) for further sensitivity analysis. Results were presented as odds ratios (OR) with their 95% confidence interval (CI) of outcomes per genetically predicted increase in each exposure factor.

In terms of various estimates for different measures, we chose the result of main MR method as the following rules:

(1) If no directional pleiotropy in MR estimates (Q statistic: *P* value > 0.05, MR-Egger intercept: *P* value > 0.05), the results of the IVW method were reported.

(2) If directional pleiotropy was detected (MR-Egger intercept: *P* value < 0.05) and *P* value > 0.05 for the Q test, the results of the MR-Egger method were reported.

(3) If directional pleiotropy was detected (MR-Egger intercept: *P* value < 0.05) and *P* value < 0.05 for the Q test, the results of the weighted median method were reported.

All data analyses were performed by the "twosampleMR" package in R (R version 3.6.3, R Core Team, 2017).

Results

As shown in **Table 1**, the MR analysis showed no significant association of genetically instrumented 25OHD concentration with COVID-19 using 89-SNP (OR, 1.168; 95% CI, 0.956-1.427; *P*=0.128). The association of 25OHD concentration with COVID-19 was robust in the weighted median and penalized weighted median methods, except in the MR-Egger regression (OR, 1.302; 95% CI, 1.011-1.676; *P*=0.044). Pleiotropy bias (*P* for MR-Egger intercept=0.174) and heterogeneity (*P*=0.656) were also not observed. In terms of various estimates for different measures, we reported the results of the IVW method. In addition, the "leave one out" results showed that by omitting the included 89 SNPs one at a time, no individual genetic variants seem to have any significant effect on the overall results (**Figure 1**). The association of 25OHD concentration with COVID-19 remained robust using

57-SNP instrument (**Table 1, Figure S1**).

The MR analysis showed no significant association of genetically instrumented 25OHD concentration with severe COVID-19 using 82-SNP (OR, 0.889; 95% CI, 0.549-1.439; *P*=0.632) (**Table 2**). The result in the weighted median, penalized weighted median, and MR-Egger regression methods were robust. There was limited evidence of heterogeneity and horizontal pleiotropy based on the Q test (*P*=0.793) and MR-Egger intercept test (*P*=0.760). Sensitivity analyses using different instruments yielded similar findings, suggesting the robustness of the causal association (**Table 2, Figure 2, Figure S2**).

Discussion

In the current study, we performed an MR analysis to investigate the causal association of 25OHD concentration with the risk of COVID-19. Our results indicated that there might be no linear causal relationship of 25OHD concentration with COVID-19 susceptibility and severity.

An observational study based on the UK Biobank data claimed that no link between vitamin D concentrations and risk of COVID-19 infection either overall or separated ethnic groups [16]. However, one study used causal inference analysis, supported the hypothesis that vitamin D plays a causal role in COVID-19 outcomes via modification of host responses to SARS-CoV-2 [23]. In addition, there were also systematic reviews and meta-analyses to explore the association between vitamin D

and COVID-19 [9,10,24]. These studies provided a biological hypothesis and evolving epidemiological data supporting a role for vitamin D in COVID-19. But these results only based on the observational study design, which may be confounder bias. In our study, the SNPs associated with vitamin D as IVs were used to estimate the overall causal association of 25OHD concentration on COVID-19 susceptibility and severity, based on the MR design. The MR study could potentially avoid many biases and confounding issues existing in conventional observational studies and thus help to identify causally related risk factors. Using MR design, we found no evidence supporting that genetically predicted 25OHD concentration was significantly associated with COVID-19 susceptibility and severity.

There are some possible explanations for these negative findings. First, these null findings suggest that the associations of 25OHD concentration with COVID-19 susceptibility and severity could attribute from the reverse causation bias and confounder bias. Vitamin D from environment with across to adequate sunshine or diet was metabolized in the liver to 25OHD, which was used to determine a patient's vitamin D status [22,25]. Vitamin D deficiency may be common in COVID-19 patients, as a consequence of quarantined and reduced outdoor behavior. The observed association between 25OHD concentration with increased risk of COVID-19 could be confounded by outdoor behavior which may be corrected with the genetic liability to COVID-19 [22]. Our findings suggested that COVID-19 susceptibility and severity are expected to decrease the prevalence of vitamin D deficiency, which are needed to be proved by more bi-directional MR studies. Second, the association between the

vitamin D level and the risk of COVID-19 may be not fixed for a lifetime, but perform time-varying [26]. However, the cross-sectional observational nature of all current MR studies limits the evaluation. The future MR studies incorporating follow-up data should be considered the effect of vitamin D level on COVID-19 and how genetic variants effects change with time may impact the interpretability and validity of their results. Third, as shown by previous studies, vitamin D supplementation only shows treatment effects among individuals with baseline 25OHD concentration of no more than 30 nmol/L, indicating that the relationship between the 25OHD concentration and the risk of diseases may be nonlinear [27-29]. However, we noted that there is a linearity assumption in our Mendelian randomization analyses [22], then non-linear relationship could not be tested and might equate to the null hypothesis of no effect of the exposure on the outcome. Therefore, our results indicated that there might be no linear causal relationship of 25OHD concentration with COVID-19 susceptibility and severity.

The evidence of findings from MR studies sit at the interface between observational studies and RCTs [30]. Of the three study designs, RCTs provide interventions for disease, while observational studies and MR studies demonstrate the risk factors that increase the risk of disease. It should be focused on the effect of vitamin D supplementation on COVID-19. The previous findings suggest that vitamin D deficiency and treatment has a long-term effect on preventing overall mortality [12,31]. In addition, future research should pay attention to not only the impact of vitamin D deficiency and treatment on the incidence of COVID-19, but also the impact of

vitamin D deficiency and treatment on the COVID-19 mortality and lost life in COVID-19.

Some limitations should be noticed. It is important to note that the results of the MR analyses are based on numerous assumptions. First, we selected genetic variants as IVs based on the recent large-scale GWAS [22], which showed a strong association with 25OHD concentration; therefore, the bias of weak instrument might be less likely. Second, the genetic variants are not associated with measured and unmeasured confounders that influence both vitamin D and COVID-19. However, the unmeasured confounders or alternative causal pathways may be still affected our results because of the limitation of the method. Third, the existence of horizontal pleiotropy may distort MR results. In our study, there was limited evidence of heterogeneity and horizontal pleiotropy. In addition, the GWAS of the COVID-19 host genetics initiative from UK Biobank individuals included small sample size, which might lead to small effect for the MR estimate and limit the IVs for COVID-19 for reverse MR analysis. The findings were based on European population, which made it difficult to represent the universal conclusions for other ethnic groups. Therefore, the future studies with larger sample size and more ethnic groups are needed to verify and explore the observed associations.

Conclusion

Using 25OHD concentration-related SNPs as IVs from GWAS data, the MR analysis results indicated that there might be no linear causal relationship of 25OHD

concentration with COVID-19 susceptibility and severity. In future, the bi-directional MR and non-linear MR study was needed to further prove these results. In addition, we should pay more attention to the randomization control trials about association between vitamin D treatment and the improvement of the COVID-19 in the long-term benefits.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

All authors have approved the manuscript and its submission. No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed by the authors.

Funding/Support

The study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81872682 and 81773527), and the China-Australian Collaborative Grant (NSFC 81561128020-NHMRC APP1112767).

Role of the Funder/Sponsor

The funding organization had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

References

1. Thomson B. The COVID-19 Pandemic: A Global Natural Experiment. Circulation 2020;142:14-6.
2. DeLuca HF. Vitamin D endocrinology. Annals of internal medicine 1976;85:367-77.
3. Kulda V. [Vitamin D metabolism]. Vnitrni lekarstvi 2012;58:400-4.
4. Aygun H. Vitamin D can prevent COVID-19 infection-induced multiple organ damage. Naunyn-Schmiedeberg's archives of pharmacology 2020;393:1157-60.
5. Holick MF, Chen TC. Vitamin D deficiency: a worldwide problem with health consequences. Am J Clin Nutr 2008;87:1080S-6S.
6. Hossein-nezhad A, Holick MF. Vitamin D for health: a global perspective. Mayo Clin Proc 2013;88:720-55.
7. Meltzer DO, Best TJ, Zhang H, Vokes T, Arora V, Solway J. Association of Vitamin D Deficiency and Treatment with COVID-19 Incidence. medRxiv : the preprint server for health sciences 2020.
8. Whittemore PB. COVID-19 fatalities, latitude, sunlight, and vitamin D. American journal of infection control 2020.
9. Ghasemian R, Shamshirian A, Heydari K, et al. The Role of Vitamin D in The Age of COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Along with an Ecological Approach. medRxiv 2020:2020.06.05.20123554.
10. Munshi R, Hussein MH, Toraih EA, et al. Vitamin D insufficiency as a potential culprit in critical COVID-19 patients. Journal of medical virology 2020.
11. Merzon E, Tworowski D, Gorohovski A, et al. Low plasma 25(OH) vitamin D level is associated with increased risk of COVID-19 infection: an Israeli population-based study. The FEBS journal 2020.
12. Pugach IZ, Pugach S. Strong Correlation Between Prevalence of Severe Vitamin D Deficiency and Population Mortality Rate from COVID-19 in Europe. medRxiv : the preprint server for health sciences 2020:2020.06.24.20138644.
13. De Smet D, De Smet K, Herroelen P, Gryspeerdt S, Martens GA. Vitamin D deficiency as risk factor for severe COVID-19: a convergence of two pandemics. medRxiv : the preprint server for health sciences 2020:2020.05.01.20079376.
14. Raisi-Estabragh Z, McCracken C, Bethell MS, et al. Greater risk of severe COVID-19 in Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic populations is not explained by cardiometabolic, socioeconomic or behavioural factors, or by 25(OH)-vitamin D status: study of 1326 cases from the UK Biobank. Journal of public health (Oxford, England) 2020.
15. Panagiotou G, Tee SA, Ihsan Y, et al. Low serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D (25[OH]D) levels in patients hospitalised with COVID-19 are associated with greater disease severity. Clinical endocrinology 2020.
16. Hastie CE, Mackay DF, Ho F, et al. Vitamin D concentrations and COVID-19 infection in UK Biobank. Diabetes and Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research and Reviews 2020;14:561-5.
17. Davey Smith G, Hemani G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal inference in epidemiological studies. Hum Mol Genet 2014;23:R89-98.
18. Sekula P, Del Greco MF, Pattaro C, Köttgen A. Mendelian Randomization as an Approach to Assess Causality Using Observational Data. Journal of the American Society of Nephrology : JASN 2016;27:3253-65.
19. Burgess S, Butterworth A, Thompson SG. Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple genetic variants using summarized data. Genet Epidemiol 2013;37:658-65.

20. Dimou NL, Tsilidis KK. A Primer in Mendelian Randomization Methodology with a Focus on Utilizing Published Summary Association Data. Methods Mol Biol 2018;1793:211-30.
21. Initiative C-HG. The COVID-19 Host Genetics Initiative, a global initiative to elucidate the role of host genetic factors in susceptibility and severity of the SARS-CoV-2 virus pandemic. European journal of human genetics : EJHG 2020;28:715-8.
22. Revez JA, Lin T, Qiao Z, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies 143 loci associated with 25 hydroxyvitamin D concentration. Nature communications 2020;11:1647.
23. Davies G, Garami AR, Byers JC. Evidence Supports a Causal Role for Vitamin D Status in COVID-19 Outcomes. medRxiv : the preprint server for health sciences 2020:2020.05.01.20087965.
24. Laird E, Rhodes J, Kenny RA. Vitamin D and inflammation: Potential implications for severity of Covid-19. Irish medical journal 2020;113.
25. Holick MF. Vitamin D deficiency. The New England journal of medicine 2007;357:266-81.
26. Meng JE, Hovey KM, Wactawski-Wende J, et al. Intraindividual variation in plasma 25-hydroxyvitamin D measures 5 years apart among postmenopausal women. Cancer epidemiology, biomarkers & prevention : a publication of the American Association for Cancer Research, cosponsored by the American Society of Preventive Oncology 2012;21:916-24.
27. Crowe FL, Thayakaran R, Gittoes N, et al. Non-linear associations of 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentrations with risk of cardiovascular disease and all-cause mortality: Results from The Health Improvement Network (THIN) database. The Journal of steroid biochemistry and molecular biology 2019;195:105480.
28. Esteghamati A, Fotouhi A, Faghihi-Kashani S, et al. Non-linear contribution of serum vitamin D to symptomatic diabetic neuropathy: A case-control study. Diabetes research and clinical practice 2016;111:44-50.
29. Zittermann A. Vitamin D Status, Supplementation and Cardiovascular Disease. Anticancer research 2018;38:1179-86.
30. Davies NM, Holmes MV, Smith GD. Reading Mendelian randomisation studies: a guide, glossary, and checklist for clinicians. Bmj Clinical Research 2018;362:k601.
31. Ouchetto O, Drissi Bourhanbour A. Risk Factors for Mortality of COVID-19 Patients. medRxiv : the preprint server for health sciences 2020:2020.07.02.20145375.

Figure legends

Figure 1. **MR leave-one-out sensitivity analysis for '25OHD concentration' on 'COVID-19'**

Leave-one-out analysis: each row represents a MR analysis of 25OHD concentration on COVID-19 using all instruments expect for the SNP listed on the y-axis. The point represents the odds ratio with that SNP removed and the line represents 95% confidence interval.

COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019; MR: mendelian randomization; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism; 25OHD: 25-hydroxyitamin D

Figure 2. **MR leave-one-out sensitivity analysis for '25OHD concentration' on 'severe COVID-19'**

Leave-one-out analysis: each row represents a MR analysis of 25OHD concentration on severe COVID-19 using all instruments expect for the SNP listed on the y-axis. The point represents the odds ratio with that SNP removed and the line represents 95% confidence interval.

COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019; MR: mendelian randomization; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism; 25OHD: 25-hydroxyitamin D

Figure S1. **MR leave-one-out sensitivity analysis for '25OHD concentration' on 'COVID-19'**

Leave-one-out analysis: each row represents a MR analysis of 25OHD concentration on COVID-19 using all instruments expect for the SNP listed on the y-axis. The point represents the odds ratio with that SNP removed and the line represents 95% confidence interval.

COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019; MR: mendelian randomization; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism; 25OHD: 25-hydroxyitamin D

Figure S2. **MR leave-one-out sensitivity analysis for '25OHD concentration' on 'severe COVID-19'**

Leave-one-out analysis: each row represents a MR analysis of 25OHD concentration on severe COVID-19 using all instruments expect for the SNP listed on the y-axis. The point represents the odds ratio with that SNP removed and the line represents 95% confidence interval.

COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019; MR: mendelian randomization; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism; 25OHD: 25-hydroxyitamin D

Table 1 Causal association of 25OHD concentration with COVID-19

Method	89- SNP Instrument			57- SNP Instrument		
	OR (95% CI)	Beta (SE)	*P*	OR (95% CI)	Beta (SE)	*P*
IVW	1.168 (0.956-1.427)	0.156 (0.102)	0.128	1.192 (0.945-1.504)	0.176 (0.118)	0.138
Weighted median	1.017 (0.750-1.379)	0.017 (0.156)	0.912	1.134 (0.810-1.588)	0.126 (0.172)	0.464
Penalised weighted median	0.990 (0.737-1.328)	-0.010 (0.150)	0.945	1.134 (0.814-1.579)	0.126 (0.169)	0.4570.
MR_Egger	1.302 (1.011-1.676)	0.26 (0.13)	0.044	1.265 (0.951-1.682)	0.235 (0.145)	0.112
β (intercept)	-	-0.007 (0.005)	0.174	-	-0.004 (0.006)	0.485
Q statistic	-	-	0.656	-	-	0.925

Beta is the estimated effect size.

25OHD: 25 hydroxyvitamin D; CI: confidence intervals; COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019; IVs: instrumental variables; IVW, inverse-variance weighted; MR mendelian randomization; OR: odds ratio; SE, standard error; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism.

Table 2 Causal association of 25OHD concentration with severe COVID-19

Method	82- SNP Instrument			55- SNP Instrument		
	OR (95% CI)	Beta (SE)	*P*	OR (95% CI)	Beta (SE)	*P*
IVW	0.889 (0.549-1.439)	-0.118 (0.246)	0.632	0.936 (0.532-1.647)	-0.067 (0.288)	0.818
Weighted median	1.242 (0.618-2.498)	0.217 (0.356)	0.543	1.294 (0.605-2.767)	0.257 (0.388)	0.507
Penalised weighted median	1.241 (0.620-2.482)	0.216 (0.354)	0.542	1.293 (0.585-2.857)	0.257 (0.405)	0.526
MR_Egger	0.944 (0.509-1.749)	-0.058 (0.315)	0.855	0.998 (0.477)	-0.002 (0.376)	0.996
β (intercept)	-	-0.004 (0.012)	0.760	-	-0.004 (0.015)	0.790
Q statistic	-	-	0.793	-	-	0.650

Beta is the estimated effect size.

25OHD: 25 hydroxyvitamin D; CI: confidence intervals; COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019; IVs: instrumental variables; IVW, inverse-variance weighted; MR mendelian randomization; OR: odds ratio; SE, standard error; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism.


rs1352846
rs12798050
rs10859995
rs72997623
rs4575545
rs7528419
rs1149605
rs11076175
rs590215
rs11182428
rs12056768
rs4418728
rs8091117
rs705117
rs7604788
rs7569755
rs2725371
rs12317268
rs10908419
rs35408430
rs2346264
rs4327060
rs727857
rs11542462
rs13104260
rs12794714
rs9490317
rs11264322
rs11127186
rs6782190
rs11458206
rs6671730
rs77924615
rs8113404
rs55829990
rs200210321
rs2037511
rs11108368
rs2762943
rs10454087
rs62007299
rs138385079
rs115621755
rs541041
rs10642047
rs61883501
rs13284054
rs7149014
rs17216707
rs2207132
rs2847500
rs325384
rs1933064
rs72834856
rs61891388
rs77532868
rs10887718
rs10085881
rs212100
rs4616820
rs11732896
rs1038165
rs3925446
rs9861009
rs2952289
rs73413596
rs28374650
rs31612
rs28364331
rs1047891
rs117576073
rs187429064
rs1260326
rs6123359
rs112943319
rs12123821
rs10908465
rs78151190
rs4364259
rs10426
rs7412
rs142158911
rs2012736
rs140371183
rs1660839
rs2131925
rs12803256
rs613808
rs116970203
All
0.0
0.2
0.4
MR leave-one-out sensitivity analysis for '25OHD concentration' on 'COVID-19'


rs12794714
rs116970203
rs17216707
rs10859995
rs212100
rs12056768
rs8091117
rs1047891
rs7412
rs2847500
rs142158911
rs2131925
rs10426
rs61891388
rs9861009
rs1260326
rs117576073
rs13104260
rs72997623
rs2952289
rs4575545
rs13284054
rs1149605
rs12317268
rs112943319
rs138385079
rs11542462
rs3925446
rs2762943
rs4327060
rs4364259
rs11076175
rs55829990
rs11264322
rs541041
rs10908419
rs7604788
rs6782190
rs73413596
rs8113404
rs61883501
rs77924615
rs10908465
rs7569755
rs2725371
rs6671730
rs62007299
rs7149014
rs35408430
rs11108368
rs11127186
rs10454087
rs11182428
rs10887718
rs705117
rs4616820
rs78151190
rs1038165
rs613808
rs7528419
rs11458206
rs9490317
rs590215
rs325384
rs4418728
rs6123359
rs77532868
rs11732896
rs10085881
rs1933064
rs72834856
rs727857
rs2037511
rs31612
rs1660839
rs10642047
rs2346264
rs2207132
rs2012736
rs12803256
rs12798050
rs1352846
All
−1.0
−0.5
0.0
0.5
MR leave-one-out sensitivity analysis for '25OHD concentration' on 'severe COVID-19'