medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Maternal and child genetic liability for smoking and caffeine consumption and child mental health: An intergenerational polygenic risk score analysis in the ALSPAC cohort

Laura Schellhas[1,2,co], Elis Haan[1,2,co], Kayleigh E Easey[2,3], Robyn E Wootton[2,3], Hannah M Sallis[1,2,5], Gemma C Sharp[2,6], Marcus R Munafò[1,2,4], Luisa Zuccolo[2,3]

1. School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
2. MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
3. Department of Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, UK
4. NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol
5. Centre for Academic Mental Health, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, UK
6. Bristol Dental School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

[co] contributed equally to this work

Word count: 3478

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background and aims: Previous studies suggest an association between maternal tobacco and caffeine consumption during and outside of pregnancy and offspring mental health. We used an intergenerational polygenic risk scores (PRS) approach to disentangle effects of the maternal environment (intrauterine or postnatal) and pleiotropic genetic effects. Specifically, we 1) validated smoking and caffeine PRS derived from published GWAS for use during pregnancy, 2) compared estimated effects of maternal and offspring PRS on childhood mental health outcomes, and 3) tested associations between maternal and offspring PRS on their own outcomes.

Design: PRS were created for smoking and caffeine consumption for 8,196 mothers and 8,237 offspring from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). Outcomes included mostly mental health and some non-mental health phenotypes (I.e. substance use, personality, BMI and sociodemographic variables). For mothers, 79 phenotypes assessed during and outside of pregnancy, and for offspring, 71 phenotypes assessed in childhood (<10 years) and adolescence (11-18 years) were included. Linear and logistic regressions were run to assess PRS in relation to maternal and offspring phenotypes.

Findings: First, the maternal smoking and caffeine PRS were associated with these behaviours during pregnancy. Second, the maternal and offspring smoking PRS both showed evidence (permutation corrected $P < 0.05$) of association with reduced anxiety symptoms in childhood ($\beta_{maternal} = -0.033$; $\beta_{offspring} = -0.031$) and increased conduct disorder symptoms ($\beta_{maternal} = 0.024$; $\beta_{offspring} = 0.030$). Finally, the maternal and offspring smoking PRS were associated with own sensation seeking phenotypes in mothers and adolescence (e.g. increased symptoms of externalising disorders, extraversion, and monotony avoidance), but the caffeine PRS showed weaker evidence for associations with mental health outcomes. Our results indicate that the smoking PRS is most likely pleiotropic with sensation seeking personality traits. However, these results need replication in independent samples, using techniques more robust to pleiotropy.

Keywords: tobacco, caffeine, polygenic risk score, mental health, ALSPAC, intergenerational effects

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Smoking and caffeine consumption often co-occur (1) and are associated with mental health problems and other substance use behaviours (2,3). There is some evidence that smoking is a causal risk factor for mental health problems, such as depression and schizophrenia (4,5); however, the relationship between caffeine and mental health is less clear, and possibly difficult to disentangle from smoking as two often co-occur (3,6). In addition to associations between smoking, caffeine and mental health outcomes within individuals, observational research suggests that prenatal maternal consumption of tobacco and caffeine could have an intergenerational effect on offspring's mental health (7–10).

Using conventional epidemiological methods alone, it is difficult to ascertain whether prenatal tobacco and caffeine exposure causally affect offspring mental health outcomes (11,12). Not only do mother and offspring share a similar environment (such as socio-economic position), they also share, on average, 50% of their segregating genetic variation. Due to this shared genetic and environmental confounding it is difficult to disentangle the effect of maternal substance use on offspring mental health from offspring's own substance use.

The association between maternal smoking and internalising problems shows mixed findings but is less well researched compared to associations with externalising problems (9,13–15). Many studies report a positive association between prenatal smoking and offspring's externalising problems (7,16–18), which could reflect a potential intrauterine effect of smoking. However, results vary when applying different methods to account for shared environmental and genetic confounders (16). For example, studies using negative controls designs and sibling comparisons have found inconclusive evidence for a causal effect (16,17,19–21). Further, study designs enabling to adjust for shared genetic factors between mother and offspring have concluded that genetic factors (partly) explain associations between maternal prenatal smoking and externalising problems in offspring (22,23). This literature highlights the complexity of the association of exposures during pregnancy and offspring mental health and the importance of disentangling shared genetic and environmental confounders to understand whether a true causal effect exists.

Using polygenic risk scores (PRS) as proxies for smoking or caffeine consumption can, in principle, reduce bias from confounding (24). However, when investigating intergenerational effects this approach may lead to spurious results for several reasons (25). First, the genetic variants used in the PRS have mostly been identified and validated in non-pregnant adult populations and thus might not predict behaviour during pregnancy (25–27). Second, offspring's own smoking or caffeine consumption may confound associations because mothers may pass on their genetic predisposition for smoking or caffeine consumption to their children. Consequently, when offspring's mental health outcomes are assessed at an age where offspring are likely to have started smoking or drinking caffeine themselves, offspring's own consumption may cause offspring's mental health problems. Third, an association between maternal PRS and offspring mental health outcomes may reflect a shared genetic liability for smoking or caffeine consumption and mental health outcomes (pleiotropy) instead of a causal effect of the exposure.

In this study, we aimed to elucidate the effects of maternal prenatal smoking and caffeine consumption on offspring mental health, using data from a multi-generational cohort study from England, the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) (28). First, we validated the smoking and caffeine PRS by testing whether they predict consumption behaviours during pregnancy in the mothers, and in adolescence in the offspring. Second, we explored the association of maternal smoking and caffeine PRS with offspring mental health outcomes during childhood

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

before children are likely to start smoking or consuming higher level of caffeine themselves (before age 10 years). Third, we attempted to disentangle pleiotropic from potential causal associations by comparing mothers PRS and offspring PRS separately as predictors for offspring mental health outcomes in childhood. Given the shared genetics between mothers and offspring, we expected pleiotropic associations to be reflected by a larger estimated effect of the offspring PRS on offspring mental health, compared to the estimated effect of the maternal PRS (childhood PRS analysis, Figure 1). Following the same reasoning, a larger estimated effect of the maternal PRS on offspring mental health (relative to the estimated effect of the offspring PRS) would have provided more evidence to support a causal intrauterine effect of maternal behaviour on offspring mental health (intergenerational PRS analysis, Figure 1).

[Insert Figure 1]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

METHODS

Study population

The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) is a prospective longitudinal cohort study where the initial number of pregnancies enrolled is 14,541 and of these initial pregnancies, there was a total of 14,676 foetuses, resulting in 14,062 live births and 13,988 children who were alive at 1 year of age. When the oldest children were approximately 7 years of age, an attempt was made to bolster the initial sample with eligible cases who had failed to join the study originally, resulting in an additional 913 children being enrolled. The total sample size for analyses using any data collected after the age of seven is therefore 15,454 pregnancies, resulting in 15,589 foetuses. Of these 14,901 were alive at 1 year of age (28–30). The ALSPAC study was approved by the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees and informed consent for the use of data collected via questionnaires and clinics was obtained from participants. The study website contains details of all the data that is available through a fully searchable data dictionary and variable search tool: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/

Phenotype data

Mental health phenotypes were selected from questionnaires and clinical assessments. Besides mental health phenotypes, some non-mental health phenotypes were also included, that were selected based on evidence in the literature indicating high comorbidity with mental health problems (e.g. alcohol, cannabis, other drugs, personality, body mass index, sleep, socio-economic variables). To validate the PRS, we derived phenotypes to describe caffeine consumption and smoking behaviours. Offspring assessment points were grouped into 'childhood' (age 7-11 years) and 'adolescence' (age 12-18 years). Maternal assessment points were grouped into 'during pregnancy' (8, 18 and 32 weeks of gestation) and 'outside of pregnancy', which included phenotypes assessed pre- and/or post-pregnancy. Outcomes assessed within the first four years after pregnancy were excluded, as the transition to parenthood may influence mental health temporarily (31) and mothers may be more likely to be pregnant again. In total we included 71 phenotypes for offspring (childhood and adolescence) and 79 phenotypes for mothers (during and outside of pregnancy). Table 1 gives an overview of phenotypes included in the intergenerational and childhood PRS analyses across time-points. A complete list of phenotypes is given in Table S1. More details about the phenotype selection and assessment can be found in Supplementary methods.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Polygenic risk scores (PRS)

In ALSPAC, genome-wide SNP data was available for 8237 children and 8196 mothers (detailed information about genotyping can be found in Supplementary methods). The GWAS and Sequencing Consortium of Alcohol and Nicotine use (GSCAN) identified 378 single nucleotide-polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with smoking initiation that were conditionally independent at the genome-wide significance level ($p< 5\times10^{-8}$). Smoking initiation was defined as being an 'ever' vs. 'never' smoker where an 'ever' smoker had to have either smoked 100 cigarettes in their lifetime and/or smoked regularly every day for at least a month. Of the 378 genome-wide significant SNPs, 356 were available in ALSPAC (26).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Considering that smoking is a complex behaviour, of which initiation is only one part, we also generated a PRS for lifetime smoking, which enables to capture effects of smoking behaviours beyond initiation without stratifying on smoking status. More details about the GWAS of lifetime smoking can be found elsewhere (32). The Coffee and Caffeine Genetics Consortium found 8 SNPs to be independently associated with cups of coffee consumed per day at the genome-wide level of significance (27), which were all available in ALSPAC. These SNPs have also been found to be associated with caffeine use from other caffeinated beverages (33,34). PRS were calculated for mothers and offspring by weighted effect estimates based on summary data of recent GWAS of tobacco (26) and coffee consumption (27) using Plink 1.90 and standardised prior to use in analyses.

Statistical analysis

All analyses were performed using Stata v15 (35). The following linear and logistic regression analyses were conducted to test associations with the smoking and caffeine PRS: 1) maternal PRS with smoking and caffeine phenotypes in mothers during pregnancy to validate the PRS; 2) maternal and offspring PRS with childhood phenotypes (<10 years) for investigating intergenerational effects (Figure 1); 3) maternal and offspring PRS with their own phenotypes in mothers (during and outside of pregnancy) and offspring (adolescence) to confirm PRS associations with relevant substance use behaviours as a positive control and gain more information about mental health associations at later times in development. Analyses were adjusted for age, offspring sex, and the first 10 ancestry-informative principal components based on the ALSPAC genome-wide data. We restricted our sample to singletons or one individual from a twin pair and to individuals of European ancestry. Participants who withdrew consent at any stage were removed from the analyses. The maximum sample size available in childhood was 6156, (4974 in adolescence, 7269 during pregnancy), and 7199 outside of pregnancy.

Multiple testing

Multiple testing was accounted for by running Monte Carlo permutation testing with 1000 repetitions. These p-values are presented in the text. We also compared these results with a more stringent Bonferroni correction. However, given the correlation between our phenotypes this correction is likely to be overly conservative. Evidence for association was considered strongest for phenotypes that also survived Bonferroni correction (all results are available in the supplementary material).

RESULTS

Maternal smoking and caffeine consumption

In our sample, 51% of mothers reported having ever smoked a cigarette in their lifetime and 25% reported smoking during the first trimester of pregnancy. The mean overall caffeine level mothers consumed outside of pregnancy (97 months post-pregnancy) was 182 milligrams of caffeine a day (mg/day; SD = 130). During pregnancy, mothers reported lower caffeine consumption with a mean of 157 mg/day (SD = 121) during the 2nd trimester and 149 mg/day (SD = 114) during the 3rd trimester. Compared to mothers who did not report smoking, mother who smoked reported consistently more caffeine consumption during (2nd trimester: 76 mg/day more caffeine, 3rd trimester: 71 mg/day more caffeine) and outside of pregnancy (8 years post-pregnancy: 64 mg/day more caffeine),

Validation of PRS during pregnancy

The PRS for smoking initiation was positively associated with maternal smoking phenotypes during pregnancy (Table 2 and Table S2). The PRS for caffeine consumption was positively associated with caffeinated tea and coffee consumption during pregnancy, but not with cola consumption (Table 3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

[Insert Tables 2-3 here]

Comparison of intergenerational and childhood smoking initiation PRS analyses

Intergenerational PRS analyses. Of 16 childhood phenotypes, the strongest mental health associations were observed with reduced anxiety symptoms (β_{8years}=-0.03, 95% CI-0.05, -0.01, P_{perm}=0.002) and increased conduct disorder symptoms (β_{7years} =0.02, 95% CI 0.004, 0.04, P_{perm}=0.021). Of the non-mental health phenotypes, the strongest associations were found for lower IQ (β_{8years} =-0.59, 95% CI -1.05, -0.134, P_{perm}=0.02), higher overall caffeine consumption (mg/day; β_{8years}=0.05, 95% CI 0.02, 0.07, P_{perm}= <0.001) and BMI (β_{7years} =0.08, 95% CI 0.02, 0.14, P_{perm}=0.001) as well as the likelihood of being left-handed ($OR_{11years}$ =1.11, 95% CI 1.01, 1.23, P_{perm}=0.012), which was included as a negative control phenotype (because we would not expect a causal intrauterine effect of maternal smoking or caffeine on handedness). Only associations with offspring's anxiety symptoms and caffeine consumption survived Bonferroni correction of P<0.003 (Figure 2, Table S3).

Childhood PRS analyses. As observed in the intergenerational analysis, there was some evidence for an association with reduced anxiety problems (β_{8years} =-0.03, 95% CI -0.05, -0.01, P_{perm}=0.002) and increased conduct disorder symptoms (β_{7years} =0.03, 95% CI 0.01, 0.05, P_{perm}=0.001). In contrast to the intergenerational analysis, there was some evidence for an association with ADHD symptoms (β_{7years} =0.03, 95% CI 0.003, 0.06, P_{perm}=0.034). The strongest non-mental health associations of the intergenerational analysis were replicated using the offspring smoking PRS (lower IQ: β_{8years}= -0.74, 95% CI -1.18, -0.29, P_{perm}< 0.001; increased caffeine consumption: β_{8years} = 0.03, 95% CI 0.01, 0.06, P=0.005; BMI: β_{7years} =0.05, 95% CI -0.0003, 0.10, P_{perm}=0.048) with the exception of left-handedness ($OR_{11years}$ =1.05, 95% CI 0.95, 1.15, P_{perm}=0.291; Figure 4). Only associations with IQ and conduct disorder symptoms survived Bonferroni correction of P<0.003 (Figure2, Table S3).

The results using lifetime smoking PRS were largely consistent. Only associations with offspring's IQ, ODD and total behavioural difficulties survived Bonferroni correction (Table S4).

Comparison of intergenerational and childhood caffeine PRS analyses

Intergenerational PRS analyses. Given that offspring's caffeine PRS was not robustly associated with caffeine consumption in childhood, we were able to use the results of the childhood analysis as a test for pleiotropy, despite some children already consuming low levels of caffeine at this age. Of the 16 childhood phenotypes, the strongest mental health association was observed with decreased risk for specific phobias in offspring ($OR_{10years}$ =0.72, 95% CI 0.52, 1.01, P_{perm}=0.028; Figure 3). There was no evidence for associations with any of the non-mental health phenotypes.

Childhood PRS analyses. In contrast to the intergenerational analysis, there was no evidence for an association with specific phobias ($OR_{10years}$=1.00, 95% CI 0.72, 1.38, P_{perm}=0.998) but some evidence for an association with reduced general anxiety symptoms (β_{8years}= -0.02, 95% CI -0.04, -0.002, P_{perm}=0.026). The strongest association amongst the non-mental health phenotypes was observed with fewer hours of sleep in term-time (β_{7years}= -0.03, 95% CI -0.05, -0.004, P_{perm}=0.018), (Figure 3 and Table S5). None of the associations of the intergenerational and childhood analyses for caffeine survived Bonferroni correction.

[Insert Figures 3 and Table 3 here]

Smoking and caffeine PRS analyses with phenotypes during and outside of pregnancy and during adolescence

The PRS for smoking were associated with these behaviours outside of pregnancy and during adolescence. The caffeine PRS was associated with caffeine consumption outside of pregnancy

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

(except for cola consumption) but not during adolescence. Strongest evidence for associations with the smoking PRS was found for increased depressive symptoms, increased substance use, BMI and extraverted personality traits in mothers and more externalising problems and extraversion, increased BMI, and lower IQ in adolescence. A detailed description of these results can be found in the Supplementary analyses and Tables S6-S7. None of the caffeine PRS associations survived Bonferroni correction (Table S8).

DISCUSSION

In this study we aimed to disentangle possible causal associations of maternal smoking and caffeine consumption, with a particular focus on the prenatal period, on offspring mental health from pleiotropic associations. Our results showed that the smoking and caffeine PRS are valid predictors of smoking and caffeine consumption from tea and coffee during pregnancy. The smoking initiation PRS was associated with various psychological traits and other substance use behaviours across different time points in life. In particular, we observed associations of the smoking initiation PRS with sensation-seeking traits across development, such as less anxiety and increased externalising problems in childhood, an extroverted personality type, more externalising problems and alcohol consumption in adolescence, as well as higher expression of anger, more monotony avoidance outside of pregnancy and alcohol consumption during and outside of pregnancy. We found few associations between the caffeine PRS and offspring mental health outcomes. Critically, our results indicate that the associations found between the maternal smoking and caffeine PRS and offspring mental health outcomes are likely due to pleiotropic effects, rather than acting through the maternal intrauterine environment.

The literature supports our findings of pleiotropic associations between the smoking PRS and sensation-seeking personality traits. Previous studies found that adolescents who smoke have more externalising problems, higher impulsivity and novelty-seeking type of behaviours (36) and that children with lower cognitive abilities have more behavioural problems and are more likely to initiate smoking themselves (37,38). There is evidence for shared genetic factors influencing smoking behaviours, externalising problems and novelty seeking type of behaviours (39,40), as well as educational attainment (41). However, some studies argue that the effect from the maternal postnatal environment (such as parenting behaviours) and maternal mental health cannot be dismissed even after accounting for genetic effects (42,43). We found some evidence that the smoking PRS is associated with maternal depression during and outside of pregnancy, which could (partly) explain the association we observed between the smoking PRS and offspring externalising problems. A study similar in design to our methodology, that examined associations between PRS for increased alcohol consumption and maternal and offspring mental health (44) also found an association between alcohol use and maternal depression during pregnancy but no evidence for an association with externalising problems in offspring. Even though this requires further testing, it could provide some initial evidence that the association between the smoking PRS and offspring externalising problems is more likely to be pleiotropic than confounded by maternal depression. Further, other studies suggest that the genetic instrument for smoking initiation may not only measure smoking behaviour but also captures novelty-seeking and impulsive behaviours even when only using genome-wide significant SNPs (41,45–47). In addition, GSCAN summary statistics for smoking initiation showed a strong genetic correlation with ADHD and risk tolerance behaviour, which could make pleiotropic effects more likely (26). Taken together with the existing literature, our findings support the notion that these observed associations with smoking initiation PRS are likely explained by shared genetic liability in mothers and offspring.

We did not find strong evidence for intergenerational effects between the maternal caffeine PRS and offspring mental health outcomes in childhood. The associations we observed between caffeine PRS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

and decreased likelihood of binge drinking, reduced caffeine consumption and lower socioeconomic status during pregnancy, as well as higher GCSE exam grades during adolescence stand-in contrast to a study in the UK Biobank where the caffeine PRS was positively associated with alcohol consumption outside of pregnancy and not associated with social class (33). Therefore, these findings should be interpreted with caution, as they might be unique to the ALSPAC sample in terms of participants sociodemographic characteristics or false positives. Although these results could be due to yet unexplained forms of bias, it is also possible that the caffeine PRS is capturing underlying personality/socio-behavioural profiles with far reaching consequences for health and wellbeing, which deserves further investigation.

Strengths and Limitations

A major strength of this study was the exploration of exposure-outcome associations at time points in life other than adulthood. Further, the validation of genetic variants discovered in non-pregnant female and male populations, as proxies during pregnancy, is vital for future investigation of intrauterine effects of the exposures (25). Lastly, the intergenerational comparison of associations of the smoking and caffeine PRS with childhood mental health outcomes, that are likely to be free of confounding through offspring's own substance consumption enabled us to disentangle potential pleiotropic and environmental effects on mental health.

The following limitations should also be considered. First, the limited sample size (in the context of genetic association studies) likely resulted in low statistical power to detect small effects. Second, we were restricted to phenotypes as assessed in ALSPAC, and the comparison of related phenotypes was not similar across development (e.g. ADHD/conduct disorder in childhood with extraversion & anger personality traits in mothers outside of pregnancy). Third, many mental health phenotypes in childhood were based on maternal report, which may not accurately reflect offspring's mental health problems (48,49) but rather mothers own mental health status (50,51). Fourth, we constructed PRS for smoking initiation based on the latest GWAS that included ALSPAC mothers (26). Due to the sample overlap, the true strength of explored associations might be smaller than we reported. However, given the small contribution of data from ALSPAC (~1%) to a total sample size of 1.2 million, the risk of bias is likely negligible. Fifth, as our dataset included phenotypes from later time points and we relied on participants whose genotype data was available, it is possible that our findings are subject to selection bias (52,53).

Future research

Future research should validate a shared genetic liability between the smoking initiation PRS and sensation seeking personality traits. If these results are robust, future studies investigating the effects on mental health using the smoking initiation PRS might consider accounting for sensation seeking personality traits. Further, future research should aim to differentiate effects of smoke exposure through the intrauterine and postnatal environment, and investigate a potential interaction of smoking and caffeine consumption during pregnancy on offspring mental health (54). More analyses including paternal data would be helpful to truly understand the effect of smoking and caffeine consumption on offspring mental health outcomes. For instance, studies with paternal genotype data could help to differentiate whether observed effects are due to intrauterine or postnatal exposure, through conducting negative control comparisons of prenatal associations of maternal and paternal substance use.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study validated the application of the smoking initiation, lifetime smoking and caffeine PRS for research investigating intrauterine exposures to smoking and caffeinated coffee and tea. Further, we found stronger evidence for pleiotropic than causal effects of maternal smoking and caffeine consumption on offspring mental health. Given the current study's limitations, particularly

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

its limited statistical power, these findings should be replicated in independent samples using more refined methods for pleiotropy detection and corrections.

Declarations of interest

None.

Acknowledgements

We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses. The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (Grant ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. This publication is the work of the authors and Laura Schellhas and Elis Haan will serve as guarantors for the contents of this paper.

Funding

This research was performed in the UK Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit (grant number: MC_UU_00011/7) and also supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Bristol Biomedical Research Centre at University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol. The MRC also funded KEE's PhD studentship. LZ was supported by a UK Medical Research Council fellowship (grant number G0902144). GCS was supported by the Medical Research Council [New Investigator Research Grant, MR/S009310/1] and the European Joint Programming Initiative "A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life" (JPI HDHL, NutriPROGRAM project, UK MRC MR/S036520/1].

This research was also conducted as part of the CAPICE (Childhood and Adolescence Psychopathology: unravelling the complex etiology by a large Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Europe) project, funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, Marie Sklodowska Curie Actions – MSCA-ITN-2016 – Innovative Training Networks under grant agreement number 721567. This study was supported by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health.

A comprehensive list of grant funding is available on the ALSPAC website (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf). GWAS data was generated by Sample Logistics and Genotyping Facilities at Wellcome Sanger Institute and LabCorp (Laboratory Corporation of America) using support from 23andMe.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Treur JL, Taylor AE, Ware JJ, McMahon G, Hottenga J-J, Baselmans BML, et al. Associations between smoking and caffeine consumption in two European cohorts: Smoking and caffeine consumption. Addiction. 2016 Jun;111(6):1059–68.

2. Kendler KS, Schmitt E, Aggen SH, Prescott CA. Genetic and Environmental Influences on Alcohol, Caffeine, Cannabis, and Nicotine Use From Early Adolescence to Middle Adulthood. ARCH GEN PSYCHIATRY. 2008;65(6):9.

3. Lara DR. Caffeine, Mental Health, and Psychiatric Disorders. Cunha RA, de Mendonça A, editors. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2010 Apr 14;20(s1):S239–48.

4. Wootton RE, Richmond RC, Stuijfzand BG, Lawn RB, Sallis HM, Taylor GMJ, et al. Evidence for causal effects of lifetime smoking on risk for depression and schizophrenia: a Mendelian randomisation study. Psychol Med. 2019 Nov 6;1–9.

5. Vermeulen JM, Wootton RE, Treur JL, Sallis HM, Jones HJ, Zammit S, et al. Smoking and the risk for bipolar disorder: evidence from a bidirectional Mendelian randomisation study. Br J Psychiatry. 2019 Sep 17;1–7.

6. Temple JL, Bernard C, Lipshultz SE, Czachor JD, Westphal JA, Mestre MA. The Safety of Ingested Caffeine: A Comprehensive Review. Front Psychiatry [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2019 Nov 27];8. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2017.00080/full

7. Dolan CV, Geels L, Vink JM, van Beijsterveldt CEM, Neale MC, Bartels M, et al. Testing Causal Effects of Maternal Smoking During Pregnancy on Offspring's Externalizing and Internalizing Behavior. Behav Genet. 2016 May;46(3):378–88.

8. Tiesler CMT, Heinrich J. Prenatal nicotine exposure and child behavioural problems. Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2014;23(10):913–29.

9. Moylan S, Gustavson K, Øverland S, Karevold EB, Jacka FN, Pasco JA, et al. The impact of maternal smoking during pregnancy on depressive and anxiety behaviors in children: the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study. BMC Med. 2015 Dec;13(1):24.

10. Bekkhus M, Skjøthaug T, Nordhagen R, Borge A. Intrauterine exposure to caffeine and inattention/overactivity in children: Caffeine and inattention/overactivity. Acta Paediatrica. 2010 Mar 5;99(6):925–8.

11. Gage SH, Munafò MR, Davey Smith G. Causal Inference in Developmental Origins of Health and Disease (DOHaD) Research. Annual Review of Psychology. 2016;67(1):567–85.

12. Thapar A, Rice F, Hay D, Boivin J, Langley K, van den Bree M, et al. Prenatal Smoking Might Not Cause Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: Evidence from a Novel Design. Biol Psychiatry. 2009 Oct 15;66(8):722–7.

13. Taylor AE, Carslake D, de Mola CL, Rydell M, Nilsen TIL, Bjørngaard JH, et al. Maternal Smoking in Pregnancy and Offspring Depression: a cross cohort and negative control study. Sci Rep. 2017 Dec;7(1):12579.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

14. Menezes AMB, Murray J, László M, Wehrmeister FC, Hallal PC, Gonçalves H, et al. Happiness and Depression in Adolescence after Maternal Smoking during Pregnancy: Birth Cohort Study. PLOS ONE. 2013 Nov 12;8(11):e80370.

15. Ashford J, Lier PACV, Timmermans M, Cuijpers P, Koot HM. Prenatal Smoking and Internalizing and Externalizing Problems in Children Studied From Childhood to Late Adolescence. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry. 2008 Jul;47(7):779–87.

16. D'Onofrio BM, Van Hulle CA, Waldman ID, Rodgers JL, Harden KP, Rathouz PJ, et al. Smoking during pregnancy and offspring externalizing problems: An exploration of genetic and environmental confounds. Dev Psychopathol. 2008;20(1):139–64.

17. Brion M-J, Victora C, Matijasevich A, Horta B, Anselmi L, Steer C, et al. Maternal smoking and child psychological problems: Disentangling causal and non-causal effects. Pediatrics. 2010 Jul;126(1):e57–65.

18. Manzano C, Castellano MH, Roman L. Maternal Smoking during Pregnancy and Its Impact on Postnatal Neurodevelopment. Clinics Mother Child Health [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2020 Apr 28];13(3). Available from: https://www.omicsonline.com/open-access/maternal-smoking-during-pregnancy-and-its-impact-on-postnatalneurodevelopment-2090-7214-1000249.php?aid=80015

19. Nomura Y, Marks DJ, Halperin JM. Prenatal Exposure to Maternal and Paternal Smoking on Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorders Symptoms and Diagnosis in Offspring. J Nerv Ment Dis. 2010 Sep;198(9):672–8.

20. Roza SJ, Verhulst FC, Jaddoe VW, Steegers EA, Mackenbach JP, Hofman A, et al. Maternal smoking during pregnancy and child behaviour problems: the Generation R Study. Int J Epidemiol. 2009 Jun 1;38(3):680–9.

21. Langley K, Heron J, Smith GD, Thapar A. Maternal and Paternal Smoking During Pregnancy and Risk of ADHD Symptoms in Offspring: Testing for Intrauterine Effects. Am J Epidemiol. 2012 Aug 1;176(3):261–8.

22. Thapar A, Rutter M. Do prenatal risk factors cause psychiatric disorder? Be wary of causal claims. Br J Psychiatry. 2009 Aug;195(2):100–1.

23. Gaysina D, Fergusson DM, Leve LD, Horwood J, Reiss D, Shaw DS, et al. Maternal smoking during pregnancy and offspring conduct problems: Evidence from three independent genetically-sensitive research designs. JAMA Psychiatry [Internet]. 2013 Sep [cited 2020 Jul 20];70(9). Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3828999/

24. Smith GD, Lawlor DA, Harbord R, Timpson N, Day I, Ebrahim S. Clustered Environments and Randomized Genes: A Fundamental Distinction between Conventional and Genetic Epidemiology. PLoS Med [Internet]. 2007 Dec [cited 2020 Feb 26];4(12). Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2121108/

25. Lawlor D, Richmond R, Warrington N, McMahon G, Davey Smith G, Bowden J, et al. Using Mendelian randomization to determine causal effects of maternal pregnancy (intrauterine) exposures on offspring outcomes: Sources of bias and methods for assessing them. Wellcome Open Research. 2017 Feb 14;2:11.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

26. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, Li Y, Brazel DM, Chen F, et al. Association studies of up to 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol use. Nature Genetics. 2019 Feb 1;51(2):237–44.

27. The Coffee and Caffeine Genetics Consortium, International Parkinson's Disease Genomics Consortium (IPDGC), North American Brain Expression Consortium (NABEC), UK Brain Expression Consortium (UKBEC), Cornelis MC, Byrne EM, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis identifies six novel loci associated with habitual coffee consumption. Molecular Psychiatry. 2015 May;20(5):647–56.

28. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, Boyd A, Golding J, Davey Smith G, et al. Cohort Profile: The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. Int J Epidemiol. 2013 Feb;42(1):97–110.

29. Northstone K, Lewcock M, Groom A, Boyd A, Macleod J, Timpson N, et al. The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): an update on the enrolled sample of index children in 2019. Wellcome Open Res. 2019 Mar 14;4:51.

30. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort Profile: The 'Children of the 90s'—the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. Int J Epidemiol. 2013 Feb 1;42(1):111–27.

31. Saxbe D, Rossin-Slater M, Goldenberg D. The transition to parenthood as a critical window for adult health. American Psychologist. 2018;73(9):1190.

32. Freathy RM, Ring SM, Shields B, Galobardes B, Knight B, Weedon MN, et al. A common genetic variant in the 15q24 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor gene cluster (CHRNA5–CHRNA3–CHRNB4) is associated with a reduced ability of women to quit smoking in pregnancy. Hum Mol Genet. 2009 Aug 1;18(15):2922–7.

33. Wootton RE, Richmond RC, Stuijfzand BG, Lawn RB, Sallis HM, Taylor GMJ, et al. Causal effects of lifetime smoking on risk for depression and schizophrenia: Evidence from a Mendelian randomisation study. bioRxiv. 2018 Dec 20;381301.

34. Taylor AE, Davey Smith G, Munafò MR. Associations of coffee genetic risk scores with consumption of coffee, tea and other beverages in the UK Biobank: Coffee genetic risk scores. Addiction. 2018 Jan;113(1):148–57.

35. Treur JL, Taylor AE, Ware JJ, Nivard MG, Neale MC, McMahon G, et al. Smoking and caffeine consumption: a genetic analysis of their association: Smoking and caffeine. Addiction Biology. 2017 Jul;22(4):1090–102.

36. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC. 2017.

37. Crone MR, Reijneveld SA. The association of behavioural and emotional problems with tobacco use in adolescence. Addictive Behaviors. 2007 Aug 1;32(8):1692–8.

38. Morin AJS, Arens AK, Maïano C, Ciarrochi J, Tracey D, Parker PD, et al. Reciprocal Relationships between Teacher Ratings of Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors in Adolescents with Different Levels of Cognitive Abilities. J Youth Adolescence. 2017 Apr 1;46(4):801–25.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

39. Daly M, Egan M. Childhood cognitive ability and smoking initiation, relapse and cessation throughout adulthood: evidence from two British cohort studies. Addiction. 2017;112(4):651–9.

40. Stephens SH, Hoft NR, Schlaepfer IR, Young SE, Corley RC, McQueen MB, et al. Externalizing Behaviors are associated with SNPs in the CHRNA5/CHRNA3/CHRNB4 gene cluster. Behav Genet. 2012 May;42(3):402–14.

41. Young SE, Stallings MC, Corley RP, Krauter KS, Hewitt JK. Genetic and environmental influences on behavioral disinhibition. American Journal of Medical Genetics. 2000;684–695.

42. Gage SH, Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Munafò MR. Investigating causality in associations between education and smoking: a two-sample Mendelian randomization study. Int J Epidemiol. 2018 Aug 1;47(4):1131–40.

43. Maughan B, Taylor A, Caspi A, Moffitt TE. Prenatal Smoking and Early Childhood Conduct Problems: Testing Genetic and Environmental Explanations of the Association. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2004 Aug 1;61(8):836–43.

44. Eilertsen EM, Hannigan LJ, McAdams TA, Rijsdijk FV, Czajkowski N, Reichborn-Kjennerud T, et al. Parental Prenatal Symptoms of Depression and Offspring Symptoms of ADHD: A Genetically Informed Intergenerational Study. J Atten Disord. 2020 Apr 26;1087054720914386.

45. Easey KE, Wootton RE, Sallis H, Haan E, Schellhas L, Munafo M, et al. The association of alcohol polygenic risk scores with mental health outcomes: A multi-generational analysis in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. medRxiv. 2020 Jul 7;2020.07.06.20147231.

46. Harrison R, Munafo MR, Smith GD, Wootton RE. Examining the effect of smoking on suicidal ideation and attempts: A triangulation of epidemiological approaches. medRxiv. 2019 Oct 25;19007013.

47. Khouja JN, Wootton RE, Taylor AE, Davey Smith G, Munafò MR. Association of genetic liability to smoking initiation with e-cigarette use in young adults. [Internet]. Epidemiology; 2020 Jun [cited 2020 Jul 22]. Available from: http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.06.10.20127464

48. Hicks BM, Clark DA, Deak JD, Liu M, Durbin CE, Schaefer JD, et al. Polygenic Risk Score for Smoking is associated with Externalizing Psychopathology and Disinhibited Personality Traits but not Internalizing Psychopathology in Adolescence. bioRxiv. 2020 Jul 30;2020.07.29.227405.

49. Najman JM, Williams GM, Nikles J, Spence S, Bor W, O'Callaghan M, et al. Bias influencing maternal reports of child behaviour and emotional state. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2001 Apr 1;36(4):186–94.

50. Gartstein MA, Bridgett DJ, Dishion TJ, Kaufman NK. Depressed mood and maternal report of child behavior problems: Another look at the depression–distortion hypothesis. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology. 2009 Mar 1;30(2):149–60.

51. Ringoot AP, Tiemeier H, Jaddoe VWV, So P, Hofman A, Verhulst FC, et al. Parental depression and child well-being: young children's self-reports helped addressing biases in parent reports. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2015 Aug 1;68(8):928–38.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

52. Hennigan KM, O'Keefe M, Noether CD, Rinehart DJ, Russell LA. Through a Mother's Eyes: Sources of Bias When Mothers with Co-occurring Disorders Assess Their Children. JBHSR. 2006 Jan 1;33(1):87–104.

53. Munafò MR, Tilling K, Taylor AE, Evans DM, Davey Smith G. Collider scope: when selection bias can substantially influence observed associations. Int J Epidemiol. 2018 Feb;47(1):226–35.

54. Taylor AE, Jones HJ, Sallis H, Euesden J, Stergiakouli E, Davies NM, et al. Exploring the association of genetic factors with participation in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. Int J Epidemiol. 2018 Aug 1;47(4):1207–16.

55. Grosso LM, Bracken MB. Caffeine Metabolism, Genetics, and Perinatal Outcomes: A Review of Exposure Assessment Considerations during Pregnancy. Annals of Epidemiology. 2005 Jun 1;15(6):460–6.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Comparison of intergenerational and childhood analysis results to disentangle maternal environmental from pleiotropic effects.



Note. Design overview of the comparison of the intergenerational analysis (top) and the childhood analysis (bottom). A larger effect estimate in the intergenerational compared to the childhood analysis would reflect a causal effect of caffeine/smoke exposure through the maternal environment. A larger effect estimate in the childhood compared to the intergenerational analysis would reflect pleiotropic association of the polygenic risk scores with mental health.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Comparison of phenotype associations with the smoking initiation polygenic risk scores (PRS) in the intergenerational and childhood analysis.



Note. Points outside the lines had a permutation corrected p-value < 0.05. Points above the upper line represent positive associations and points below the lower line represent negative associations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 3. Comparison of phenotype associations with the caffeine polygenic risk scores (PRS) in the intergenerational and childhood analysis.



Note. Points outside the lines had a permutation corrected p-value < 0.05. Points above the upper line represent positive associations and points below the lower line represent negative associations.

Table 1. Availability of phenotypes included in the intergenerational and negative control analyses across sub-populations

	Timepoints			
Measures	**Offspring**		**Mothers**	
	Childhood (age<10)	Adolescence (age 12-18)	Outside of pregnancy (pre/post-pregnancy)	During pregnancy
Mental health				
Emotional problems				
Depression symptoms	x	x	x	x
Anxiety symptoms	x	x	x	x
Specific phobia	x	x		
Behavioural problems				
Oppositional defiant disorder symptoms	x	x		
Conduct disorder symptoms	x	x	Personality measures (extraversion, anger, impulsivity)	
ADHD symptoms	x	x		
Total behavioural difficulties	x	x		
Neuro-developmental				
Autism (lifetime diagnosis)		x		
Other				
Handedness (negative control)	x			
IQ	x	x	Only education & SES	Only education & SES
Number of stressful life events	x	x	x	x
BMI	x	x	x	Only Image perception and physical activity
Sleep initiation	x	x		
Sleep maintenance	x	x		
Hours of sleep (duration)	x	x	x	
Overall caffeine intake	x	x	x	x

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Associations between smoking initiation polygenic risk scores (PRS) and smoking phenotypes in mothers (during and outside of pregnancy) and adolescent offspring.

	Phenotype	Effect estimate	Effect size*	95% CI	p-value	Sample size
Mothers						
outside of pregnancy	Mother has ever smoked	OR	1.40	1.33, 1.48	1.24×10^{-8}	7194
	Number of cigarettes smoked	Beta	0.15	0.08, 0.22	3.81×10^{-5}	3426
Pregnancy – 18 weeks gestation	Tobacco smoked in 1st three months of pregnancy	OR	1.35	1.23, 1.44	3.0×10^{-7}	7237
	Mother cut down smoking	OR	1.33	1.25, 1.42	5.89×10^{-7}	7269
	Mother stopped smoking during pregnancy	OR	0.98	0.88, 1.11	0.771	1863
Offspring						
Adolescence– 14 years	Smoked at age 14 years	OR	1.18	1.09, 1.28	6.50×10^{-4}	4145
	Smoked more than 20 cigarettes	OR	1.19	1.03, 1.38	0.024	1058
	Age 1st smoked a cigarette	Beta	0.001	-0.04, 0.04	0.953	1064
Adolescence– 18 years	Ever smoked a whole cigarette	OR	1.26	1.15, 1.37	1.09×10^{-4}	2402
	Number of cigarettes smoked in lifetime	Beta	0.19	0.10, 0.2	4.24×10^{-5}	1144

* Reflects the average change in the outcome that is associated with a one standard deviation increase in the PRS. For binary outcomes, this will be the odds ratio (e.g. Mother's odds of ever smoking are 1.4 times compared to not smoking), for continuous outcomes it represents the average unit change (e.g. 0.15 cigarettes smoked).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.20189837; this version posted September 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Associations between caffeine polygenic risk scores (PRS) and daily caffeine intake in mothers (during and outside of pregnancy), and offspring (age 8 and 13 years)

	Daily caffeine intake phenotype	Effect size* (beta)	95% CI	p-value	Sample size
Mothers					
Outside of pregnancy	Total (coffee, tea, and cola)	9.89	6.34, 13.44	4.97×10^{-8}	4783
	Coffee	0.03	0.01, 0.06	0.009	4655
	Tea	0.07	0.03, 0.10	1.01×10^{-4}	4632
	Cola	0.01	-0.01, 0.03	0.332	4670
Pregnancy – 18 weeks gestation	Total (coffee, tea, and cola)	5.85	3.09, 8.61	3.28×10^{-5}	7220
	Coffee	0.02	0.01, 0.04	0.011	7198
	Tea	0.02	0.01, 0.04	0.007	7189
	Cola	-0.001	-0.02, 0.01	0.890	7185
Pregnancy – 32 weeks gestation	Total (coffee, tea, and cola)	6.32	3.74, 8.89	1.56×10^{-6}	6767
	Coffee	0.03	0.01, 0.04	0.01	6596
	Tea	3.42	1.80, 5.04	3.65×10^{-5}	6608
	Cola	-0.01	-0.03, 0.01	0.278	6500
Offspring					
Childhood – age 8 years	Total (coffee, tea, and cola)	0.01	-0.01, 0.03	0.377	4589
	Coffee	0.01	-0.06,0.08	0.845	254
	Tea	0.18	-1.52, 1.88	0.836	1475
	Cola	0.003	-0.02, 0.03	0.829	4551
Adolescence – age 13 years	Total (coffee, tea, and cola)	0.01	-0.03, 0.05	0.670	3405
	Coffee	0.03	-0.02, 0.08	0.271	467
	Tea	0.89	-0.35, 2.13	0.161	1933
	Cola	-0.02	-0.05, 0.02	0.424	2411

* Reflects the average change in the outcome that is associated with a one standard deviation increase in the PRS. For continuous outcomes it represents the average unit change (e.g. a one unit increase in PRS is associated with mothers consuming 9.89 mg/day more caffeine outside of pregnancy). For transformed variables, it represents the average quantile or quartile change (e.g. a one-unit change in PRS is associated with 0.03 quantile mg/day increase in coffee consumption outside of pregnancy, Supplementary methods).