Covariance of Interdependent Samples with Application to GWAS

Daniel Krefl[a,b] and Sven Bergmann[a,b,c]

[a] *Department of Computational Biology, University of Lausanne, Switzerland*
[b] *Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Lausanne, Switzerland*
[c] *Dept. of Integrative Biomedical Sciences, University of Cape Town, South Africa*

Abstract

Proximal genetic variants are frequently correlated, implying that also the corresponding effect sizes detected by genome-wide association studies (GWAS) are not independent. There are already methods taking this into account when aggregating effects from a single GWAS across genes or pathways. Here we present a rigorous, yet fast method for detecting genes with coherent association signals for two traits, facilitating cross-GWAS analyses. To this end we devised a new significance test for covariance of datapoints not drawn independently, but with known inter-sample covariance structure. We show that the distribution of its test statistic is a linear combination of χ^2 distributions, with positive and negative coefficients. The corresponding cumulative distribution function can be efficiently calculated with Davies' algorithm at high precision. We apply this general framework to test for dependence between SNP-wise effect sizes of two GWAS at the level of genes. We extend this test to detect also gene-wise causal links. We demonstrate the utility of our method by uncovering potential shared genetic links between severity of COVID-19 and (1) being prescribed class M05B medication (drugs affecting bone structure and mineralization), (2) rheumatoid arthritis, (3) vitamin D (25OHD), and (4) serum calcium concentrations. Our method detects a potential role played by chemokine receptor genes linked to T_H1 versus T_H2 immune reaction, a gene related to integrin beta-1 cell surface expression, and other genes potentially impacting severity of COVID-19. Our approach will be useful for similar analyses involving data-points with known auto-correlation structures.

November 2021

Author summary

Genome wide association studies (GWAS) deliver effect size estimates of a given trait for millions of Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs). There are already powerful tools to use these summary statistics to elucidate the global joint genetic contribution to a pair of traits, such as *cross-trait LD-score regression*, but these methods cannot reveal the joint contributions at the level of genes and pathways. Here we present a novel methodology to co-analyse the association data from a pair of GWAS in order to identify genes and pathways that may be of relevance to both of the respective traits. The novelty in our test is that a gene is considered to be co-relevant if the SNP-wise effects from both GWAS tend to have the same sign and magnitude in the gene window. This is different from the commonly used approach asking only for the aggregate signals from two GWAS to be jointly significant. Our method is made feasible due to a novel insight into the product-normal distribution. We apply our new method to test for co-significant genes for severe COVID-19 and conditions leading to prescription of common medications. Out of the 23 medication classes we tested for coherent co-significant genes, only one, M05B (drugs affecting bone structure and mineralization), yielded Bonferroni significant hits. We then searched for available GWAS data for related conditions, and found that also rheumatoid arthritis, calcium concentration and vitamin D are traits pointing to a number of co-relevant genes in our new coherence analysis. Furthermore, testing for anti-coherence showed that the medication classes H03A (thyroid preparations), R03A and R03BA (drugs for obstructive airway diseases) feature Bonferroni co-significant genes. Our joint analysis provides new insights into potential COVID-19 disease mechanisms.

1 Introduction

Pearson's sample correlation is one of the most used techniques in data analysis, independent of the specific field of science. It is defined as the covariance divided by the standard deviations of two random variables and gives a measure of linear dependence. The core underlying requirement is that the observed samples are drawn independently from a joint bivariate distribution. However, not all applications possess independently drawn samples.

One particular application with dependent samples occurs in genome-wide association studies (GWAS). Specifically, GWAS correlate genotypes, most commonly single

nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), with a phenotype of interest, both measured in the same study population. For human studies usually between 1 and 10 million SNPs are considered, and in most GWAS each of these SNPs is tested independently for correlation with the phenotype. By now, thousands of such GWAS have been conducted and identified a plethora of statistically significant associations of SNPs with complex traits. For most traits, in particular complex diseases or their risk factors that have been assessed in very large cohorts (100k or more subjects), usually hundreds of SNPs turn out to be significant, even after stringent correction for multiple hypotheses testing. Individual SNP-wise effect sizes are often very small, but add up to sizable narrow sense heritability, pointing to a polygenic genetic architecture [1]. Mapping SNP-wise effects to genes and annotated gene-sets (*pathways*) [2, 3] can yield valuable insights into the genetic underpinning and potential pathomechanisms of complex diseases and aid drug discovery and re-purposing.

However, due to Linkage Disequilibrium (LD) (*cf.*, [4]), many SNPs in close proximity are not independent, and this leads to dependencies between the observed SNPs' effect sizes. This is of particular relevance when aggregating SNP-wise effects to genes or pathways. Gene-wise effects are typically computed by adding up the (squared) effects of all SNPs within the transcript region of a gene of interest, as well as sizable up- and downstream-regions that may contain regulatory elements of this gene. Pathway effects are computed from the gene-wise effects [2]. LD can lead to an inflation of signal for significant SNPs in sizable LD blocks, since their signals are not independent. Such SNPs will dominate the joint association signal and lead to gene and pathway scores reflecting the level of importance for the phenotype inaccurately, if no correction is applied. For this reason, techniques and tools have been developed to correct for LD in the aggregation process, like for example *Pascal* [2] and *MAGMA* [3]. These tools mainly differ in how they map SNP effect sizes to genes, how the LD structure is accounted for, and details of the numerical procedure to estimate significance.

Some SNPs are significantly associated with more than one trait. The phenomenon of a single genetic variant affecting two or more traits is called *pleiotropy* [5]. In the case of disease traits such a shared genetic component hints at the same functional pathology contributing to several diseases, *cf.*, [6]. At the gene level, usually a gene is considered to be relevant for two different traits if the gene carries one or more effect sizes that are significant in both traits. However, this may not be a good criterion under all circumstances. Protein coding genes often contain several independent LD blocks.

Therefore, two traits may associate with genetic variation in two or more functionally different blocks of SNPs within the same gene, which may independently be significant. Hence, even though the two traits share the same significant gene, they may not share the same functional mechanism. To call a gene pleitropic, one should therefore move beyond comparing single variants, and take all SNPs in the gene region into account, corrected by LD.

Several methods have been proposed to uncover shared genetic origin of two traits from GWAS summary statistics: One early method is a test of co-localisation between GWAS pairs based on Bayesian statistics [7]. This method assumes that at most one association is present for each trait in the region of interest. The extension to the general case of multiple associations (which is usually the case) appears, however, to be non-trivial. A more recent method is cross-trait *LD score regression* [8], an extension of single-trait *LD score regression* (LDSR) [9], which is a method to estimate heritability and confounding biases from GWAS summary statistics. Like single-trait LDSR, cross-trait LDSR considers the effect sizes as random variables and uses *LD-scores* (*i.e.*, the sum of genetic correlations between a given SNP and all other SNPs) to estimate the genetic correlation between two traits. Yet this estimate is at the level of the entire genome, and it is difficult to use this approach to obtain estimates at the level of genes. The reason is that SNPs in the same genomic region are often in high LD, so the variables entering the linear correlation may be highly dependent, and this has to be corrected for. Similarly, the standard errors and p-values are estimated via resampling (jackknife). But this requires independent SNPs, which is not the case for strong LD. Another method to estimate local genetic covariance and correlation has been introduced in [10]. However, this method requires the computation of the inverse SNP-SNP correlation matrix, which often does not have full rank. This issue can be addressed by applying a regularization scheme, but this introduces extra assumptions and parameters, which may have to be tuned for best performance.

Here, we propose to consider the second cross moment (*i.e.*, the non-standardized covariance) between the effects of SNPs for two traits within a gene region, corrected for LD, as a measure for pleiotropy. This gives us a simple, but systematic definition of co-significance of a gene for two traits, *i.e.*, if the SNP-wise cross-moment is significant. For a single SNP this reduces to testing against the product-normal distribution, and hence corresponds to a multiplicative meta-analysis, rather than an additive one like Fisher's. We show that for multiple SNPs with a non-trivial covariance structure one

can express the underlying test distribution in terms of a linear combination of χ^2 distributions, with a mixture of positive and negative coefficients. The corresponding cumulative distribution function can be efficiently calculated with Davies' algorithm at high precision. Thus, our method takes into account not only isolated significant SNPs, but all common SNPs within the gene region to call a gene co-significant for two traits. Furthermore, using the notion of Mendelian randomization, our statistic can be extended to test for a possible causal relation between the two traits, mediated by the tested gene.

We demonstrate the utility of our methods by a timely co-analysis of GWAS summary statistics on the severity of COVID-19, being prescribed one of 23 different medication classes, and traits related to osteoporosis, like vitamin D and calcium concentrations.

2 Results

2.1 Coherence test

Consider the index $I = \sum_i w_i z_i$ with w_i and z_i N independent samples of two random variables $z, w \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. The index can also be written as $I = N\,\mathbb{E}(wz)$ with $\mathbb{E}$ denoting the expectation. Clearly, I is proportional to the standard empirical covariance of w and z.

For independent pairs of samples, the sampling distribution of I is simply a sum of independent product-normal distributions, hence one can infer that for identically correlated random variables with correlation coefficient ϱ (*cf.*, Methods, *Product-Normal distribution*)

$$I \sim \frac{1+\varrho}{2}[\chi^2_N] - \frac{1-\varrho}{2}[\chi^2_N]\,. \tag{2.1}$$

In particular, for $\varrho = 0$, we have that $I \sim X(N,1)$, with X being the *variance-gamma* distribution discussed in more detail in the supplement. One should note that the difference is in the distributional sense and therefore generally non-vanishing. A null assumption of zero correlation (or some other fixed value) can therefore be tested, as the cumulative distribution function (cdf) for I can be calculated explicitly and efficiently with Davies' algorithm (*cf.*, Methods, *Linear combination of χ^2 distributions*).

The main advantage of the above significance test is that it is straight-forward to relax the requirement of sample independence. That is, we can view the index I as a scalar product of random samples of $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w)$ and $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_z)$, with

$\mathcal{N}$ denoting here the multivariate Gaussian distribution and $\Sigma_{w|z}$ covariance matrices. For $\Sigma_w = \Sigma_z = 1$, the corresponding distribution of I is given by (2.1). In the general case, the inter-dependencies can be corrected for via linear decorrelation, *cf.*, Methods *Coherence test decorrelation*. The case of interest for this paper is $\Sigma := \Sigma_w = \Sigma_z$. In this case, one can show that under the null of w and z being independent

$$I \sim \sum_i \frac{\lambda_i}{2}[\chi_1^2] - \sum_i \frac{\lambda_i}{2}[\chi_1^2]\,, \tag{2.2}$$

with λ_i the ith eigenvalue of Σ. Hence, I is distributed according to a linear combination of χ_1^2 distributions with positive and negative coefficients, and therefore the cdf and tail probability can be calculated with Davies' algorithm. Note that the above discussion can be extended to non-standardized variables (for $\varrho = 0$) via making use of results given in supplementary section I.

As discussed in detail in [2], a GWAS (*cf.*, Methods, *GWAS*) gene enrichment test can be performed via testing against I with $w = z$. This effectively tests against the expected variance of SNPs' significances in the gene. What we propose here, is to use $I = w^T z$ with w and z resulting from two different GWAS phenotypes, to test for co-significance of a gene for two GWAS. In more detail, a significance test can be performed either against the right tail of the null distribution (2.2) (*coherence*), or against the left tail (*anti-coherence*).

A clarifying remark is in order. Note that we do not centralize w and z over the gene SNPs. Hence, we do not test for covariance, but for a non-vanishing second cross-moment. After de-correlation, it is best to interpret this as testing independently each joint SNP in the gene for a coherent deviation from the null expectation. Therefore we refer to this test as testing for genetic coherence, or simply as cross-scoring. For simplicity, in this work we only consider a fixed effect size model and assume that the correlation matrix Σ obtained from an external reference panel is a good approximation for both GWAS populations.

2.2 Simulation study

It is useful to discuss the single element case in more detail. The distribution (2.2) simplifies for $N = 1$ to $I \sim \frac{1}{2}[\chi_1^2] - \frac{1}{2}[\chi_1^2]$, which corresponds to the uncorrelated product normal distribution, *cf.*, Methods eq. (4.4). The index I for $N = 1$ is a measure of coherence (or anti-coherence) between z and w. The significance threshold curve for a



Figure 1: Significance threshold curves in the one element case for the product-normal (dashed) and Fisher's method (dotted) for various p-values.

fixed desired p-value, say $p_I = 10^{-7}$, is illustrated in figure 1. The curve corresponding to a given p_I is unbounded. That is, for a given w, there is always a corresponding z such that the resulting product I is significant. This differs from Fisher's exact method which combines two p-values $p_{w,z}$ into a combined one (p_F) via $-2\log p_F = -2\log p_w - 2\log p_z \sim [\chi^2_4]$. Since Fisher's method combines significance by addition, the corresponding combined significance curve is bounded. Specifically, in the extreme case of one of the p-values being equal to one, the significance simply corresponds to that of the other p-value. In contrast, for the product-normal, divergence between the p-values is penalized. If one of the p-values is large, say $p_w \simeq 1$, the other one has to be extremely small to achieve a given combined significance value, i.e. $p_z \ll p_w$ (*cf.*, figure 1). Therefore, one should see Fisher's method as being additive in the evidence, while the product-normal based method as being multiplicative.

The importance of correcting for the inter-dependence between the elements of w and z in the index I can be already seen in the $N = 2$ case, as discussed in section III of the supplement. For higher N this becomes even more pronounced. For example, consider a correlation matrix Σ of dimension one hundred with off-diagonal elements identically set to 0.2. We draw 1000 pairs of independent samples of $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ and calculate for each pair I. A p-value is then obtained for each index value for the linear combination of χ^2 distributions (2.2) (also referred to as weighted χ^2), and for the variance-gamma distribution X. Recall that the latter does not correct for the off-diagonal correlations. We repeat the experiment with the off-diagonal elements set to 0.8, resulting in a stronger element-wise correlation. Resulting qq-plots for both cases are shown in figure 2. We observe that the variance-gamma distribution (2.1) (with



Figure 2: QQ-plots of observed p-values resulting from the index I for 1000 pairs of samples of $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ against uniform p-values. Top: Off-diagonal elements of Σ set to 0.2. Bottom: Off-diagonal set to 0.8. The blue curve is obtained using the variance-gamma distribution to perform the statistical test, while the orange curve is obtained via the weighted χ^2 distribution. The latter corrects for the correlation and therefore is well calibrated.

$\varrho = 0$) indeed becomes unsuitable for increasing element-wise correlation of the data sample elements. In detail, not correcting for the inter-sample correlation leads to more and more false positives with increasing correlation strength. In contrast, the weighted χ^2 distribution (2.2) yields stable results in both the weakly and strongly correlated regime, as is evident in figure 2.

2.3 Ratio test

Consider the normalized index

$$R = \frac{\sum_i w_i z_i}{\sum_j z_j^2}\,, \tag{2.3}$$

with w and z as in the previous sections, in particular independent. The cdf for R can be calculated to be given by

$$F_R(r) = \Pr(R \leq r) = F_{\hat{v}\hat{z}}(0), \tag{2.4}$$

with $\hat{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda)$, $\hat{v} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (1+r^2)\Lambda)$, Λ the matrix of eigenvalues of Σ, and $F_{\hat{v}\hat{z}}(0)$ the linear combination of χ_1^2 cdf evaluated at the origin, see Methods, *Ratio test derivation*. (Similar results can be obtained for w and z interchanged.) Hence, the cdf of the ratio (2.3) can also be calculated with Davies' algorithm. A consistency check follows from the case of one dimension, where R has to be Cauchy distributed. The corresponding cdf is given by $F_C = 0.5 + \arctan(r)/\pi$. Evaluation for various r shows agreement



Figure 3: Interpretation of the ratio test. The test detects potential gene-wise causal relations between a GWAS trait viewed as exposure (E) and a GWAS trait viewed as outcome (O). The association of the exposure has to be confirmed independently via standard gene enrichment test. Potential confounders (C) have to be excluded by other means.

with values calculated from (4.10) in the one-dimensional case. Note that for non-standardized w_i and z_i similar expressions can be derived, albeit in terms of the non-central χ^2 distribution, *cf.*, the supplement.

Note that the ratio $R = w^T z/(z^T z) = \sum_i \lambda_i \bar{w}_i \bar{z}_i / (\sum_j \lambda_j \bar{z}_j^2)$ with $\bar{w}_i$ and $\bar{z}_i$ i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$, and λ_i the ith eigenvalue of Σ, can be interpreted as the weighted least squares solution in the case of heteroscedasticity for the regression coefficient of the linear regression between the de-correlated effect sizes of the two GWAS. Therefore, with the cdf for R derived above, we can test for a significant deviation from the null expectation of no relation. Note that in general R is not invariant under interchange of w and z, and may be used under certain conditions to make inference about the causal direction, *cf.*, multi-instrument Mendelian randomization, in particular [11]. Specifically, we consider the trait related to w as exposure and that of z to be the outcome. Then the ratio test tries to detect genes that are strongly (anti)-coherent between exposure and outcome, but at the same time only exhibit relatively low variance in the outcome, as is clear from the definition of R. Thus the ratio test effectively normalises the alignment of the outcome to the exposure, with respect to the outcome's own variation. The causal direction from exposure to outcome is implied, if the exposure is confirmed to be associated to the gene via a significant gene enrichment p-value, p_V, obtainable from the usual χ^2 test of [2], and if confounding factors can be excluded. The overall scheme is illustrated in figure 3.

2.4 COVID-19 GWAS application

To demonstrate the usefulness of our methods in the context of real and topical GWAS data (*cf.*, Methods, *GWAS*) we consider the recent meta-GWAS on very severe respiratory confirmed COVID-19 [12, 13] as main phenotype and co-analyse it with several other related traits (see also *Data availability* statement). Specifically, we use the summary statistics resulting from European subjects excluding those from UK Biobank in order to avoid overlap with the secondary trait GWAS. This GWAS shows significant gene enrichment on chromosomes 3 and 12, as can be inferred via testing for gene enrichment following [2]. The Manhattan plot for the resulting gene p-values is shown in supplementary figure 3.

We cross-scored this GWAS against a panel of GWAS on medication within the UK Biobank [14], which take prescription (self-reported intake) of 23 common types of medications as traits. Hence, in cross-scoring against the severe COVID-19 GWAS we sought to uncover whether there is a shared genetic architecture of pre-disposition for severe COVID and being prescribed specific medications. All calculations have been performed with the python package *PascalX* [15], which incorporates the methods detailed in the *Methods* section (see also *Code availability* statement). The directions of association are extracted from the signs of the raw effect sizes (β). Note that we take only SNPs with matching alleles between the GWAS pairs and the reference panel into account. We transformed the raw GWAS p-values via *joint* rank transformation, for the reason discussed in Methods under *SNP normalisation*.

The cross-scoring results for the test are shown in figure 4. Cross scoring of GWAS effects from prescription of medication group M05B (drugs affecting bone structure and mineralization) reveals joint coherent signals with that for very severe COVID-19. We show the Manhattan plot resulting from the null model (2.2) for the medication group M05B in figure 5. We observe that SNP-wise effects in genes in the well-known COVID-19 peak locus on chromosome 3 appear to be coherent with those from being prescribed M05B medication, with Bonferroni significance for the chemokine receptor genes *CCR1*, *CCR3* and the gene *LZTFL1* in the region chr3p21. We tested the orientation of the aggregated associations of these genes via the D-test, *cf.*, Methods, *Direction of association*, over the COVID-19 GWAS and find a positive direction (right tail) with $p_D \simeq 1.7 \times 10^{-4}, 8.6 \times 10^{-3}$ and 0.03, respectively.

For illustration, we show the spectrum of SNPs considered in the *CCR3* region and their SNP-SNP correlation matrix in figure 6. One can see that there is a large block



Figure 4: Resulting p-values for cross-scoring 23 drug classes GWAS against very severe COVID-19 GWAS for coherence, respectively, anti-coherence. Each data point corresponds to a gene. The dotted red line marks a Bonferroni significance threshold of 1.18×10^{-7} (0.05 divided by the 18453 genes tested and 23 drug classes). Left: Anti-coherence. Right: Coherence. Note that the drug class M05B shows the most significant enrichment in coherence with severe COVID-19.



Figure 5: Manhattan plot for cross scoring very severe confirmed COVID-19 with medication class M05B for coherence. Data points correspond to genes. The dotted red line marks a Bonferroni significance threshold of 1.18×10^{-7} (0.05 divided by the 18453 genes tested and 23 drug classes). The inlay plot shows a zoom into the relevant locus chr3p21.31.



Figure 6: Left: SNP p-values after rank transform for the *CCR3* gene. The x-axis is numbered according to the ith SNP in the gene window ordered by increasing position. The dotted black lines indicate the transcription start and end positions (first and last SNP). Up bars correspond to M05B and down bars to severe COVID-19. Green indicates positive and orange negative association with the trait. Right: SNP-SNP correlation matrix inferred from the 1KG reference panel. The color scale is shown on the right with dark red (+1) corresponding to perfect SNP-SNP correlation and dark blue (−1) to perfect anti-correlation over the reference population.

of SNPs in high LD, encompassing some of *CCR3*'s 5'UTR and most of its gene body, all having positive associations with both COVID-19 and M05B drug prescription. Furthermore, a somewhat weaker signal of coherence can be seen for SNPs in its 3'UTR, some of which share negative associations. Using our coherence test described above, we calculate a p-value of $p \simeq 8.2 \times 10^{-9}$ for *CCR1* and $p \simeq 3.3 \times 10^{-9}$ for *CCR3*. The SNP spectrum in the *LZTFL1* region is shown in supplementary figure 4. The p-value for the significance of the coherence is $p \simeq 2.7 \times 10^{-8}$.

Direction of association inferred from the D-test and coherence suggests that genetic predispositions leading to M05B prescription may carry a higher risk for severe COVID-19. We list the Bonferroni significant pathways for (anti)-coherent M05B and severe COVID-19 genes detected via a pathway enrichment test (Methods, *Pathway enrichment*), in table 1. Note that the enrichment test of pathways is performed with the (anti)-coherent gene enrichment p-values, and therefore tests for pathways which are of relevance for both traits simultaneously.

The cross-scoring test also detected the gene *HLA-DQA1* to be Bonferroni signifi-

trait	tail	enriched pathways	# genes	p-value
C10AA	R	-		
	L	-		
H03A	R	-		
	L	KEGG graft versus host disease	21	1.1×10^{-8}
		KEGG autoimmune thyroid disease	25	3.4×10^{-8}
		GOCC MHC protein complex	9	3.4×10^{-8}
		KEGG allograft rejection	22	4.1×10^{-8}
		GOBP interferon gamma mediated signaling pathway	72	5.8×10^{-8}
		GOMF MHC class II receptor activity	3	6.5×10^{-8}
		GOCC lumenal side of endoplasmic reticulum membrane	16	7.7×10^{-8}
		Durante adult olfactory neuroephithelium B cells	30	1.0×10^{-7}
		HP hemoptysis	54	2.9×10^{-7}
		GOCC MHC class II protein complex	3	3.0×10^{-7}
		GOCC lumenal side of membrane	23	3.0×10^{-7}
		GOMF peptide antigen binding	14	3.7×10^{-7}
		HP abnormal pulmopnary thoracic image finding	66	4.9×10^{-7}
		GOBP response to interferon gamma	148	8.2×10^{-7}
		GOBP regulation of leukocyte proliferation	214	8.6×10^{-7}
		KEGG type I diabetes mellitus	27	1.5×10^{-6}
L04	R	Farmer breast cancer cluster 8	3	1.2×10^{-6}
	L	GOBP interferon gamma mediated signaling pathway	72	1.5×10^{-9}
		GOMF peptide antigen binding	14	1.3×10^{-7}
		Reactome interferon gamma signaling	67	2.0×10^{-7}
		GOBP response to interferon gamma	148	4.8×10^{-7}
M05B	R	Roeth tert targets dn	8	7.3×10^{-8}
	L	-		
R03A	R	-		
	L	GOBP antigen processing and presentation of endogenous peptide antigen	14	1.5×10^{-7}
		GOBP antigen processing and presentation of endogenous antigen	17	3.4×10^{-7}
R03BA	R	-		
	L	KEGG graft versus host disease	21	6.4×10^{-9}
		Module 143	9	1.4×10^{-7}
		GOCC MHC protein complex	9	3.8×10^{-7}
		Module 293	7	5.3×10^{-7}
		WP cytokines and inflammatory response	22	6.5×10^{-7}
		KEGG allograft rejection	22	7.6×10^{-7}
		GOMF MHC class II receptor activity	3	1.4×10^{-6}
		GOBP antigen processing and presentation of endogenous peptide antigen	14	1.5×10^{-7}
		GOBP antigen processing and presentation of endogenous antigen	17	2.3×10^{-7}
		Gaurnier PSDM4 targets	44	1.1×10^{-6}
		KEGG type I diabetes mellitus	27	1.6×10^{-6}

Table 1: Bonferroni significant pathways for cross-scored severe COVID-19 genes. The coherent case corresponds to the right (R) tail, the anti-coherent case to the left (L) tail. The number of genes in the pathway is given in the fourth column. We tested against the 32284 gene sets of MSigDB 7.4 and only Bonferroni significant pathways ($p < 0.05/32284 \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-6}$) are listed.

cant under anti-coherence for the drug classes H03A (thyroid preparations), R03A and R03BA (drugs for obstructive airway diseases). Further, we note that the drug classes C10AA (HMG CoA reductase inhibitors) and L04 (immunosuppressants) have gene hits with a p-value $< 1 \times 10^{-5}$. Interestingly, all of these drug classes find application in auto-immune diseases and allergies. In particular, of the non-significant genes we detect the gene *FUT1* with $p \simeq 2.9 \times 10^{-7}$ for C10AA to be closest to Bonferroni significance. The D-test shows that *FUT1* is located in the left-tail under C10AA ($p_D \simeq 9.8 \times 10^{-4}$) and therefore the variations in this gene may be a possible risk factor for severe COVID-19. It is known that *FUT1* is involved in the creation of a precursor of the H antigen, itself being a precursor to each of the ABO blood group antigens. It has been hypothesized before in the literature that the ABO blood system correlates to COVID-19 severity, *cf.*, [16].

We also find the observed leading *TRIM* genes for L04 of interest. For illustration of the anti-coherence case, the SNP spectrum for *TRIM26* ($p \simeq 1.1 \times 10^{-6}$) under L04 is shown in figure 5 of the supplement. The pathway enrichment test in the anti-coherent case shows that L04 cross-scored severe COVID-19 has Bonferroni significant enrichment in interferon gamma related pathways, see table 1. Note that *TRIM* proteins are expressed in response to interferons, *cf.*, [17], and therefore the detected pathways are consistent with the enrichment of *TRIM* genes.

2.5 Osteoporosis related GWAS

The main application of M05B medications is the treatment of osteoporosis. In order to investigate this potential link further, we cross-scored the COVID-19 GWAS against a selection of GWAS with phenotypes related to osteoporosis, namely, bone mineral density (BMD) estimated from quantitative heel ultrasounds and fractures [18], estrogene levels in men (estradiol and estrone) [19], calcium concentration [20], vitamin D (25OHD) concentration [21] and rheumatoid arthritis (RA) [22]. The inferred gene enrichment for coherence and anti-coherence with the COVID-19 GWAS is shown in figure 7. We found Bonferroni significant enrichment for RA and enrichment with gene p-values $< 10^{-5}$ for calcium and vitamin D. The Manhattan plot for the Bonferroni significant trait is shown in figure 8. Note that $\approx 47\%$ of the SNP alleles between the RA and COVID-19 GWAS were not matching and that we discarded all non-matching SNPs for the analysis. A list of the most significant detected genes under the test is given in table 2. The table also contains a brief description of the potential relation of



Figure 7: Resulting p-values for cross scoring several GWAS related to osteoporosis against the severe COVID-19 GWAS. The red dotted line marks the Bonferroni significance threshold of 3.9×10^{-7} (0.05 divided by the 18453 genes tested and 7 traits). We observe Bonferroni significant enrichment for RA and in addition enrichment in vitamin D and calcium with p-values $< 10^{-5}$.



Figure 8: Manhattan plot for cross scoring severe confirmed COVID-19 with rheumatoid arthritis for anti-coherence. Data points correspond to genes. The dotted red line marks a Bonferroni significance threshold of 3.9×10^{-7} (0.05 divided by the 18453 genes tested and 7 traits). The labels denote the leading gene hit for the corresponding peak.



Figure 9: Manhattan plot for ratio scoring Vitamin D concentration against severe COVID-19 in the coherent case, with ratio denominator given by COVID-19. The Bonferroni significance threshold of $p = 3.4 \times 10^{-7}$ is indicated by the red dotted line (0.05 divided by the 18453 genes and 2 times 4 traits tested).

the respective gene to COVID-19, if known.

In particular, for RA several TRIM genes are Bonferroni significant. Note that TRIM proteins are associated with innate immunity, and are in particular involved in pathogen-recognition and host defence [17, 23]. This is consistent with the (weaker) TRIM signals we detected in the previous section for the immunosuppressants L04, which find application in treatment of RA. The D-test shows that the leading TRIM genes are in the right tail under the RA GWAS, with $p_D < 10^{-6}$. The anti-coherence therefore suggests a protective effect of variants related to a predisposition for RA.

For calcium in the anti-coherent case, the top gene *HGFAC* with $p \simeq 4.0 \times 10^{-7}$ is only slighlty below the Bonferroni significance threshold. This gene sit in the right tail ($p_D \simeq 8.9 \times 10^{-4}$) under the D-test (4.8) applied to the calcium GWAS. Therefore, the aggregated variants in this gene imply that a predisposition for high calcium concentration may implicate a reduced risk for severe COVID-19, *i.e.*, a protective effect.

Let us also briefly discuss an application of the ratio based causality test. We ratio tested the COVID-19 GWAS against M05B, RA, vitamin D and calcium in the coherent and anti-coherent case, making use of eq. (2.4). The resulting gene hits of interest are summarized in table 3, together with a brief description of the potential COVID-19 context of the gene hits. Unless not indicated otherwise in the table, confounding between calcium and vitamin D could be excluded. The Manhattan plot resulting from the ratio test for Vitamin D as exposure and COVID-19 as outcome is shown in figure 9. We found that Vitamin D carries two interesting hits suggesting causal pathways

gene	trait	D	p-value	COVID-19 context description
TRIM26	RA	$-$	1.4×10^{-7}	TRIM proteins are associated with innate immunity, and are in particular involved in pathogen-recognition and host defence [17, 23].
TRIM10			2.5×10^{-7}	
TRIM15			2.8×10^{-7}	
TRIM40			4.6×10^{-7}	
TSPAN31			1.5×10^{-7}	Has been observed before to be regulated in Vero E6 cells over-expressing the SARS-CoV S2 subunit [55].
AGAP2			1.8×10^{-7}	Modulates the transforming growth factor beta-1 (*TGF-β1*), the principal mediator of the fibrotic response in liver, lung, and kidney [56].
CDK4			3.3×10^{-7}	Cyclin dependent kinases (CDKs) have been proposed as a new treatment option for COVID-19 [57].
OS9			5.4×10^{-7}	Codes for a protein that binds to the hypoxia-inducible factor 1 (*HIF-1*), a key regulator of the hypoxic response [58, 59]. Regulation of *HIF-1* interpolates between regeneration and scaring of injured tissue [60]. It is known that severe COVID-19 may lead to lung tissue fibrosis [61, 62].
TYK2			8.1×10^{-7}	Component of type I and type III interferon signaling pathways. The gene has been implicated before to be involved in the genetic mechanisms for critical illness due to COVID-19 [63].
OAS3	vitamin D		1.8×10^{-6}	The *OAS* family are essential proteins involved in the innate immune response to viral infection [64]. Vitamin D can increase the expression of the *OAS* genes [65]. Under the D-test we have $p_D \simeq 7.2 \times 10^{-5}$ for the COVID-19 GWAS.
OAS2			2.2×10^{-6}	
OAS1			3.0×10^{-6}	
FYCO1			5.3×10^{-6}	Plays a role in microtubule plus end-directed transport of autophagic vesicles [66]. SARS-CoV-2 inhibits autophagy activity [67]. A regulatory role of vitamin D on autophagy at different steps, including induction, nucleation and degradation has been suggested, *cf.*, [68].
LZTFL1			7.9×10^{-6}	Modulates T-cell activation and enhances IL-5 production [69]. Mouse models suggest that expression of IL-5 alters bone metabolism [70].
CXCR6			8.1×10^{-6}	This gene is expressed by subsets of T_H1 cells, but not by T_H2 cells, and may be important in trafficking of effector T cells that mediate type-1 inflammation [71]. The vitamin D analog TX527 promotes the surface expression of *CXCR6* on T-cells and inhibiting effector T cell reactivity while inducing regulatory T cell characteristics, promoting migration to sites of inflammation [72].
HGFAC	calcium		4.0×10^{-7}	Plays a role in converting hepatocyte growth factor (HGF) to its active form. Binding of HGF causes the up-regulation of *CXCR3*. *CXCR3* is preferentially expressed on T_H1 cells, while *CCR3* on T_H2 cells [73]. *CXCR3* binds the chemokine receptor *CCR3* and prevents an activation of T_H2-lymphocytes, biasing an immune reaction towards T_H1 inflammation [74]. *CXCR3* is able to increase intracellular Ca^{2+} levels [75]. The D-test for calcium shows that the gene is located in the right tail ($p_D \simeq 5.9 \times 10^{-4}$).
DOK7			1.5×10^{-6}	Activates *MuSK*, which is involved in concentrating *AChR* in the muscle membrane at the neuromuscular junction. The latter protein is critical for signaling between nerve and muscle cells, a necessity for movement, and is influenced by intra-cellular calcium [76]. Muscle weakness is a symptom of some severe COVID-19 patients [77]. The D-test for calcium shows that the gene is located in the right tail ($p_D \simeq 3.5 \times 10^{-5}$).
AGAP2	vitamin D	$+$	2.6×10^{-6}	
OS9			3.8×10^{-6}	
TSPAN31			4.4×10^{-6}	

Table 2: Table of genes detected via the coherence test for COVID-19 against RA, vitamin D and calcium (with $p < 6.0 \times 10^{-6}$). The column **D** indicates the direction of the test with $+$ for coherent and $-$ for anti-coherent.

gene	E	O	D	p_R-value	COVID-19 context description
KLC1	vitamin D	COVID	+	7.1×10^{-7}	Kinesin-1 uncoats viral DNA and features in the COVID-19 virus-host protein interactions, belonging to the functional group of viral trafficking [78].
XRCC3				2.7×10^{-6}	
ZFYVE21				3.2×10^{-6}	Regulates microtubule-induced PTK2/FAK1 dephosphorylation, which is important for integrin beta-1/ITGB1 cell surface expression. Integrins in host cells may play the role of alternative receptors to ACE2 for SARS-CoV-2 [40, 41].
RNF217	calcium			1.9×10^{-6}	Member of the E3 ubiquitin protein ligase family. A potential COVID-19 therapeutic pathway based on E3 ubiquitin ligases has been recently proposed in [79].
DDP9	COVID	calcium	−	5.8×10^{-7}	Has been implicated before to be involved in the genetic mechanisms for critical illness due to COVID-19 [63].
HOXC4	M05B	COVID		2.7×10^{-6}	Related to an enhanced antibody response under the regulation of estrogens. Has been discussed before in the COVID-19 context in [80]. Potential confounding role of vitamin D ($p_V \simeq 0.06$).
PPP2R3A	calcium			9.6×10^{-6}	Interacts with *CDC6* [81], which is up-regulated at the early stages of human coronavirus 229E infection [82]. Potential confounding role of vitamin D ($p_V \simeq 0.03$).

Table 3: Table of genes of significance ($p < 10^{-6}$) detected via ratio tests against COVID-19. The column **E** list the exposure, **O** the outcome and **D** the direction of test with + for coherent and − for anti-coherent. We confirmed that all listed genes are p_V significant under the exposure, but not the outcome.

E	O	D	enriched pathway	# genes	p-value
RA	COVID	-	GOCC MHC protein complex	9	3.6×10^{-8}
			GOMF peptide antigen binding	14	2.5×10^{-8}
			KEGG allograft rejection	22	8.1×10^{-7}
			KEGG graft vs. host disease	21	3.0×10^{-7}
			Module 143	9	2.5×10^{-7}
			Module 293	7	7.5×10^{-7}

Table 4: Bonferroni significant pathways for the ratio test. We tested against the 32284 gene sets of MSigDB 7.4 and only Bonferroni significant pathways ($p < 0.05/32284 \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-6}$) are listed.

from Vitamin D concentration to severity of COVID-19. Namely, the genes *KLC1* and *ZFYVE21*. The observed p_R-values suggest a causal flow from genetic predisposition for vitamin D concentration to severity of COVID-19, mediated via these genes.

In the anti-coherent case the gene *HOXC4* is detected for M05B. Modulo potential confounders, a causal relation from predisposition to take M05B to severity of COVID-19 via *HOXC4* is suggested. Interestingly, we also find an inverse causal relation. Namely, a predisposition for severe COVID-19 implying a predisposition for calcium concentration, mediated by the gene *DPP9*. For a brief discussion of the potential role played by these genes in the COVID-19 context we refer to table 3.

We also tested all cases against pathway enrichment (see Methods, *Pathway enrichment*). We detected only for RA Bonferroni significant pathways. They are listed in table 4. Note that while on the gene level we did not detect genes of significance

under the ratio test for RA, the non-significant genes combine to Bonferroni significant pathways for the trait. We observed the detected pathways already in table 1 to be co-enriched for immune system related drug classes and severe COVID-19. The ratio test implies that these pathways may play a causal role.

2.6 Multiplicative meta-analysis

We investigated how the gene-wise coherence test based on the product-normal statistic compares to results from the more simple procedure of first computing gene-wise significance for each trait (via the usual χ^2-test, *cf.*, [2]), and then testing the corresponding combined scores via the product-normal as if there was only a *single* genetic element affecting both traits, *i.e.*, to perform a novel kind of *multiplicative* meta-analysis of gene scores (*cf.*, fig. 1 for an illustration of the corresponding combined product normal p-values). Note that in doing so, we however loose the information on the direction of coherence. As before, we use jointly qq-normalized GWAS p-values to avoid the risk of unintended uplift, and only keep SNPs with consistent alleles between the GWAS pairs.

In general, we expect such a simple meta-analysis approach to generate both more false positives and false negatives. It is clear that ignoring coherence of the contributing SNP-wise effects in the gene window can create false positives. However, also false negatives may occur: In our proposed novel coherence test, introduced in the Results section, several independent weak signals may combine to a stronger signal, if the directions of association are consistent over the gene window. Such signals are invisible in the simple approach.

Figure 10 shows scatter plots for gene-wise log-transformed p-values for some of the GWAS we discussed above. Namely, the severe COVID-19 GWAS against the M05B medication class and rheumatoid arthritis GWAS. Significance thresholds for the (simple) product-normal are also indicated. We note that the boundaries of the scattered p-value distributions appear to follow product-normal significance curves, justifying our choice to take the single-element product-normal to define significance thresholds for the combined χ^2 statistic.

The left plot of figure 10 shows the co-analysis of COVID-19 and M05B GWAS signals. We observe that *CCR1* and *CCR3* are also Bonferroni significant under the simple meta-analysis test, however not *LZTFL1*. Also, while *CCR9* and *CXCR6* cross the $p < 10^{-6}$ threshold under the coherence test, not so under the simple single-element



Figure 10: GWAS gene scores, obtained separately for two GWAS using joint qq-normalization and standard χ^2 based enrichment test, plotted against each other. Each point corresponds to a gene. The gray dotted line marks the diagonal. The orange and red dashed curves mark the simple gene-wise product-normal threshold curves for significance of $p < 10^{-6}$, respectively, Bonferroni significance. The color of a gene (red and orange) indicate the full SNP-wise cross scored p-value (Bonferroni significant, respectively, $p < 10^{-6}$).

product-normal test. This confirms that the coherence test can improve the signal strength, and may lead to less false negatives. The right plot of figure 10 shows severe COVID-19 against RA. While again all Bonferroni significant genes are also Bonferroni significant under the single-element test, we observe several additional genes which appear to be Bonferroni significant under the simple test. For instance, it appears that the single element test is not able to completely resolve the TRIM gene cluster and hence may lead to false positives.

3 Discussion

The work presented here relies on the novel mathematical insight that the null distribution of the normal product of two effect size vectors with a common known covariance structure, can be expressed in terms of a weighted χ^2 difference distribution (*cf.*, eq. (2.2)). Moreover, we showed that the ratio between this product and the square of one of the vectors, which allows for testing causal relationships, also relates to this distribution. In both cases the corresponding cdf and tail probabilities can be computed efficiently with Davies' algorithm.

This insight has application for GWAS, because it enables testing for *coherent* SNP-wise effects within a gene window for two different traits. Importantly, our test

is different from an additive test looking merely for co-significance. Indeed, testing whether the signs of the effects sizes tend to be the same (or opposite) within the window, has potentially more power to identify genes that modulate both traits. Our test is statistically rigorous, properly taking into account the SNPs' correlation structure (i.e. LD), while still being able to be computed rapidly and accurately without any approximations. The assumption we have to make is that there is an underlying joint normal distribution, and that the dependency pattern of the SNPs can be jointly inferred from a reference population.

We also introduced a simplified version of the coherence test, which essentially can be understood as a novel kind of product-normal based multiplicative meta-analysis of χ^2 based gene scores. At hand of a few explicit examples we observed that for detecting highly significant genes such a simpler test for co-significance may be sufficient. Yet, we also observed that our gene-wise coherence statistics often provides added sensitivity and specificity, in particular in cases driven by several marginally significant genes.

We applied our method to identify genes with a role both in severe COVID-19 and medical conditions leading to the prescription of any of 23 medication classes. Our analysis revealed a particular strong signal of coherence between COVID-19 and M05B medications, with chemokine receptor genes *CCR1*, *CCR3* and *LZTFL1* as lead hits. The chemokine receptor of type 1 (*CCR1*) is involved in regulation of bone mineralization and immune/inflammatory response. Mouse studies suggest that this gene plays a role in protection from inflammatory response and host defence [24, 25]. The chemokine receptor *CCR3* is of importance for regulation of eosinophils, a leukocyte involved in many inflammatory pathologies [26]. In particular, mouse models suggest a complex role of *CCR3* in allergic diseases [27]. Due to their critical role in recruiting effector immune cells to the location of inflammation chemokines are suspected to be a direct cause of acute respiratory disease syndrome, a major cause of death in severe COVID-19 (*cf.*, [28]). Hence, it appears plausible that the genes singled out by our new coherence test indeed play a role for both traits.

We also observed that genetic variants in genes related to both the adaptive (HLA) and innate immune system (TRIM genes), which are more frequent in subjects treated with medications indicated for specific auto-immune disorders, tend to reduce the risk of severe COVID-19. Indeed, it is well known that auto-immune disorders are more common in females [29] who also have a smaller risk of severe COVID-19 in comparison to men [30]. While it is reasonable to expect that subjects with an increased risk for

auto-immune disorders will tend to fight off infections more efficiently, the added value of our analysis is to pinpoint specific genes that are potentially involved in mediating this effect, and which may hint towards a protective pathway and/or therapeutic targets against severe COVID-19.

We then searched for coherence signals between COVID-19 and additional GWAS traits known to be related to diseases treated with M05B drugs. This analysis suggests that RA, vitamin D and calcium concentration are traits of co-relevance for severe COVID-19. The RA trait provided further strong evidence for the relevance of *TRIM* genes of the innate immune system for a protective pathway, while vitamin D and calcium concentration traits implicated genes related to differentiation between type-1 and type-2 immune response. A possible explanation of the later could be that many patients being prescribed class M05B medication suffer from osteoporosis. Vitamin D stimulates the absorption of calcium and therefore is often prescribed to these patients in order to increase their bone mineral density [31]. Data clearly support the function of vitamin D in bone growth and maintenance. Yet, evidence for a role of vitamin D in acute respiratory tract infections [32], often observed for patients with severe COVID-19, is less clear cut: Vitamin D is thought to reduce the risk of infection, mainly due to factors involving physical barriers, cellular natural immunity and adaptive immunity [33]. Furthermore, a lack of plasma vitamin D level has been associated with the risk of infection [34]. Yet, direct conclusive evidence for its proposed protective function specific to severe COVID-19 is still lacking [35], even though possible links between severity of COVID-19 and vitamin D are actively discussed in the current literature (see for instance [36, 37, 38] and references therein). In this study we found potential genetic hints that link the severity of COVID-19 to vitamin D concentration through specific genes operating in immune response pathways, including those coding for chemokine receptors. Our results suggest that vitamin D concentration may impact the severity of COVID-19 through its influence on balancing between type-1 (inflammatory) or type-2 (anti-inflammatory) immune reactions. Interestingly, a similar mechanism of action can be associated with the top hit of our coherence analysis between COVID-19 and serum calcium levels, the Bonferroni significant gene *HGFAC*, *cf.*, table 2. In general it is known that viruses also appropriate or interrupt Ca^{2+} signaling pathways and dependent processes, *cf.*, [39]. In particular *HGFAC* up-regulates *CXCR3*, which binds the chemokine receptor *CCR3* and biases the immune reaction towards T_H1 inflammation. Note that vitamin D strongly increases the rate of absorption of calcium, which

may lead one to suspect a confounding effect. However, we detect different coherent genes for the traits, suggesting that, both, calcium and vitamin D concentrations may influence independently severity of COVID-19.

In addition, using the ratio test to perform a causal analysis, we detected a potential causal link from genetic predisposition for vitamin D deficiency to severity of COVID-19, mediated by the *ZFYVE21* gene. Note that *ZFYVE21* regulates microtubule-induced PTK2/FAK1 dephosphorylation, which is important for integrin beta-1/ITGB1 cell surface expression and thereby potentially impacts disease outcome by influencing alternative receptors to ACE2 for host cell entry, *cf.*, [40, 41].

The novel aspect of our method is its capacity to identify candidate genes mediating the causal effects, but we cannot exclude potential confounders in this causal analysis. Our localized gene-centred approach was able to single out several plausible candidates for causal genes, which have been discussed already elsewhere in the COVID-19 context, and call for further investigations. This illustrates the power of the methods developed in this work as a discovery engine. We therefore believe that they are likely to be of utility for other studies trying to identify genetic players mediating pleiotropic effects. An expected increase in the power of severe COVID GWAS and other relevant traits is likely to further refine the picture starting to emerge in our analysis.

A recent work using standard GWAS methods could not detect genetic evidence linking vitamin D to severity of COVID-19 [42]. The discrepancy to our observed effects, which are only marginally below the Bonferroni threshold (*cf.*, figure 9), is likely explained by the fact that in our approach all genes were tested individually, while in [42] the analysis was restricted to the set of SNPs proximal to known vitamin D pathway genes.

In this work we chose genes as a natural level of granularity to search for coherent effects, while our pathway analyses merely aggregate such gene-wise significance in coherence. Future work could extend the concept of coherence to entire pathways. Specifically, one can ask whether such groups of genes all tend to exhibit effects of the same sign. In fact, in our pathway analysis we already implement this for gene pairs whose SNPs are in strong LD, and should therefore be analysed jointly (so-called *meta-genes*, as introduced in the original Pascal approach [2]). It did not escape us that for multiple genes one can compute the product normal of the signed aggregate gene effects introduced in (4.8). Future work may investigate whether such *pathway coherence* could provide an efficient means to study pleiotropy at this intermediate

level and may have more power than gene-level and whole-genome coherence analysis. Similarly, our ratio-score in (2.3) could be extended to the pathway level, which would allow for performing Mendelian randomization at this level.

A limitation of our approach is that common genetic effects to different traits cannot be disentangled from potential other joint residual contributions. Yet, using GWAS data from different populations such contributions are likely to be negligible.

Throughout this study we assumed that there is no sample overlap between the GWASs under consideration and they either have similar sample sizes, or that effects of sample size differences can be compensated by qq-normalization. Further work is needed to study the potential impact of sample overlap in more detail and to develop potential corrections along the lines of [43, 44]. Also our method would profit from better ways to deal with GWAS pairs whose traits exhibit very different effect size distributions or sample sizes.

Finally, we can envisage other, more general, applications of the methods discussed in this paper. For instance, our approach could be used to correct for the auto-correlation structures in estimating the significance of correlation between time-series. Hence, the technical results of this paper may be as well of interest for other domains.

4 Methods

4.1 Linear combination of χ^2 distributions

We denote the χ^2-distribution with n degrees of freedom as $[\chi^2_n]$. It is well known that the sum of N independent $\chi^2_{n_i}$ distributed random variables v_i is again χ^2 distributed, *i.e.*,

$$\sum_i v_i \sim \left[\chi^2_{\sum_i n_i}\right] .$$

However, no closed analytic expression for the distribution Ξ of a general linear combination,

$$\sum_i a_i v_i \sim \sum_i a_i [\chi^2_{n_i}] = [\Xi] , \tag{4.1}$$

where a_i are real coefficients, is known. Nevertheless, a variety of numerical algorithms exist to compute the cdf of Ξ, denoted as F_Ξ, up to a desired precision. Perhaps most well known are Ruben's algorithm [45, 46, 47] and Davies' algorithm [48]. The latter is of most relevance for this work, as it allows for negative a_i.

With F_Ξ at hand, for a given real x a right tail probability p (p-value) can be calculated as

$$p = 1 - F_\Xi(x)\,. \tag{4.2}$$

4.2 Product-Normal distribution

A central role in this work is played by the product-normal distribution, the distribution of the product of two normal-distributed random-variables w and z. The moment generating function for joint normal samples with correlation ϱ reads [49]

$$M_{w,z}(\nu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1-(1+\varrho)\nu)(1+(1-\varrho)\nu)}}\,.$$

Our key observation is that the above moment generating function factorizes into moment generating functions of the gamma distribution, $M_\Gamma(\nu|\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{(1-\beta\nu)^\alpha}$, *i.e.*,

$$M_{w,z}(\nu) = M_\zeta(\nu|1/2, 1+\varrho)\, M_{-\xi}(\nu|1/2, 1-\varrho)\,.$$

Therefore,

$$zw \sim [\Gamma(1/2, 1+\varrho)] - [\Gamma(1/2, 1-\varrho)]\,. \tag{4.3}$$

For general parameters of the two gamma distributions the corresponding difference distribution is known as the bilateral gamma distribution [50]. (Note that the subtraction in equation (4.3) is in the distributional sense, so, even for $\varrho = 0$, the corresponding distribution does not vanish.)

Due to the well known relation between the gamma and χ^2 distributions, one can also express the product-normal distribution in terms of the χ^2 distribution introduced in the previous section. In detail,

$$zw \sim \frac{1+\varrho}{2}[\chi_1^2] - \frac{1-\varrho}{2}[\chi_1^2]\,. \tag{4.4}$$

The cdf of the product-normal can therefore be efficiently calculated using Davies' algorithm, as the distribution (4.4) is simply a linear combination of χ_1^2 distributions. A similar relation can be derived for the product distribution of non-standardized Gaussian variables, albeit in terms of the non-central χ^2 distribution, *cf.*, supplementary section I. Note that the relation (4.3) allows for a simple analytic derivation of a closed form solution for the product-normal pdf, but not for the cdf. For completeness, details can be found in the supplement, section II.

4.3 Coherence test decorrelation

We make use of the eigenvalue decompositions $U_w \Sigma_w U_w^T = \Lambda_w$ and $U_z \Sigma_z U_z^T = \Lambda_z$, with $\Lambda_.$ the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues of $\Sigma_.$, to decorrelate the elements of each set. The index I can then be written as

$$I = w^T z = w^T U_w^T U_w U_z^T U_z z = \hat{w}^T U_w U_z^T \hat{z} = \hat{w}^T K \hat{z}\,,$$

with $\hat{w} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda_w)$, $\hat{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda_z)$ and $K := U_w U_z^T$. In components, I reads

$$I = \sum_{i,j} K_{ij}\, \hat{w}_i \hat{z}_j\,.$$

For $\Sigma_w = \Sigma_z =: \Sigma$ the matrix K is the identity matrix, and the result given in equation (2.2) follows.

4.4 GWAS

As explained in the introduction, a prime example of very strong inter-element correlations are SNPs in LD. Recall that the univariate least squares estimates of the effect sizes β in genome wide association studies (GWAS) reads

$$\beta_i = \frac{1}{n} x_i^T y\,, \tag{4.5}$$

with x_i the ith column of the genotype matrix X of dimension (n, p) and y the phenotype vector of dimension n. Both x and y are mean centered and standardized. n is the number of samples and p the number of SNPs. The central limit theorem and standardization ensures that for n sufficiently large $z_i := \sqrt{n}\beta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

As a multi-variate model, we have

$$y = X\alpha + \epsilon\,,$$

with α the vector of p true effect sizes and ϵ the n-dimensional vector of residuals with components assumed to be $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and independent. Substituting the multivariate model into (4.5), yields

$$\beta_i = \frac{1}{n} x_i^T (X\alpha + \epsilon)\,.$$

As a fixed effect size model, under the null assumption that $\alpha = 0$ (no effects), we infer that

$$z_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} x_i^T \epsilon\,.$$

We can stack an arbitrary collection of such z_i to a vector z via stacking the x_i to a matrix x, such that

$$z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} x^T \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)\,, \tag{4.6}$$

with $\Sigma := \frac{1}{n} x^T x$. Note that we made use of the affine transformation property of the multi-variate normal distribution.

It is important to be aware that z is only a component-wise univariate estimation, and hence the null model (4.6) is for a collection of SNPs with effect sizes estimated via independent regressions.

We can also take the effects to be random variables themselves. Let us assume that independently $\alpha_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, h^2/p)$, with h referred to as *heritability*. We then have that

$$z_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(x_i^T X \alpha + x_i^T \epsilon \right)\,,$$

such that

$$z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, h^2 L) + \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) = \mathcal{N}(0, h^2 L + \Sigma)\,, \tag{4.7}$$

with $L := \frac{1}{np} x^T X X^T x$, and where we assumed that α and ϵ are independent. Two remarks are in order. As X runs over all SNPs, calculation of L usually requires an approximation, for instance, via a cutoff. Furthermore, the null model (4.7) requires an estimate of the heritability. Such an estimate can be obtained for via LD score regression [9].

4.5 Direction of association

The direction of effect of the aggregated gene SNPs can be estimated via the index

$$D := \sum_i z_i\,. \tag{4.8}$$

In detail, making use of the Cholesky decomposition $\Sigma = CC^T$ and the affine transform property of the multi-variate Gaussian, we have that as null

$$D \sim \mathcal{N}(0, |C|_F^2)\,, \tag{4.9}$$

with $|.|_F$ the Frobenius norm. Testing for deviations from D in the right or left tail, gives an indication of the direction of the aggregated effect size. Note that the (anti)-coherence test between pairs of GWAS introduced above is alone not sufficient to determine the direction for a GWAS pair, but requires in addition to test at least

one GWAS via (4.8) to determine the base direction of the aggregated gene effect. Furthermore, at least one GWAS needs to carry sufficiently oriented signal in the gene such that (4.8) can succeed. We will also refer to testing for deviations from (4.9) as D-test. (Note that we regularize Σ via thresholding eigenvalues smaller than 10^{-8} for the D-test.)

4.6 Ratio test derivation

Clearly, for $\Sigma_w = \Sigma_z = \Sigma$ we have that

$$\Pr(R \leq r) = \Pr(\hat{w}\hat{z} \leq r\hat{z}^2) = \Pr((\hat{w} - r\hat{z})\hat{z} \leq 0)\,.$$

We define $\hat{v} = \hat{w} - r\hat{z}$ such that $\hat{v} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (1+r^2)\Lambda)$. Note that the component-wise correlation coefficient ϱ between $\hat{v}$ and $\hat{z}$ reads

$$\varrho = -\frac{r}{\sqrt{1+r^2}}\,.$$

Hence, from eq. (4.4) and the supplementary section I, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}\hat{z} \sim &\sum_i \frac{\lambda_i\sqrt{1+r^2}(1+\varrho)}{2}[\chi_1^2] \\ &- \sum_i \frac{\lambda_i\sqrt{1+r^2}(1-\varrho)}{2}[\chi_1^2]\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

We conclude that (2.4) holds.

4.7 Pathway enrichment

The gene scores resulting from the above coherence or ratio test can be utilized instead of the usual gene scores to perform a gene set (pathway) enrichment test. A pathway is thereby tested for enrichment in coherent or causal genes for a GWAS trait pair. We follow the pathway scoring methodology of [2]. In detail, genes of a pathway which are in close proximity are fused to so-called meta-genes and coherence or ratio test based gene scores are re-computed for the fused genes. The purpose of the fusion is to correct for dependencies between the gene scores due to LD. The resulting gene scores (p-values) are qq-normalized and inverse transformed to χ_1^2 distributed random variables. This is followed by testing against the χ_n^2 distribution, with n the total number of (meta)-genes in the pathway. In this work, we tested for pathway enrichment against MSigDB 7.4 [51, 52].

4.8 SNP normalisation

As we have discussed in the Results section, the product normal combines evidence for coherent association in a multiplicative manner. A potential challenge to the method we propose arises when one of the two GWAS has associations with very low p-values. Such highly significant associations are common for GWAS with very large sample sizes. Without moderating these p-values, such associations may appear nominally co-significant as soon as the other GWAS provides a mild level of significance. We propose two possible strategies to mitigate this.

One strategy is to introduce a hard cutoff for very small SNP-wise p-values. The precise cutoff depends on the desired co-significance to achieve, and the amount of possible uplift of large p-values one finds acceptable. The dynamics is clear from figure 1. If we target a co-significance of $p = 10^{-8}$ and accept to consider SNPs with a p-value of 0.05 or less in one GWAS to be sufficiently significant, we have to cutoff p-values around 10^{-16}. While such a cutoff ensures that no SNPs with p-values above 0.05 in one GWAS can become co-significant due to very high significance (i.e. p-value below 10^{-16}) in the other GWAS, applying such a hard cutoff point hampers distinguishing differences in co-significance.

An alternative strategy is to transform all p-values, rather than only the most significant ones. For example, the so-called qq-normalisation, re-assigns uniformly distributed p-values according to the rank r, i.e. $p = (r + 1)/(N + 1)$, where N is the number of p-values. (This approach implies the strongest p-value moderation and therefore is very conservative.) The product-normal statistic in (2.2) is then computed with w and z according to the inverse χ^2 cdf of the respective p-values. Since for GWAS usually $N \simeq 10^6$, the most significant transformed p-value is $\sim 10^{-6}$. According to figure 1 the other p-value has then to be smaller than $10^{-3} - 10^{-4}$ to achieve (genome-wide) co-significance.

Since the qq-normalisation allows for combining two GWAS with significantly different signal strengths without the need to introduce an adhoc cutoff, it is our approach of choice and will be used in this work. We also prefer to apply this transformation for the ratio test in order to compensate for different signal strengths between the GWAS.

Data availability

Gene annotation can be downloaded from Ensemble BioMart https://www.ensembl.org/ (we used release 104). 1K Genome project reference panel can be obtained from https://www.internationalgenome.org/ (we used the 30x high coverage GRCh38 release of [53]). The MSigDB v7.4 database used for pathway enrichment tests can be downloaded at https://www.gsea-msigdb.org/gsea/msigdb/.

The used GWAS summary statistics are published by the authors of the cited original studies on the following websites.
BMDs: [18]
http://www.gefos.org/?q=content/data-release-2018
Calcium: [20]
https://gwas.mrcieu.ac.uk/datasets/ukb-d-30680_irnt/
COVID-19: [13]
https://www.covid19hg.org/results/r5/
(A2_ALL_eur_leave_ukbb_23andme, release 7. Jan. 2021)
Drug classes: [14]
https://cnsgenomics.com/content/data
Estradiol and Estrone: [19]
https://www.gefos.org/?q=content/estrogen-gwas-2018
RA: [22]
https://plaza.umin.ac.jp/ yokada/datasource/software.htm
Vitamin D: [21]
https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/efotraits/EFO_0004631

Code availability

The used methods have been implemented in the python package *PascalX* (version 0.0.2), available on GitHub (https://github.com/BergmannLab/PascalX) and Zenodo [15]. Default settings and the European subpopulation of the 1K Genome Project [54] as reference panel to estimate the SNP-SNP correlations Σ were used. We only considered protein coding genes and SNPs within a gene window extending $50kb$ beyond the transcription start and end position. For the coherence and ratio test we only considered SNPs with matching alleles between GWAS pairs.

Author contributions

The study has been conceived and designed jointly by both authors. D.K. implemented the methods in code and performed all data analysis. Both authors participated in writing the manuscript and approved the final manuscript prior to submission.

Competing interests statement

The authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgments We like to thank A. L. Button, A. Brümmer, Z. Kutalik and S. O. Vela for valuable comments on an earlier draft of the manuscript.

References

[1] Buniello, A. et al. "The NHGRI-EBI GWAS Catalog of published genome-wide association studies, targeted arrays and summary statistics 2019." Nucleic Acids Research, 2019, Vol. 47

[2] Lamparter D, Marbach D, Rueedi R, Kutalik Z, and Bergmann S. "Fast and rigorous computation of gene and pathway scores from SNP-based summary statistics." PLoS Computational Biology 12, e1004714, 2016

[3] de Leeuw C, Mooij J, Heskes T, Posthuma D "MAGMA: Generalized gene-set analysis of GWAS data." PLoS Comput Biol 11(4): e1004219. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004219

[4] Slatkin M. "Linkage disequilibrium–understanding the evolutionary past and mapping the medical future." Nat Rev Genet. 2008;9(6):477-485. doi.org/10.1038/nrg2361

[5] Solovieff, N., Cotsapas, C., Lee, P. et al. "Pleiotropy in complex traits: challenges and strategies." Nat Rev Genet 14, 483–495 (2013). doi.org/10.1038/nrg3461

[6] Kwang-Il Goh, Michael E. Cusick, David Valle, Barton Childs, Marc Vidal, Albert-László Barabási, "The human disease network." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences May 2007, 104 (21) 8685-8690; doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0701361104

[7] Giambartolomei C, Vukcevic D, Schadt EE, Franke L, Hingorani AD, et al. "Bayesian Test for Colocalisation between Pairs of Genetic Association Studies Using Summary Statistics." PLOS Genetics 10(5): e1004383. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004383

[8] Bulik-Sullivan B, Finucane HK, Anttila V, et al. "An atlas of genetic correlations across human diseases and traits." Nat Genet. 2015;47(11):1236-1241. doi.org/10.1038/ng.3406

[9] Bulik-Sullivan BK, Loh PR, Finucane HK, et al. "LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies." Nat Genet. 2015;47(3):291-295. doi.org/10.1038/ng.3211

[10] Shi H, Mancuso N, Spendlove S, Pasaniuc B. "Local Genetic Correlation Gives Insights into the Shared Genetic Architecture of Complex Traits." Am J Hum Genet. 2017;101(5):737-751. doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2017.09.022

[11] Toby Johnson, "Efficient Calculation for Multi-SNP Genetic Risk Scores." Presented at the American Society of Human Genetics Annual Meeting, San Francisco, November 6–10, 2012

[12] The COVID-19 Host Genetics Initiative. "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." Eur. J. Hum. Genet. 28, 715–718 (2020). doi.org/10.1038/s41431-020-0636-6

[13] COVID-19 Host Genetics Initiative. "Mapping the human genetic architecture of COVID-19." Nature (2021). doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03767-x

[14] Wu, Y., Byrne, E.M., Zheng, Z. et al., "Genome-wide association study of medication-use and associated disease in the UK Biobank." Nat Commun 10, 1891 (2019). doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09572-5

[15] Krefl, D. and Bergmann, S., "PascalX". (2021). Zenodo. doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4429921

[16] Silva-Filho JC, Melo CGF, Oliveira JL. "The influence of ABO blood groups on COVID-19 susceptibility and severity: A molecular hypothesis based

on carbohydrate-carbohydrate interactions." Med Hypotheses. 2020;144:110155. doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110155

[17] Ozato, K., Shin, DM., Chang, TH. et al. "TRIM family proteins and their emerging roles in innate immunity." Nat Rev Immunol 8, 849–860 (2008). doi.org/10.1038/nri2413

[18] Morris JA, et. al. "An atlas of genetic influences on osteoporosis in humans and mice." Nature Genetics volume 51, pages258–266(2019) doi.org/10.1038/s41588-018-0302-x

[19] Eriksson AL, et. al. "Genetic Determinants of Circulating Estrogen Levels and Evidence of a Causal Effect of Estradiol on Bone Density in Men." The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism, Volume 103, Issue 3, March 2018, Pages 991–1004, doi.org/10.1210/jc.2017-02060

[20] Neale lab, "UK Biobank calcium metabolite phenotype." Dataset ukb-d-30680_irnt from ieu open gwas project gwas.mrcieu.ac.uk/

[21] Revez JA, et. al. "Genome-wide association study identifies 143 loci associated with 25 hydroxyvitamin D concentration." Nat Commun 11, 1647 (2020). doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15421-7

[22] Okada Y, Wu D, Trynka G, et al. "Genetics of rheumatoid arthritis contributes to biology and drug discovery". Nature. 2014;506(7488):376-381. doi.org/10.1038/nature12873

[23] Giraldo MI, Hage A, van Tol S, Rajsbaum R. "TRIM Proteins in Host Defense and Viral Pathogenesis." Curr Clin Microbiol Rep. 2020 Aug 8:1-14. doi.org/10.1007/s40588-020-00150-8

[24] Gao, JL., et al. "Impaired host defense, hematopoiesis, granulomatous inflammation and type 1-type 2 cytokine balance in mice lacking CC chemokine receptor 1." J Exp Med. 1997 Jun 2;185(11):1959-68. doi.org/10.1084/jem.185.11.1959

[25] Hickey MJ, Held KS, Baum E, Gao JL, Murphy PM, Lane TE. "CCR1 deficiency increases susceptibility to fatal coronavirus infection of the central nervous system." Viral Immunol. 2007 Dec;20(4):599-608. doi.org/10.1089/vim.2007.0056

[26] Daniel J. Dairaghi, Elizabeth R. Oldham, Kevin B. Bacon,Thomas J. Schall "Chemokine Receptor CCR3 Function Is Highly Dependent on Local pH and Ionic Strength." COMMUNICATIONS— VOLUME 272, ISSUE 45, P28206-28209, NOVEMBER 07, 1997 doi.org/10.1074/jbc.272.45.28206

[27] Alison A. Humbles, Bao Lu, Daniel S. Friend, Shoji Okinaga, Jose Lora, Amal Algarawi, Thomas R. Martin, Norma P. Gerard, Craig Gerard "The murine CCR3 receptor regulates both the role of eosinophils and mast cells in allergen-induced airway inflammation and hyperresponsiveness." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Feb 2002, 99 (3) 1479-1484; doi.org/10.1073/pnas.261462598

[28] Bariaa A. Khalil, Noha Mousaad Elemam, Azzam A. Maghazachi, "Chemokines and chemokine receptors during COVID-19 infection." Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal, Volume 19, 2021, Pages 976-988, ISSN 2001-0370, doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2021.01.034

[29] Angum F, Khan T, Kaler J, Siddiqui L, Hussain A. "The Prevalence of Autoimmune Disorders in Women: A Narrative Review." Cureus. 2020;12(5):e8094. Published 2020 May 13. doi.org/10.7759/cureus.8094

[30] Peckham, H., de Gruijter, N.M., Raine, C. et al. "Male sex identified by global COVID-19 meta-analysis as a risk factor for death and ITU admission." Nat Commun 11, 6317 (2020). doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19741-6

[31] Lips P, van Schoor NM. "The effect of vitamin D on bone and osteoporosis." Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2011 Aug;25(4):585-91. doi.org/10.1016/j.beem.2011.05.002

[32] Jolliffe D, et. al., "Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory infections: systematic review and meta-analysis of aggregate data from randomised controlled trials" medRxiv, Nov. 2020 (preprint) doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.14.20152728

[33] Rondanelli M, Miccono A, Lamburghini S, et al. "Self-Care for Common Colds: The Pivotal Role of Vitamin D, Vitamin C, Zinc, and Echinacea in Three Main Immune Interactive Clusters (Physical Barriers, Innate and Adaptive Immunity) Involved during an Episode of Common Colds-Practical Advice on Dosages and on

the Time to Take These Nutrients/Botanicals in order to Prevent or Treat Common Colds." Evid Based Complement Alternat Med. 2018;2018:5813095. Published 2018 Apr 29. doi.org/10.1155/2018/5813095

[34] Merzon E, Tworowski D, Gorohovski A, Vinker S, Cohen A G, Green I, Frenkel-Morgenstern M, "Low plasma 25(OH) vitamin D level is associated with increased risk of COVID-19 infection: an Israeli population-based study." FEBS J. 2020 Sep;287(17):3693-3702. doi: 10.1111/febs.15495

[35] Vimaleswaran K S, Forouhi N G, Khunti K. "Vitamin D and covid-19" BMJ 2021; 372 :n544 doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n544

[36] Ali N. "Role of vitamin D in preventing of COVID-19 infection, progression and severity." J Infect Public Health. 2020 Oct;13(10):1373-1380. doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2020.06.021

[37] Pereira M., et. al. "Vitamin D deficiency aggravates COVID-19: systematic review and meta-analysis." Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition (2020) doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2020.1841090

[38] Murdaca G., Pioggia G. and Negrini S. "Vitamin D and Covid-19: an update on evidence and potential therapeutic implications." Clin Mol Allergy. 2020; 18: 23. doi.org/10.1186/s12948-020-00139-0

[39] Yubin Zhou, Teryl K. Frey and Jenny J. Yanga "Viral calciomics: Interplays between Ca2+ and virus." Cell Calcium. 2009 Jul; 46(1): 1–17. doi.org/10.1016/j.ceca.2009.05.005

[40] Sigrist CJ, Bridge A, Le Mercier P. "A potential role for integrins in host cell entry by SARS-CoV-2." Antiviral Res. 2020;177:104759. doi.org/10.1016/j.antiviral.2020.104759

[41] Dakal TC. "SARS-CoV-2 attachment to host cells is possibly mediated via RGD-integrin interaction in a calcium-dependent manner and suggests pulmonary EDTA chelation therapy as a novel treatment for COVID 19." Immunobiology. 2021;226(1):152021. doi.org/10.1016/j.imbio.2020.152021

[42] Guillaume Butler-Laporte, et. al. "Vitamin D and COVID-19 susceptibility and severity in the COVID-19 Host Genetics Initiative: A Mendelian randomization study" PLOS Medicine doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003605

[43] Lin DY, Sullivan PF. "Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies with overlapping subjects." Am J Hum Genet. 2009;85(6):862-872. doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2009.11.001

[44] LeBlanc M, et. al. "A correction for sample overlap in genome-wide association studies in a polygenic pleiotropy-informed framework." BMC Genomics. 2018 Jun 25;19(1):494. doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-4859-7

[45] H. Ruben, "Probability Content of Regions Under Spherical Normal Distributions, IV: The Distribution of Homogeneous and Non-Homogeneous Quadratic Functions of Normal Variables." Ann. Math. Statist. Volume 33, Number 2 (1962), 542-570.

[46] J. Sheil and I. O'Muircheartaigh, "Algorithm AS 106: The Distribution of Non-Negative Quadratic Forms in Normal Variables Journal of the Royal Statistical Society." Series C (Applied Statistics) Vol. 26, No. 1 (1977), pp. 92-98

[47] "Algorithm AS 204: The Distribution of a Positive Linear Combination of χ^2 Random Variables." Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics) Vol. 33, No. 3 (1984), pp. 332-339

[48] R. B. Davies, "Numerical Inversion of a Characteristic Function." Biometrika, Vol. 60, No. 2 (Aug., 1973), pp. 415-417

[49] C. C. Craig, "On the frequency function of xy." Ann. Math. Stat. 7 (1936) 1-15

[50] Uwe Küchler and Stefan Tappe, "Bilateral gamma distributions and processes in financial mathematics,", Stochastic Processes and their Applications, Volume 118, Issue 2, 2008, Pages 261-283, doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2007.04.006

[51] Arthur Liberzon, Aravind Subramanian, Reid Pinchback, Helga Thorvaldsdóttir, Pablo Tamayo, Jill P. Mesirov, "Molecular signatures database (MSigDB) 3.0," Bioinformatics, Volume 27, Issue 12, 15 June 2011, Pages 1739–1740, doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr260

[52] Aravind Subramanian, Pablo Tamayo, Vamsi K. Mootha, Sayan Mukherjee, Benjamin L. Ebert, Michael A. Gillette, Amanda Paulovich, Scott L. Pomeroy, Todd R. Golub, Eric S. Lander, Jill P. Mesirov "Gene set enrichment analysis: A knowledge-based approach for interpreting genome-wide expression profiles." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Oct 2005, 102 (43) 15545-15550; doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0506580102

[53] Marta Byrska-Bishop et. al., "High coverage whole genome sequencing of the expanded 1000 Genomes Project cohort including 602 trios." doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.06.430068

[54] The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium "A global reference for human genetic variation," Nature 526, 68-74 (01 October 2015) doi.org/10.1038/nature15393

[55] Yeung YS, Yip CW, Hon CC, et al. "Transcriptional profiling of Vero E6 cells overexpressing SARS-CoV S2 subunit: insights on viral regulation of apoptosis and proliferation." Virology. 2008;371(1):32-43. doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2007.09.016

[56] Navarro-Corcuera A, Ansorena E, Montiel-Duarte C, Iraburu MJ. "AGAP2: Modulating TGFβ1-Signaling in the Regulation of Liver Fibrosis." Int J Mol Sci. 2020;21(4):1400. Published 2020 Feb 19. doi.org/10.3390/ijms21041400

[57] Gargouri M, Alzwi A, Abobaker A. "Cyclin dependent kinase inhibitors as a new potential therapeutic option in management of COVID-19." Med Hypotheses. 2021;146:110380. doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110380

[58] Lokmic Z, Musyoka J, Hewitson TD, Darby IA. "Hypoxia and hypoxia signaling in tissue repair and fibrosis." Int Rev Cell Mol Biol. 2012;296:139-85. doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394307-1.00003-5

[59] Hong WX, Hu MS, Esquivel M, et al. "The Role of Hypoxia-Inducible Factor in Wound Healing." Adv Wound Care (New Rochelle). 2014;3(5):390-399. doi.org/10.1089/wound.2013.0520

[60] Lee, J.W., Ko, J., Ju, C. et al. "Hypoxia signaling in human diseases and therapeutic targets." Exp Mol Med 51, 1–13 (2019). doi.org/10.1038/s12276-019-0235-1

[61] Mirjam Kiener, Nuria Roldan, Carlos Machahua1, Arunima Sengupta, Thomas Geiser, Olivier Thierry Guenat, Manuela Funke-Chambour, Nina Hobi and Marianna Kruithof-de Julio "Human-Based Advanced in vitro Approaches to Investigate Lung Fibrosis and Pulmonary Effects of COVID-19." Front. Med., 07 May 2021 doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2021.644678

[62] Alison E. John, Chitra Joseph, Gisli Jenkins, Amanda L. Tatler "COVID-19 and pulmonary fibrosis: A potential role for lung epithelial cells and fibroblasts." Immunological Reviews, Wiley First published: 24 May 2021 doi.org/10.1111/imr.12977

[63] Pairo-Castineira, E., Clohisey, S., Klaric, L. et al. "Genetic mechanisms of critical illness in COVID-19." Nature 591, 92–98 (2021). :doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-03065-y

[64] NCBI gene database www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene/4939

[65] Jadhav NJ, Gokhale S, Seervi M, Patil PS, Alagarasu K. "Immunomodulatory effect of 1, 25 dihydroxy vitamin D3 on the expression of RNA sensing pattern recognition receptor genes and cytokine response in dengue virus infected U937-DC-SIGN cells and THP-1 macrophages." Int Immunopharmacol. 2018 Sep;62:237-243. 10.1016/j.intimp.2018.07.019

[66] Pankiv S, Alemu EA, Brech A, Bruun JA, Lamark T, Overvatn A, Bjørkøy G, Johansen T. "FYCO1 is a Rab7 effector that binds to LC3 and PI3P to mediate microtubule plus end-directed vesicle transport." J Cell Biol. 2010 Jan 25;188(2):253-69. 10.1083/jcb.200907015

[67] Miao G, Zhao H, Li Y, Ji M, Chen Y, Shi Y, Bi Y, Wang P, Zhang H. "ORF3a of the COVID-19 virus SARS-CoV-2 blocks HOPS complex-mediated assembly of the SNARE complex required for autolysosome formation." Dev Cell. 2021 Feb 22;56(4):427-442.e5. 10.1016/j.devcel.2020.12.010

[68] Wu S, Sun J. "Vitamin D, vitamin D receptor, and macroautophagy in inflammation and infection." Discov Med. 2011;11(59):325-335.

[69] Jiang, H., et al. "LZTFL1 upregulated by all-trans retinoic acid during CD4+ T cell activation enhances IL-5 production." J. Immunol. 196, 1081–1090. doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.1500719

[70] Macias MP, et. al. "Expression of IL-5 alters bone metabolism and induces ossification of the spleen in transgenic mice." J Clin Invest. 2001;107(8):949-959. doi.org/10.1172/JCI11232

[71] Kim CH, Kunkel EJ, Boisvert J, Johnston B, Campbell JJ, Genovese MC, Greenberg HB, Butcher EC. "Bonzo/CXCR6 expression defines type 1-polarized T-cell subsets with extralymphoid tissue homing potential." J Clin Invest. 2001 Mar;107(5):595-601. 10.1172/JCI11902

[72] Baeke F, Korf H, Overbergh L, Verstuyf A, Thorrez L, Van Lommel L, Waer M, Schuit F, Gysemans C, Mathieu C. "The vitamin D analog, TX527, promotes a human CD4+CD25highCD127low regulatory T cell profile and induces a migratory signature specific for homing to sites of inflammation." J Immunol. 2011 Jan 1;186(1):132-42. 10.4049/jimmunol.1000695

[73] Qin S, et. al. "The chemokine receptors CXCR3 and CCR5 mark subsets of T cells associated with certain inflammatory reactions". The Journal of Clinical Investigation. 101 (4): 746–54. doi.org/10.1172/JCI1422

[74] Loetscher P, et. al. "The ligands of CXC chemokine receptor 3, I-TAC, Mig, and IP10, are natural antagonists for CCR3." J Biol Chem. 2001 Feb 2;276(5):2986-91. doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M005652200

[75] Smit MJ, et. al. "CXCR3-mediated chemotaxis of human T cells is regulated by a Gi- and phospholipase C-dependent pathway and not via activation of MEK/p44/p42 MAPK nor Akt/PI-3 kinase". Blood. 102 (6): 1959–65. doi.org/10.1182/blood-2002-12-3945

[76] Laura J. Megeath and Justin R. Fallon "Intracellular Calcium Regulates Agrin-Induced Acetylcholine Receptor Clustering." Journal of Neuroscience 15 January 1998, 18 (2) 672-678; DOI: doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.18-02-00672.1998

[77] Chaolin Huang, Lixue Huang, Yeming Wang, Xia Li, Lili Ren, Xiaoying Gu, et al. "6-month consequences of COVID-19 in patients discharged from hospital: a cohort study" The Lancet, volume 397, issue 10270, p220-232, January 16, 2021 doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32656-8

[78] Dae-Kyum Kim, et. al., "A map of binary SARS-CoV-2 protein interactions implicates host immune regulation and ubiquitination." bioRxiv 2021.03.15.433877; doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.433877

[79] Chatterjee, P., Ponnapati, M., Kramme, C. et al. "Targeted intracellular degradation of SARS-CoV-2 via computationally optimized peptide fusions." Commun Biol 3, 715 (2020). doi.org/10.1038/s42003-020-01470-7

[80] Picchiotti N., et. al. "Post-Mendelian genetic model in COVID-19," medRxiv 2021.01.27.21250593 doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.27.21250593

[81] Davis AJ, Yan Z, Martinez B, Mumby MC. "Protein phosphatase 2A is targeted to cell division control protein 6 by a calcium-binding regulatory subunit." J Biol Chem. 2008;283(23):16104-16114. doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M710313200

[82] Friedman N, Jacob-Hirsch J, Drori Y, Eran E, Kol N, et al. (2021) "Transcriptomic profiling and genomic mutational analysis of Human coronavirus (HCoV)-229E -infected human cells." PLOS ONE 16(2): e0247128. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247128