Title: Estimating the genetically predicted effects of lifestyle risk factors, educational

attainment and Alzheimer's disease liability on weight change during midlife

Grace M. Power[1*], Jessica Tyrrell[2], Apostolos Gkatzionis[1], Si Fang[1], Jon Heron[1], George Davey

Smith[1*†], Tom G. Richardson[1,3*†]

[1] MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences,

Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK

[2] Genetics of Complex Traits, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

[3] Department of Genetics, Novo Nordisk Research Centre Oxford, Oxford, UK

*Corresponding authors: Grace M Power (grace.power@bristol.ac.uk), George Davey Smith

(kz.davey-smith@bristol.ac.uk) and Tom G Richardson (tom.g.richardson@bristol.ac.uk)

†Contributed equally as last authors

Word Count: 3,528

Abstract (290):

Background: Weight change is a major indicator of adverse health outcomes. This study aims to

examine factors contributing to weight change over a one-year interval in midlife.

Methods: Observational and one-sample Mendelian randomisation (MR) analyses were

conducted to estimate effects on weight change compared to one year previously (mean age: 56.5

years) using data from the UK Biobank study (n=453,169). Risk factors included alcohol

consumption, smoking intensity, body mass index (BMI), educational attainment and Alzheimer's

disease liability.

Results: Observational analyses indicated strong evidence of an association between greater

educational attainment and family history of Alzheimer's disease with weight loss. In contrast,

smoking intensity and higher BMI were associated with weight gain. MR analyses were consistent

with observational estimates for educational attainment and Alzheimer's disease liability on

weight loss and provided strong evidence of a genetically predicted effect between higher overall

BMI and weight gain. Whilst there was little evidence of a genetically predicted effect between

smoking intensity and weight change in those who had ever smoked, when stratified, smoking

intensity was associated with weight loss in current smokers and weight gain in previous smokers.

There was little evidence of an association between alcohol consumption and weight change in the

one-year period. Inverse probability weighting was used to account for non-random selection on

smoking and alcohol status and further stratification by smoking status, indicating that our results

were largely robust to collider bias.

Conclusions: Individuals who have been in education for longer, may have more opportunity to

reduce their weight in midlife. The effect of Alzheimer's disease liability on weight loss could be

indicative of early signs of dementia. The relationship between smoking intensity and weight

change is complex, reinforcing the importance of combining interventions aimed at controlling

weight and smoking cessation among cigarette smokers.

Key Messages:

• Observational and Mendelian randomisation analyses used in this study provide consistent

evidence that educational attainment and Alzheimer's disease liability have an effect on

weight loss over one year during midlife.

• This suggests that individuals experiencing unintentional weight loss in midlife may be at

high risk of developing Alzheimer's disease in later life.

• These results additionally demonstrate the value of Mendelian randomisation in

minimising spurious associations obtained through observational research when assessing

lifestyle risk factors prone to residual confounding, such as smoking intensity.

• Our findings show that the relationship between smoking and weight change is complex,

endorsing the notion that strategies to tackle weight control and smoking cessation should

be combined.

Key words: weight change, midlife, Alzheimer's disease, educational attainment, smoking

intensity, alcohol consumption, lifestyle risk factors, observational epidemiology, genetic

epidemiology

Abbreviations

BMI	Body mass index
IPW	Inverse Probability Weighting
MR	Mendelian randomisation
OLR	Ordinal logistic regression
UKB	UK Biobank

Background:

Weight change across the lifecourse can have major health implications (1-3). Weight gain in adulthood has been associated with increased risk of cardiometabolic disease, including type 2 diabetes and coronary heart disease (4), whereas weight loss in midlife may be an early indicator of dementia and mortality (5-9). Furthermore, lifestyle risk factors, including increased alcohol consumption and smoking intensity, have been shown to associate with weight change. Alcohol has been reported to increase weight as a consequence of excess calorie intake (10). Evidence concerning the relationship between smoking and weight change, however, is both conflicting and complex (11, 12). Such inconsistencies are likely due to other lifestyle factors, since physical inactivity, unhealthy diet and alcohol consumption are positively correlated with both adiposity and smoking behaviour (13). There is evidence indicating that smoking intensity reduces weight within current smokers, whilst having been a heavier smoker previously has been reported to lead to greater weight gain amongst previous smokers (14). Furthermore, higher body mass index (BMI) has been shown to influence lifetime smoking, smoking initiation and smoking heaviness (15). In addition, a 2013 systematic review comprising 289 observational studies assessing educational attainment and obesity, identified an inverse relationship in studies from higher-income countries (16). This review revealed an association between lower education and obesity, whilst other studies have revealed an association between higher educational attainment and reduced weight gain (17). Evident within this review is a sparsity of observational investigations that adjusted for potential confounders, further highlighting the inherent issues of residual confounding within observational research (18).

Mendelian randomisation (MR) is a technique that can be used to generate more reliable evidence

about causal effects of exposures on disease outcomes compared with observational studies (19).

This is achieved by harnessing genetic variants associated with modifiable exposures, an approach

that can be more robust to confounding factors and reverse causation than naïve observational

analyses (20, 21). MR has been successfully applied to estimate the genetically predicted effect of

biological, behavioural and socioeconomic exposures on disease risk (22-25). MR investigations

have also been extended to evaluate the genetically predicted effects of disease liability on

outcomes (26), which includes diseases that typically have a late-onset in the lifecourse, such as

dementia. Whilst latent liability to dementia can be thought of as probabilistically underlying the

binary diagnosis measure, results are therefore interpreted on the liability scale (27, 28). Within

the data employed for our investigation, participants are likely to be at different stages of disease

development and some who would never develop disease may still show influences of liability on

outcomes, emphasising the need for interpretation to be the effect of liability, not disease.

This study aims to estimate the observational and genetically predicted effects of alcohol intake,

smoking, BMI, educational attainment and Alzheimer's disease liability on weight change

compared to one year previously during midlife, using data on participants from the UK Biobank

(UKB) study (1). Initially, observational analyses will be conducted using ordinal logistic

regression (OLR). MR analyses will then be applied to compare the effects of genetically predicted

exposures with observational estimates. In doing so, we sought to develop a better understanding

of the factors that contribute to weight change in midlife to improve effective strategies in the

prevention of related adverse outcomes (29, 30).

Methods:

Data resources

Data were collected from the UKB study; a population-based cohort aged between 40-69 years at recruitment, enrolled in the United Kingdom between 2006 and 2010 (1). In depth details on data collection within UKB during clinic visits and through electronic health records, as well as genotyping, quality control and imputation have been described in detail previously (31).

All observational exposure data were collected cross-sectionally (Table S1). Smoking intensity by current smokers was assessed by number of cigarettes per day. Alcohol intake by ever drinkers was assessed by units per day, which was calculated from the NHS estimates of pure alcohol consumption per day using data collected via the UKB (32). Weekly and monthly average intake was converted to daily intake by dividing by 7 and 30, respectively. Educational attainment was derived as a continuous score using the criteria described previously by the SSGAC consortium (33). Family history of Alzheimer's disease was analysed as a binary variable indicating either or both parents reportedly having Alzheimer's disease, as well as subsequent analyses of mothers and fathers separately. The outcome variable used in this investigation was obtained from participants being asked the question "Compared with one year ago, has your weight changed?" with the response options "Yes – lost weight", "No – weight about the same" and "Yes – gained weight" which were coded 0, 1 and 2, respectively. We used to the variable containing data on previous and current smokers to stratify on smoking status in MR analyses.

Genetic risk scores

Instruments for each exposure were constructed as genetic risk scores coded additively in UKB

using the software PLINK (34). Genetic variants robustly associated with alcohol intake (35), BMI

(36), educational attainment (37) and Alzheimer's disease (38) were identified from large-scale

genome-wide association studies which did not include the UKB study. Variants were selected

based on $P<5\times10^{-8}$ and $r^2<0.001$ using a reference panel of Europeans from the 1000 genomes

project phase 3 to ensure they were independent (39). Influence on smoking is poorly captured by

the observational variable indicating number of cigarettes smoked per day (40). Thus, for smoking

intensity, we used a single variant as our instrument (rs16969968) located at the *CHRNA5* locus

which has been shown to be robustly associated with smoking heaviness (41).

Statistical analysis

OLR analyses were undertaken to calculate observational estimates of each of the five exposures

in turn on weight change compared to one year previously. Analyses were adjusted for age, sex

and the top ten principal components to account for residual population stratification in the UKB

study.

Univariable MR analyses were conducted using individual-level data by applying OLR with the

genetic instruments described above in turn on weight change compared to one year previously.

MR analyses were adjusted for the same covariates as in the observational analyses. Using one-

sample MR, as opposed to two-sample MR, allowed us to remove participants who had reportedly

never smoked or who were never drinkers. This ensured analyses were conducted accurately on

appropriate populations: ever smoked (n=150,812) and ever drunk alcohol (n=312,948), making

the modelling more intuitive.

Previous evidence has found that the effect of ever smoking on BMI weakens as time since

smoking cessation increases (41, 42). Therefore, to get an accurate estimate of smoking on weight

related outcomes, analyses should be undertaken in current smokers as a separate group.

Consequently, MR analyses of the relationship between the genetic instrument used for smoking

intensity and weight change were completed after stratifying on current (n=33,098) and previous

(n=117,714) smoking. Furthermore, conducting MR analyses in current smokers ensures

comparisons can made between MR and observational estimates, since the observational smoking

intensity variable is measured by number of cigarettes smoked per day and is therefore collected

for current smokers only.

Collider bias

We used Inverse Probability Weighting (IPW) to account for both (i) selection on smoking and

alcohol use and (ii) stratification by smoking status, both of which may have induced collider bias

into analyses. This was to ensure our estimates had accounted for unmeasured confounding and

non-random selection (43). As illustrated in Figure 1, the exclusion of never-smokers (or never-

drinkers) opens a pathway between the genetic instrument used and the outcome, weight change

compared to one year previously, via both measured and unmeasured confounders (Figure 1A).

Likewise, stratification within the ever smokers' group to investigate the relationship between

previous or current smoking on weight change may also induce bias (Figure 1B).

Figure 1A: A directed acyclic graph indicating potential collider bias encountered in this study

when selecting participants based on smoking and alcohol drinking status in the UK Biobank.

Figure 1B: A directed acyclic graph indicating potential collider bias encountered in this study

when stratifying on participants' smoking status in the UK Biobank.

IPW, an approach that uses weights to attempt to make selected participants a representative

sample of the study population, has been shown to ameliorate bias (43, 44). Here, we explain how

we have applied this method to investigate the relationship between smoking intensity and weight

change. The first stage was additionally computed to assess the association between alcohol

consumption and weight change in MR analysis.

IPW weights were derived from a logit model estimated on the whole population. The logit model

included the collider (never vs ever smokers) as the binary outcome, and risk factors for smoking

initiation as independent variables. These weights were then included in the analysis assessing the

effect of the genetic instrument used for smoking intensity on weight change in ever smokers. A

second logit model was estimated within the ever (previous vs current) smoking population. This

included risk factors for current smoking. Weights from this second model were multiplied by the

previous weights described above. These new weights were then included in the stratified analysis

assessing the effect of the genetic instrument for smoking intensity on weight change within

previous (n=106,666) and current (n=7,669) smokers. Each selected participant is now not only

accounting for themselves but for those with similar characteristics who were not selected (45).

Reduced sample sizes were a result of including additional variables in our models as data on all

variables was necessary for analyses. The first stage was additionally computed to assess the

association between alcohol consumption and weight change in MR analysis.

Sensitivity analyses

Additional sensitivity analyses were conducted using MR to apply the pleiotropy robust weighted

median and MR-Egger methods using the 'TwoSampleMR' R package (46-48). This was

computed for the exposures measuring alcohol consumption, educational attainment, BMI and

genetically predicted Alzheimer's disease to examine the robustness of results to horizontal

pleiotropy; the phenomenon where genetic variants influence multiple traits or disease outcomes

via independent biological pathways. Pleiotropy robust methods were not undertaken for smoking

intensity due to only using a single SNP instrument at the *CHRNA5* locus.

Results:

Observational analyses adjusted for age, sex and the top ten principal components to account for

residual population stratification indicated strong evidence of association between smoking

intensity in current smokers and weight gain (OR, 95% CI: 1.013, 1.010 to 1.016, P= 1×10^{-16}),

higher overall BMI and weight gain (OR, 95% CI: 1.113, 1.112 to 1.115, P<1×10^{-300}), educational

attainment and weight loss (OR, 95% CI: 0.969, 0.968 to 0.971, P<1×10^{-300}) and Alzheimer's

disease in either or both parents and weight loss (OR, 95% CI: 0.970, 0.951 to 0.990, P=0.003)

(Table 1).

Causal effect estimates from one-sample MR were similar to the observational estimates for most

exposures (Figure 2). For instance, there was strong evidence of a genetically predicted effect

between higher overall BMI and weight gain (OR, 95% CI: 1.065, 1.058 to 1.072, P=5×10^{-75}),

educational attainment and weight loss (OR, 95% CI: 0.956, 0.950 to 0.963, P=3x10^{-39}) and

Alzheimer's disease liability and weight loss (OR, 95% CI: 0.985, 0.978 to 0.991, P=7x10^{-6}). In

contrast, MR analyses provided little evidence of an effect between the genetic instrument used

for smoking intensity and weight change in those that had ever smoked (i.e., previous and current

smokers) (OR, 95% CI: 1.006, 0.991 to 1.021, P=0.5). However, upon stratifying ever smokers

into previous and current, there was evidence that smoking intensity has a genetically predicted

effect on weight loss in current smokers (OR, 95% CI: 0.964, 0.933 to 0.995, P=0.02) and weight

gain in previous smokers (OR, 95% CI: 1.017, 1.000 to 1.035, P=0.04), with strong evidence of

effect modification (P=0.004). There was little evidence of a genetically predicted effect of alcohol

intake on weight change (OR, 95% CI: 1.00, 0.993 to 1.007, P=0.9) (Table 2).

Figure 2: A forest plot comparing results from one-sample mendelian randomization (yellow) and

observational (blue) analyses with the outcome variable comprising three tiers coded 0 ("Yes –

lost weight", 1 ("No – weight about the same") and 2 ("Yes – gained weight"). Dots filled-in

indicate some to very strong statistical evidence of an association and the exposure variable

Alzheimer's disease presented on the continuous liability scale in one-sample MR and coded 0

("Alzheimer's disease in neither parent") and 1 ("Alzheimer's disease in either or both parents")

in observational analyses.

Collider bias

IPW analyses were conducted for estimates that may be biased by non-random selection. Initially

these were computed for estimates calculated within the ever smoker and alcohol consumer

groups. There was evidence of an effect between the genetic instrument used for smoking intensity

and weight change in those that had ever smoked (i.e., previous and current smokers) (OR, 95%

CI: 1.009, 1.002 to 1.016, P=0.009) and alcohol consumption and weight change in those that had

ever drunk alcohol (OR, 95% CI: 0.997, 0.989 to 1.004, P=0.371) (Table 3). Upon stratifying,

there was strong evidence of an effect between smoking intensity and weight change in those that

had previously smoked (OR, 95% CI: 1.019, 1.008 to 1.030, P=0.001) and little evidence between

smoking intensity and weight change in those that were current smokers (OR, 95% CI: 0.988,

0.948 to 1.029, P=0.6) (Table 3). Including additional variables into IPW models reduced sample

sizes and therefore impacted the precision of these estimates.

Sensitivity analyses

Findings from the two-sample MR weighted median and MR-Egger method revealed similar

trends to one-sample MR, suggesting that effects detected are unlikely to be prone to horizontal

pleiotropy (Table 4). MR leave one out sensitivity analysis showed that when 'rs12972156',

located at the *APOE* locus on chromosome 19, is left out, the effect estimates for genetically

predicted Alzheimer's disease liability on weight change compared to one year previously

attenuated but still supported an effect on weight loss (OR, 95% CI: 0.993, 0.988 to 0.998,

P=0.008).

Discussion:

In this study, results from observational analyses indicated strong evidence of an association

between four exposures (smoking intensity, BMI, educational attainment and Alzheimer's disease

family history) and weight change compared to one year previously in midlife (mean age: 56.5

years). Conversely, there was little evidence of a relationship between alcohol intake and weight

change within this lifecourse interval. Using one-sample MR, there was strong evidence of an

effect between genetically predicted BMI and weight gain, whereas genetically predicted

educational attainment and Alzheimer's disease liability provided evidence of an effect on weight

loss. MR analyses found weak evidence of a genetically predicted effect of smoking intensity and

alcohol consumption on weight change compared to one year previously in midlife, however, when

those who had ever smoked were stratified by previous and current smoking, smoking intensity

had a genetically predicted effect on weight gain and weight loss, respectively. Results from IPW

analyses, conducted to account for potential collider bias, reveal consistent directions of effect

with stronger evidence and weaker statistical evidence, respectively. This is likely a reflection of

sample size reduction in the latter.

Educational attainment in our study was associated with weight loss in midlife based on evidence

from both observational and MR analyses. An inverse association between educational attainment

and obesity has been consistently observed in studies conducted in high-income countries (16).

For instance, a prospective cohort study comprising children (n=12,150) born in Aberdeen

between 1950 and 1956 concluded educational attainment was inversely associated with adult BMI

(mean age 48 years) after controlling for childhood intelligence and other measured covariates

(49). Findings from this study were explained by fixed family factors, such as parental

socioeconomic background, intelligence and education, and school and neighbourhood

characteristics. Results for educational attainment in our study may also be partially interpreted as

a proxy for socioeconomic position. In addition to overall BMI, higher educational attainment, has

been associated with a lower increase in weight gain during adulthood in a multicentre cohort

study conducted between 1992 to 2000 across Europe (n=361,467) (17). Education, as well as

other socioeconomic factors, may influence weight-related behaviours such as diet and physical

activity, thus affecting energy balance. If health behaviours of this kind persist, this imbalance has

the potential to accumulate over time, leading to accelerated increase in weight, and therefore,

continued and greater weight gain in midlife.

Alzheimer's disease liability was a strong predictor of weight loss in both observational and MR

analyses. Importantly, using the *APOE* variant as a genetic instrument for Alzheimer's disease

liability may be less prone to misclassification than reported family history, which may explain

the narrower confidence intervals when comparing observational and MR estimates for this

exposure. This result was supported using a two-sample MR leave one out analysis undertaken.

Here we found removal of the 'rs12972156' genetic variant, located at the *APOE* locus, attenuated

the association between Alzheimer's disease liability and weight loss. Nevertheless, findings

consistently show a genetically predicted effect between Alzheimer's disease liability and weight

loss in midlife. These results are in line with previous observational research revealing that weight

loss precedes the diagnosis of dementia (5) and MR research indicating an association between a

higher polygenic risk score for Alzheimer's disease and lower BMI and body fat (50).

Findings related to alcohol consumption were not consistent with *a priori* expectations derived

from previous studies assessing long-term weight change (10). Specifically, evidence from the

literature suggesting that increase in alcohol use is associated with weight gain. This may be in

part due to our outcome measuring weight change compared to just one year previously at midlife,

assuming that on average, those that drink in this age group have been doing so for a considerable

length of time over the lifecourse. Thus, weight change as a result of drinking is likely to have had

a substantial effect already, resulting in evidence of an impact within one year challenging to

ascertain. In addition, observational analyses indicated that increased smoking intensity resulted

in weight gain. Whilst there was no evidence of an association between smoking intensity and

weight change compared to one year previously in midlife within those who had ever smoked in

one-sample MR, when this group was stratified by smokers who previously smoked and who

currently smoke, results were in line with evidence pointing to an inverse association between

current cigarette smoking and body weight, followed by weight gain after smoking cessation (11,

14, 51, 52). Again, it is important to reiterate that careful consideration is required if stratifying a

population into subgroups when conducting MR analyses, as well as observational analyses, to

evaluate when collider bias may have been introduced. We express the importance of adjusting for

this using IPW (43). These findings also highlight the potential for MR to better mitigate against

distortions resulting from residual confounding, often present in observational epidemiology (19).

It has also been established that there is a bi-directional association between heavy smoking and

BMI, outlining the added complexity of this relationship (13). Higher levels of BMI have been

reported to increase risk of smoking uptake as well as intensity of smoking (13). This highlights

the need to combine weight control and smoking cessation strategies within interventions aimed

at tackling these important public health concerns.

The association between BMI and weight gain during one year in midlife in observational and one-

sample MR analyses suggests that individuals with a higher BMI will typically continue to gain

weight at this stage in the lifecourse. Reduced metabolism levels in those with higher BMI are

likely to lead to low energy, which may discourage physical activity, further enhanced by midlife

body changes as a result of aging (53).

Strengths and limitations

Observational analyses have previously been conducted alongside MR to compare findings;

however, this study is distinctive in that it assesses a time varying outcome; weight change

compared to one year previously at midlife. This study also utilises additional sensitivity analyses

through weighted median and MR-Egger methods in two-sample MR to ensure the robustness of

univariable results to horizontal pleiotropy.

Important limitations exist in this investigation, however. Firstly, the outcome is a self-reported

measure of perceived weight change over a one-year period. Individuals with certain

characteristics, including higher overall BMI and educational attainment, may be more likely to

misreport their weight, indicating the potential for recall bias and thus differential

misclassification. For instance, those with higher educational history have been shown to be more

likely to underreport their weight, which would result in overestimated effect sizes (54). Secondly,

the outcome used is restricted since it does not demonstrate weight change over a substantial period

of time (i.e., more than one year). As discussed previously, this was a potential issue when

assessing alcohol consumption, however, additionally has an added benefit in being able to

examine recent and rapid weight change during midlife. Additionally, we do not have data on

whether an individual changed their smoking or drinking throughout the year in which we examine

their weight change. Another key limitation of this study is selection bias and thus limited

generalisability. Participants in the UKB are older, more likely to be female and less likely to live

in socially deprived areas, compared to participants in nationally representative data sources (55).

In addition, previous MR studies have revealed that longer educational duration and older

menarche have increased participation, whilst a genetic liability of neuroticism, Alzheimer's

disease and schizophrenia have reduced participation, providing further evidence for participation

bias (56). Furthermore, (i) selection on smoking and alcohol use, and (ii) stratification by smoking

status, may have induced collider bias (43, 57). Whilst IPW was conducted to account for this,

including additional variables to generate weights resulted in smaller sample sizes and thus

reduced power and precision in our IPW estimates.

Conclusion:

This investigation provides novel evidence of the effects of lifestyle risk factors, educational

attainment and Alzheimer's disease liability on weight change compared to one year previously in

midlife. Results suggest that individuals who attended higher education may have more

opportunity to help reduce weight gain during this stage in the lifecourse. At the same time,

findings may have implications for early testing for Alzheimer's disease when weight loss is

observed at midlife. In addition, the relationship between smoking and weight change is complex

with findings endorsing the idea that strategies to tackle weight control and smoking cessation

should be combined.

Acknowledgments:

We would like to thank the UK Biobank study and all participants who contributed to it, as well

as the authors of all the genome-wide association studies who made their summary statistics

available for the benefit of this work.

References:

397
398
1.   Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK Biobank: An

Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a Wide Range of Complex Diseases of

Middle and Old Age. PLOS Medicine. 2015;12(3):e1001779.

2.   Yarnell JWG, Patterson CC, Thomas HF, Sweetnam PM. Comparison of weight in

middle age, weight at 18 years, and weight change between, in predicting subsequent 14 year

mortality and coronary events: Caerphilly Prospective Study. Journal of Epidemiology and

Community Health. 2000;54(5):344.

3.   Corrada MM, Kawas CH, Mozaffar F, Paganini-Hill A. Association of Body Mass Index

and Weight Change with All-Cause Mortality in the Elderly. American Journal of Epidemiology.

2006;163(10):938-49.

4.   Wilson PW, Kannel WB. Obesity, diabetes, and risk of cardiovascular disease in the

elderly. Am J Geriatr Cardiol. 2002;11(2):119-23,25.

5.   Knopman DS, Edland SD, Cha RH, Petersen RC, Rocca WA. Incident dementia in

women is preceded by weight loss by at least a decade. Neurology. 2007;69(8):739-46.

6.   Johnson DK, Wilkins CH, Morris JC. Accelerated Weight Loss May Precede Diagnosis

in Alzheimer Disease. Archives of Neurology. 2006;63(9):1312-7.

7.   Chen C, Ye Y, Zhang Y, Pan XF, Pan A. Weight change across adulthood in relation to

all cause and cause specific mortality: prospective cohort study. BMJ. 2019;367:l5584.

8.   Hamer M, O'Donovan G. Sarcopenic obesity, weight loss, and mortality: the English

Longitudinal Study of Ageing. Am J Clin Nutr. 2017;106(1):125-9.

9.   Wong CJ. Involuntary weight loss. Med Clin North Am. 2014;98(3):625-43.

10.   Mozaffarian D, Hao T, Rimm EB, Willett WC, Hu FB. Changes in diet and lifestyle and

long-term weight gain in women and men. N Engl J Med. 2011;364(25):2392-404.

11.   Sneve M, Jorde R. Cross-sectional study on the relationship between body mass index

and smoking, and longitudinal changes in body mass index in relation to change in smoking

status: the Tromso Study. Scand J Public Health. 2008;36(4):397-407.

12.   Dare S, Mackay DF, Pell JP. Relationship between smoking and obesity: a cross-

sectional study of 499,504 middle-aged adults in the UK general population. PLoS One.

2015;10(4):e0123579.

13.   Carreras-Torres R, Johansson M, Haycock PC, Relton CL, Davey Smith G, Brennan P, et

al. Role of obesity in smoking behaviour: Mendelian randomisation study in UK Biobank. BMJ.

2018;361:k1767-k.

14.   Piirtola M, Jelenkovic A, Latvala A, Sund R, Honda C, Inui F, et al. Association of

current and former smoking with body mass index: A study of smoking discordant twin pairs

from 21 twin cohorts. PLOS ONE. 2018;13(7):e0200140.

15.   Taylor AE, Richmond RC, Palviainen T, Loukola A, Wootton RE, Kaprio J, et al. The

effect of body mass index on smoking behaviour and nicotine metabolism: a Mendelian

randomization study. Human molecular genetics. 2019;28(8):1322-30.

16.   Cohen AK, Rai M, Rehkopf DH, Abrams B. Educational attainment and obesity: a

systematic review. Obes Rev. 2013;14(12):989-1005.

17.   Rohrmann S, Steinbrecher A, Linseisen J, Hermann S, May A, Luan J, et al. The

association of education with long-term weight change in the EPIC-PANACEA cohort. Eur J

Clin Nutr. 2012;66(8):957-63.

18.   Smith GD, Ebrahim S. Data dredging, bias, or confounding. BMJ. 2002;325(7378):1437-

8.

19.   Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. 'Mendelian randomization': can genetic epidemiology

contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease?*. International Journal of

Epidemiology. 2003;32(1):1-22.

20.   Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. What can mendelian randomisation tell us about modifiable

behavioural and environmental exposures? BMJ. 2005;330(7499):1076-9.

21.   Davey Smith G, Holmes MV, Davies NM, Ebrahim S. Mendel's laws, Mendelian

randomization and causal inference in observational data: substantive and nomenclatural issues.

European Journal of Epidemiology. 2020;35(2):99-111.

22.   Swerdlow DI, Holmes MV, Kuchenbaecker KB, Engmann JE, Shah T, Sofat R, et al. The

interleukin-6 receptor as a target for prevention of coronary heart disease: a mendelian

randomisation analysis. Lancet. 2012;379(9822):1214-24.

23.   Holmes MV, Dale CE, Zuccolo L, Silverwood RJ, Guo Y, Ye Z, et al. Association

between alcohol and cardiovascular disease: Mendelian randomisation analysis based on

individual participant data. BMJ. 2014;349:g4164.

24.   Nguyen TT, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Kawachi I, Gilman SE, Walter S, Liu SY, et al.

Instrumental variable approaches to identifying the causal effect of educational attainment on

dementia risk. Ann Epidemiol. 2016;26(1):71-6.e1-3.

25.   Tillmann T, Vaucher J, Okbay A, Pikhart H, Peasey A, Kubinova R, et al. Education and

coronary heart disease: mendelian randomisation study. BMJ. 2017;358:j3542.

26.   Tudball MJ, Bowden J, Hughes RA, Ly A, Munafò MR, Tilling K, et al. Mendelian

randomisation with coarsened exposures. Genet Epidemiol. 2021;45(3):338-50.

27.   Davey Smith G. Post–Modern Epidemiology: When Methods Meet Matter. American

Journal of Epidemiology. 2019;188(8):1410-9.

28.   Edwards JH. Familial predisposition in man. Br Med Bull. 1969;25(1):58-64.

29.   Strand BH, Wills AK, Langballe EM, Rosness TA, Engedal K, Bjertness E. Weight

Change in Midlife and Risk of Mortality From Dementia up to 35 Years Later. The Journals of

Gerontology: Series A. 2017;72(6):855-60.

30.   Janssen I, Bacon E. Effect of Current and Midlife Obesity Status on Mortality Risk in the

Elderly. Obesity. 2008;16(11):2504-9.

31.   Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK Biobank

resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. Nature. 2018;562(7726):203-9.

32.   NHS. Calculating Alcohol Units [Available from: https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/alcohol-

support/calculating-alcohol-units/.

33.   Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okbay A, Kong E, Maghzian O, Zacher M, et al. Gene discovery and

polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1.1

million individuals. Nature Genetics. 2018;50(8):1112-21.

34.   Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LC, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-generation

PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. Gigascience. 2015;4:7-.

35.   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;51(2):237-44.

36.   Locke AE, Kahali B, Berndt SI, Justice AE, Pers TH, Day FR, et al. Genetic studies of

body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. Nature. 2015;518(7538):197-206.

37.   Okbay A, Beauchamp JP, Fontana MA, Lee JJ, Pers TH, Rietveld CA, et al. Genome-

wide association study identifies 74 loci associated with educational attainment. Nature.

2016;533(7604):539-42.

38.   Lambert JC, Ibrahim-Verbaas CA, Harold D, Naj AC, Sims R, Bellenguez C, et al. Meta-

analysis of 74,046 individuals identifies 11 new susceptibility loci for Alzheimer's disease. Nat

Genet. 2013;45(12):1452-8.

39.   Abecasis GR, Auton A, Brooks LD, DePristo MA, Durbin RM, Handsaker RE, et al. An

integrated map of genetic variation from 1,092 human genomes. Nature. 2012;491(7422):56-65.

40.   Munafò MR, Timofeeva MN, Morris RW, Prieto-Merino D, Sattar N, Brennan P, et al.

Association Between Genetic Variants on Chromosome 15q25 Locus and Objective Measures of

Tobacco Exposure. JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute. 2012;104(10):740-8.

41.   Millard LAC, Munafò MR, Tilling K, Wootton RE, Davey Smith G. MR-pheWAS with

stratification and interaction: Searching for the causal effects of smoking heaviness identified an

effect on facial aging. PLoS Genet. 2019;15(10):e1008353.

42.   Freathy RM, Kazeem GR, Morris RW, Johnson PC, Paternoster L, Ebrahim S, et al.

Genetic variation at CHRNA5-CHRNA3-CHRNB4 interacts with smoking status to influence

body mass index. Int J Epidemiol. 2011;40(6):1617-28.

43.   Hughes RA, Davies NM, Davey Smith G, Tilling K. Selection Bias When Estimating

Average Treatment Effects Using One-sample Instrumental Variable Analysis. Epidemiology.

2019;30(3).

44.   Gkatzionis A, Burgess S. Contextualizing selection bias in Mendelian randomization:

how bad is it likely to be? International Journal of Epidemiology. 2019;48(3):691-701.

45.   Nohr EA, Liew Z. How to investigate and adjust for selection bias in cohort studies. Acta

Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica. 2018;97(4):407-16.

46.   Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, Wade KH, Haberland V, Baird D, et al. The MR-Base

platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. Elife. 2018;7.

47.   Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid

instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. Int J Epidemiol.

2015;44(2):512-25.

48.   Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian

Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. Genet

Epidemiol. 2016;40(4):304-14.

49.   Lawlor DA, Clark H, Davey Smith G, Leon DA. Childhood intelligence, educational

attainment and adult body mass index: findings from a prospective cohort and within sibling-

pairs analysis. International Journal of Obesity. 2006;30(12):1758-65.

50.   Korologou-Linden R, Howe LD, Millard LAC, Ben-Shlomo Y, Williams DM, Smith

GD, et al. The causes and consequences of Alzheimer's disease: phenome-wide evidence from

Mendelian randomization. medRxiv. 2020:2019.12.18.19013847.

51.   Munafò MR, Tilling K, Ben-Shlomo Y. Smoking status and body mass index: a

longitudinal study. Nicotine Tob Res. 2009;11(6):765-71.

52.   Kaufman A, Augustson EM, Patrick H. Unraveling the Relationship between Smoking

and Weight: The Role of Sedentary Behavior. J Obes. 2012;2012:735465.

53.   Khandelwal S. Obesity in midlife: lifestyle and dietary strategies. Climacteric.

2020;23(2):140-7.

54.   Stommel M, Schoenborn CA. Accuracy and usefulness of BMI measures based on self-

reported weight and height: findings from the NHANES & NHIS 2001-2006. BMC Public

Health. 2009;9:421.

55.   Sekula P, Del Greco M F, Pattaro C, Köttgen A. Mendelian Randomization as an

Approach to Assess Causality Using Observational Data. Journal of the American Society of

Nephrology. 2016;27(11):3253-65.

56.   Tyrrell J, Zheng J, Beaumont R, Hinton K, Richardson TG, Wood AR, et al. Genetic

predictors of participation in optional components of UK Biobank. Nat Commun.

2021;12(1):886.

57.   Munafò MR, Tilling K, Taylor AE, Evans DM, Davey Smith G. Collider scope: when

selection bias can substantially influence observed associations. International Journal of

Epidemiology. 2018;47(1):226-35.