medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Dimensional gender diversity is associated with greater polygenic propensity for cognitive performance and interacts with other genetic factors in predicting health outcomes

Taylor R. Thomas[1], Ashton J. Tener[1], Amy M. Pearlman [2], Katherine L. Imborek [3], Ji Seung Yang[4], John F. Strang[5], Jacob J. Michaelson[1,6,7*]

1 Department of Psychiatry, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
2 Department of Urology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
3 Department of Family Medicine, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
4 Human Development and Quantitative Methodology, University of Maryland, College Park MD
5 Gender and Autism Program, Center for Neuroscience, Children's National Hospital, George Washington University School of Medicine, Washington DC
6 Iowa Neuroscience Institute, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
7 Hawkeye Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Research Center (Hawk-IDDRC), University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
***** jacob-michaelson@uiowa.edu

Abstract

Both sex and gender are characteristics that play a key role in risk and resilience in health and well-being. Current research lacks the ability to quantitatively describe gender and gender diversity and is limited to endorsement of categorical gender identities, which are contextually and culturally dependent. A multidimensional data-driven approach to characterizing gender diversity will enable researchers to advance the health of gender-diverse people by better understanding how genetic factors interact to determine health outcomes. In N = 450 independent adults with or without autism in the SPARK cohort, we used the Gender Self-Report (GSR), a self-report tool that psychometrically captures two quantitative dimensions of gender diversity: Binary, the extent to which one identifies with the binary gender opposite that of their sex at birth, and Nonbinary gender diversity, the extent to which one identifies with a neutral gender and/or both binary genders. We correlated the two GSR scores with two mental health outcomes and 20 human behavior polygenic scores in a subset of N = 450 participants. Same-sex sexual behavior polygenic scores were positively correlated with Binary ($\rho = 0.12,\ p < 0.05$) and Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.11,\ p < 0.05$). Interestingly, cognitive performance polygenic scores were also correlated with Binary ($\rho = 0.09,\ p = 0.07$) and Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.13,\ p < 0.05$). In agreement with this, an association was also observed in a larger SPARK sample (N = 3,466, with less granular gender identity data), in which the sex/gender discordant group had higher mean polygenic scores for educational attainment ($p < 0.05$). Binary and Nonbinary were positively correlated with poorer mental health, and accounting for genetic effects had minimal impact on these associations. However, when stratifying individuals by polygenic scores quartiles, we observed dramatic differences in genetic risk and resilience, with individuals in the high risk quartile for schizophrenia and bipolar polygenic risk having strong positive correlations of gender diversity with mental health, whereas the lower quartile had no significant associations. Overall, our results suggest (1) cognitive ability and gender diversity share overlapping genetic factors, (2) greater gender diversity is correlated with poorer mental health outcomes and this effect is not directly explained by neuropsychiatric polygenic risk, but rather an interaction effect, and (3) quantitatively measuring gender diversity facilitates a better understanding of the role of gender in health outcomes.

1 Introduction

Sex and gender (see Table 1 for our definitions of terms) can have major impacts on health outcomes [1]. This stems from both extrinsic factors (e.g. healthcare barriers [2, 3]) as well as biological factors, with sex and gender impinging on the underlying molecular mechanisms of disease and well-being [4]. In health research, sex is a more objective and well-defined variable than gender, which is multidimensional with binary and nonbinary components and often experienced on a continuum [5]. Gender diversity can be characterized with self-endorsement of gender identity labels

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(e.g. transgender, nonbinary, genderqueer), but these labels are contextually and culturally dependent [6]. Moreover, gender diversity, a fundamental aspect of human diversity, is not only expressed by individuals with transgender or nonbinary identities. People who identify as cisgender also exhibit variation in gender diversity and expression [7] that would be lost in studies only reporting categorical descriptors of gender identity. Therefore, a quantitative, dimensional characterization of gender that is independent of categorical gender identity self-endorsement will enable health researchers to appropriately incorporate gender diversity in their analyses.

Gender diversity is a crucial variable to include in health research, and this is particularly true in mental health and neuropsychiatric research. For instance, groups that express higher levels of gender diversity than the cisgender proportional majority, such as the LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer) community, often have greater rates of anxiety and depression and are more likely to attempt suicide [8]. Discrimination and resilience partially mediate these negative outcomes in LGBTQ+ college students [9], but the contributions of genetic factors to mental health risks and resiliences in these groups are unknown. Because an individual's personal identity influences gender, we hypothesized that gender diversity is also shaped by the brain, and is therefore susceptible to genetic influences like other human behavior traits [10]. Most behaviors are at least somewhat heritable, with genome-wide association studies (GWAS) of common genetic variants showing many loci, each of small effect, contributing additively (i.e. polygenic) [11]. These loci are often found to be associated with several behavioral traits, i.e., they are pleiotropic. To date, genetic research of gender diversity has been limited to small sample sizes with a focus on rare genetic variants [12], which limits the generalizability of the gene-behavior relationships. A reasonable proxy to gender diversity is same-sex sexual behavior (SSSB), for which a GWAS in over 400,000 participants identified five loci associated with the trait [13]. The heritability of SSSB varied by age, ranging from 0.08 to 0.25, and was positively genetically correlated with several neuropsychiatric conditions and personality traits. However, the interpretation of these genetic correlations are limited because of the possible confounding with minority stress/discrimination, meaning the positive correlation could be due to either true pleiotropy between SSSB and neuropsychiatric conditions, or could be due to individuals engaging in SSSB facing more sexual and/or gender-based discrimination that increase risk for neuropsychiatric conditions. Recent work has begun disentangling the confounding variables of genetic risk, discrimination, and mental health outcomes— a study of N = 1,146 participants found the association between discrimination (not necessarily sexual or gender-based discrimination) and anxiety was persistent after controlling for genetic liability via polygenic scores for anxiety, depression, and neuroticism [14].

We sought to investigate whether gender diversity, like SSSB, is pleiotropic with other behavioral traits like personality, neuropsychiatric conditions, and/or cognitive ability, and also how this pleiotropy might play a role in mental health outcomes. Ultimately, we believe this line of research will advance the health of gender diverse people through a greater understanding of how genetic factors interact with gender diversity in determining health outcomes. We administered a SPARK Research Match to N = 818 adults (with a subset of N = 450 having genetic data) in which the participants answered questions regarding their gender identity and sexual orientation, as well as two psychometric self-report tools. The first, the Adult Self Report (ASR) [15], is a well-established measurement of various mental health outcomes and adaptive behaviors. The second, the Gender Self-Report, is composed of 30 items that capture two quantitative dimensions of gender diversity: Binary gender diversity, the extent to which one identifies with the binary gender opposite that of their sex, and Nonbinary gender diversity, the extent to one identifies with a neutral gender and/or both binary genders. Study participants were recruited from the SPARK cohort [16], a nationwide genetic study of over 270,000 individuals with and without autism. Existing research demonstrating the common intersection of autism and gender diversity makes SPARK an ideal cohort for understanding the genetic factors that contribute to gender diversity. Previous sociological studies have shown there is an enrichment of gender diversity [17] in autistic samples compared to the general population. Likewise, general population samples of individuals identifying as transgender or nonbinary are more likely to have clinically relevant levels of autistic traits [18]. We then sought to answer the following questions in the sample with genetic data available (N = 450): First, are polygenic scores for human behavioral traits correlated with the two measures of dimensional gender diversity from the GSR? Second, are mental health outcomes correlated with gender diversity? Lastly, to what extent do polygenic scores explain and/or interact with the relationship between gender diversity and mental health outcomes? An overview of our analyses is shown in Figure 1.

2 Methods

2.1 Primary study: SPARK Research Match

SPARK [16] is a U.S.-based nationwide autism study of over 270,000 participants, in which genetic data is available for many of the participants. For the primary study we conducted a Research Match, in which independent adults, with or without autism, were invited to participate. Those who agreed and consented to participate were asked to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

complete the Gender Self Report (GSR), the Adult Self Report (ASR) [**?**], and additional questions regarding their sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression, with the final sample size N = 818. This study was approved by the University of Iowa Institutional Review Board (IRB #201611784). SPARK is approved by the Western IRB (#20151664).

2.1.1 Measures

Self-endorsed labels of gender identity and sexual orientation: Participants were able to select as many labels for gender identity and sexual orientation they found applicable. Selections of nonbinary, demigender, gender fluid, third gender, agender, gender neutral, pangender, bigender, and gender queer were categorized as nonbinary/neutral. Cisgender and transgender were each categorized separately. Participants who did not endorse any of the listed gender identities were excluded from analyses using gender identity labels (N = 77 of 818). For sexual orientation, participants selecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual, homosexual, queer, and/or polysexual were grouped as LGBQ+ and heterosexual orientation was categorized separately. Participants who did not select any of the listed sexual orientation labels were excluded from analyses using sexual orientation labels (N = 94 of 818).

Gender Self Report (GSR): The Gender Self-Report (GSR) itemset was developed through an iterative multi-input community driven process with autistic cisgender, autistic gender-diverse, and non-autistic cisgender and gender-diverse collaborators [19]; Open Science Framework Development Summary: `https://osf.io/qh25d/?view_only=c0ce41d07bca4af1b792e074d51b7ded`. A diversified recruitment approach was employed across seven separate recruitments (N = 1,654), including the current study's recruitment (N = 818), to optimize the breadth of the GSR calibration sample and enrich the sample based on the following key characteristics: autism, gender-diverse identities (binary and nonbinary), the intersection of autism and gender-diverse identities, transition age/young adult age, and female designation at birth within the entire sample and within autism, specifically. This sampling approach resulted in an overall calibration sample that was 37.5% autistic, 32.6% gender diverse, and 38.9% cisgender sexual minority. Two-dimensional graded response model with a normal-mixture latent density adequately fit the data and yielded two factors. The two factors are labeled Female-Male Continuum (F-MC) and Nonbinary gender diversity. A transformation of the F-MC values based on designated sex at birth produced Binary gender diversity values (i.e., representing the distance on the binary gender spectrum from individual's designated sex at birth). GSR calibration employed differential item functioning, an equity-based psychometric method to identify and reduce bias, in this case by age as well as autism status. Empirical reliability coefficients for response pattern EAP (expected a posteriori) scores were 0.75 for Nonbinary gender diversity and 0.85 for Binary gender diversity. GSR factors performed well across the following validation metrics: (1) construct validity; GSR factor values followed expected value patterns comparing gender identity subgroups, (2) convergent validity; GSR factor values correlated with existing gender-related measures and in expected directions, and (3) ecological validity; GSR factor values aligned with report of gender-affirming medical treatment request/receipt. The final GSR itemset is composed of 30 questions, in which participants answered: 1 = never true, 2 = sometimes true, 3 = often true, 4 = always true. The two GSR scores, Binary and Nonbinary gender diversity, were then residualized for the effects of age, sex, and autism diagnostic status in the SPARK Research Match sample (N = 818). These two scores were then used as the phenotypes in the subsequent correlation analyses in the N = 450 subset.

Adult Self Report (ASR): The Adult Self Report (ASR) [15] is a well-established self-report questionnaire of 129 items assessing a range of adaptive behaviors and mental health outcomes. The participants responds either: 0 = not true, 1 = somewhat or sometimes true, or 2 = very true or often true. Empirically based syndrome subscales can be summed to capture overall Internalizing and Externalizing problems, which were the two measures we used in our analyses. Externalizing problems is composed of aggressive behavior, rule-breaking behavior, and intrusive behavior subscales (35 items total), and Internalizing problems is composed of the anxious depressed, withdrawn depressed, and somatic complaints subscales (37 items total). From the N = 818, five participants were removed due to having 12 (approximately 10%) or more missing ASR items. In the remaining N = 813, 0.2% of the data was missing, with no item having more than five missing data points. The missing data was imputed to the median. Then, the individual items were summed for Externalizing and Internalizing problems subscales. Lastly, age and sex were residualized from the subscale totals by linear regression and then the final values were centered to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.

2.2 Secondary analysis: Larger SPARK sample

The secondary analysis used the SPARK adult background history and child background history data from the Version 7 phenotype data release. The child background history (parent-report) was filtered to individuals age 12 or older and with cognitive age level not significantly below age. This was merged with the adult background history (self-report). SPARK is approved by the Western IRB (#20151664).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2.2.1 Measures

Categorization of sex/gender discordance: If the participant's sex assigned at birth (options: Male or Female) did not match their gender (options: Male, Female, or Other) then the participant was categorized as sex/gender discordant. The cohort was then filtered to individuals in which genetic data was available that passed quality control (see next section for genotype quality control) and were not genetically related by a relatedness threshold of 0.05. The final sample size was N = 3,466 autistic individuals, N = 88 sex/gender concordant.

2.3 Genotype quality control and imputation

Version 3 Freeze (2019) and Version 4 (2020) genotypes were first merged using PLINK [20]. The merged genotypes were then lifted from hg38 to hg19 using the LiftOver tool [21]. The genotypes included 43,209 individuals and 616,321 variants that were then quality controlled using the BIGwas quality control pipeline [22], which performed the genotype quality control, sample quality control, and identification of population stratification and sample filtering due to genetic ancestry. The BIGwas default parameters were used, except for skipping Hardy-Weinberg tests and keeping related samples due to the SPARK cohort being family-based and not a general population sample (we later removed related individuals with GCTA [23] within our SPARK sample of interest). The pre-QC annotation step removed 21 variants (N = 616,299 variants remaining). The SNP QC step removed 101,600 variants due to missingness at a threshold of 0.02 (N = 514,699 variants remaining). The sample QC step removed 1,114 individuals due to missingness, 67 individuals due to heterozygosity, and 176 due to duplicates (or monozygotic twins). The population stratification step projects the remaining individuals onto the principal components (PCs) from the combined HapMap and 1000 Genomes PCs and removed individuals who are not within median $+/-$ five times the interquartile range for PC1 and PC2. This removed an additional 9,533 individuals (N = 32,422 individuals remaining). The quality controlled set of N = 514,699 variants and N = 32,422 individuals were then imputed to the TopMed [24] reference panel using the Michigan Imputation Server [25] with the phasing and quality control steps included and to output variants with imputation quality r2 $>$ 0.3. After the genotype imputation, the variants were filtered to only the HapMap SNPs (N = 1,054,330 variants) with imputation quality r2 $\geq$ 0.8 using bcftools [26]. Next, they were lifted over from hg38 to hg19 using the VCF-liftover tool (`https://github.com/hmgu-itg/VCF-liftover`) and the alleles normalized to the hg19 reference genome. Finally, the files were converted to PLINK files with N = 1,018,200 final variants.

2.4 Polygenic score calculations

Polygenic scores were calculated using LDpred2 [27] and the bigsnpr tools [28] in R [29]. Because SPARK is family-based, an external LD reference based on 362,320 European individuals of the UK Biobank (provided by the developers of LDpred2) was used to calculate the genetic correlation matrix, estimate heritability, and calculate the infinitesimal beta weights. Polygenic scores were calculated from the following genome-wide association studies performed by the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium: ADHD (2019) [30], anorexia nervosa (2019) [31], autism (2019) [32], bipolar disorder (2021) [33], major depression (2019) [34], OCD (2018) [35], and schizophrenia (2020) [36]. Polygenic scores were calculated from genome-wide association studies performed by the Social Science Genetic Association Consortium for cognitive performance (2018) and educational attainment (2018) [37] and from the UK Biobank for same-sex sexual behavior [13]. The public LDpred2 beta weights from the Polygenic Index Repository [38] were used to calculate polygenic scores for depressive symptoms [39], extraversion [40], loneliness [41], neuroticism [42], openness [43], risky behavior [44], subjective well-being [45], age at first birth [46], number of children ever born (men) [41], and number of children ever born (women) [41].

From the N = 818 Research Match participants, N = 813 also had mental health outcomes data, and N = 457 also had genetic data that passed quality control. This subset was pruned to remove related individuals using GCTA [23] with a relatedness threshold of 0.05 (N = 7 individuals removed, N = 450 remaining). Genetic principal components were re-calculated for these N = 450 participants using the `snp_autoSVD` function from the bigsnpr package [28]. The polygenic scores were residualized using linear regression for the first five genetic principal components, autism diagnostic status, sex, and age and then centered to have a mean of 0 and scaled to have a standard deviation of 1. For the N = 3,466 participants from the larger SPARK sample with sex/gender concordance data available, the same polygenic score processing was performed.

2.5 Polygenic score analyses

In the N = 450 Research Match participants, polygenic scores were correlated with the two GSR scores (Binary and Nonbinary) and the two mental health outcomes from the ASR (Externalizing and Internalizing) using Spearman

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

correlations. For the genetic liability analysis, we residualized the effects of all 20 polygenic scores from both the GSR scores and ASR scores by linear regression. In the correlations stratified by polygenic risk, we grouped people into one of three groups for each polygenic score: upper 75th quartile (N = 113), middle quartile (N = 224), and the lower 25th quartile (N = 113). We then compared Spearman correleation coefficients between the upper versus lower quartiles. We tested for GSR score by polygenic group interaction effects in association with the ASR scores with linear models: `ASR score ~ GSR score + polygenic group + GSR score:polygenic group`.

For the N = 3,466 participants from the larger SPARK sample with sex/gender concordance, t-tests were performed.

3 Results

3.1 Distribution of the GSR scores

The demographic characteristics of the SPARK cohort are shown in Table 2. Approximately one-quarter of the cohort is transgender or gender nonbinary (TGNB). The distribution of the two GSR scores are shown in Figure 2. The two GSR measures are Binary gender diversity, the extent to which one identifies with the binary gender opposite that of their sex at birth, and Nonbinary gender diversity, the extent one identifies with a neutral gender and/or both binary genders. The scores range from 0 (no gender diversity) to 1 (high gender diversity), with the mode being for both near 0 (Figure 2A). The overall trends show higher gender diversity in females (Figure 2B) and autistic individuals (Figure 2C). TGNB and non-heterosexual participants trended towards greater Binary and Nonbinary (Figure 2D and E).

3.2 Polygenic score correlations with GSR scores

The two GSR scores were correlated with twenty human behavior polygenic scores using Spearman correlations, with the correlation coefficients ρ shown in Figure 3A. As expected, higher polygenic scores for same-sex sexual behavior were significantly positively correlated with both Binary ($\rho = 0.11,\ p < 0.05$) and Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.11,\ p < 0.05$). Interestingly, higher polygenic scores for cognitive performance were positively correlated with Binary ($\rho = 0.09,\ p = 0.07$) and Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.13,\ p < 0.05$), meaning that polygenic propensity for greater cognitive performance is associated with elevated Binary and Nonbinary gender diversity. To a lesser extent, educational attainment polygenic scores were positively correlated Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.08,\ p = 0.09$), but only moderately correlated with Binary ($\rho = 0.05,\ p = 0.26$). No neuropsychiatric polygenic scores were significantly correlated with either GSR score. The strongest correlations were Binary being positively correlated with schizophrenia polygenic scores ($\rho = 0.07,\ p = 0.13$) and OCD ($\rho = 0.06,\ p = 0.22$), and Nonbinary being negatively correlated with bipolar disorder ($\rho = -0.06,\ p = 0.22$).

3.2.1 Secondary analysis of polygenic scores with sex/gender discordance in the larger SPARK sample

Because our Research Match cohort was on the smaller end for polygenic score associations, we wanted to further test the relationship between polygenic scores and gender identity in a larger sample. To do this, we used a sparse indicator of gender diversity by identifying SPARK individuals who were discordant between their sex assigned at birth with their gender. Our final sample size for this larger SPARK sample is N = 3,466 autistic participants age 13 or older, with N = 88 sex/gender discordant and the remaining N = 3,378 sex/gender concordant (see Table 3 for demographic information). T-tests for differences in mean polygenic scores were performed (Table 4). The sex/gender discordant group had significantly greater polygenic scores for number of children ever born-women ($t = 2.78,\ p < 0.05$) and educational attainment ($t = 2.09,\ p < 0.05$), and to a lesser extent cognitive performance ($t = 1.60,\ p = 0.11$).

3.3 ASR score correlations with GSR scores

We next wanted to disentangle the relationship between mental health outcomes, GSR scores, and polygenic scores in the N = 450 participants. The two mental health outcomes were the two major subscales from the Adult Self Report (ASR) [15], Internalizing problems and Externalizing problems. Internalizing problems is an overall composite score of anxious depressed, withdrawn depressed, and somatic complaints. Externalizing problems is an overall composite score of aggressive behavior, rule-breaking behavior, and intrusive behavior. We first correlated the ASR scores with the GSR scores, in which all four were significantly positively correlated (Figure 4A). Externalizing problems was positively correlated with Binary ($\rho = 0.12,\ p < 0.05$) and Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.18,\ p < 0.05$). Internalizing problems was also positively correlated with Binary ($\rho = 0.13,\ p = 0.06$) and Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.20,\ p < 0.05$).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

3.4 ASR score correlations with polygenic scores

We next correlated the ASR scores with polygenic scores (Figure 4B). Externalizing was not significantly correlated with any polygenic scores, but it approached significance for loneliness ($\rho = 0.08,\ p = 0.09$) and ADHD ($\rho = 0.07,\ p = 0.15$). Internalizing was positively correlated with neuroticism ($\rho = 0.16,\ p < 0.05$), major depressive disorder ($\rho = 0.10,\ p < 0.05$), and depressive symptoms ($\rho = 0.10,\ p < 0.05$).

3.5 ASR score correlations with GSR scores stratified by polygenic risk

We first tested if controlling for genetic liability by residualizing out the effects of all polygenic scores from the ASR scores would attenuate the positive correlations. The correlations were hardly changed, with the strongest attentuation being Externalizing problems and Nonbinary, from $\rho = 0.18$ to $\rho = 0.17$.

Lastly, we wanted to test if there were differences in the positive relationships between mental health and gender diversity between high versus low polygenic risk groups. We grouped participants into one of three groups for each polygenic score: high risk (upper 75th quartile, N = 113), middle quartile (N = 224), and the low risk (lower 25th quartile, N = 113), and then performed ASR-GSR correlations between the upper 75th quartile and the lower 25th quartile and also tested for interaction effects with linear models: `ASR score ~ GSR score + polygenic group + GSR score:polygenic group`. Figure 4C shows the ρ for GSR-ASR correlations for the upper quartile versus lower quartile polygenic risk groups, and Table 5 has the ρ difference between the two quartiles as well as the p-value for the GSR-polygenic group interaction term. Figure 4D shows four examples of the strongest interaction effects.

We observed dramatic differences in correlations when stratified by polygenic risk, most prominently with neuropsychiatric polygenic scores. The upper quartiles for anorexia, bipolar, and schizophrenia polygenic groups had the strongest correlations, whereas the lower quartiles had correlations of roughly zero. The Nonbinary-Internalizing correlation in the schizophrenia upper group was $\rho = 0.32,\ p < 0.05$ and in the lower group was $\rho = 0$, with the interaction being $\beta = 0.32,\ p < 0.05$ (Figure 4D). A similar effect was observed for the Nonbinary-Externalizing correlation— the schizophrenia upper group was $\rho = 0.27,\ p < 0.05$, and the lower group was $\rho = 0.01$, with the interaction being $\beta = 0.21,\ p = 0.12$. The Nonbinary-Internalizing correlation in the bipolar upper group was $\rho = 0.34,\ p < 0.05$, but in the lower group was $\rho = 0.07,\ p = 0.27$, with the interaction being $\beta = 0.31,\ p < 0.05$ (Figure 4D). The Binary-Internalizing correlation in the anorexia upper group was $\rho = 0.21,\ p < 0.05$ and in the lower group was $\rho = 0.01$, with the interaction being $\beta = 0.22,\ p = 0.09$.

We also observed interaction effects with cognitive, personality, and sexuality polygenic groups. Age at first birth (AFB) is positively genetically correlated with educational attainment [11]). The Binary-Internalizing correlation in the AFB upper group was $\rho = 0.03$, but the lower group (i.e. highest polygenic quartile for younger age at first birth) was $\rho = 0.25,\ p < 0.05$, with the interaction being $\beta = -0.29,\ p < 0.05$ (Figure 4D). The Binary-Externalizing correlation in the extraversion upper group was $\rho = 0.04$, but in the lower group (i.e. highest polygenic quartile for introversion) was $\rho = 0.22,\ p < 0.05$, with the interaction being $\beta = -0.24, p < 0.06$ (Figure 4D).

4 Discussion

Our analyses are the first to address the relationships of gender diversity with mental health outcomes and genetics. We leveraged two novel, dimensional measures of gender diversity, Binary and Nonbinary gender diversity, from the Gender Self-Report (GSR) in a neurodivergent sample of N = 818 adults in the SPARK autism cohort (N = 450 with genetic data). In this sample, we found greater gender diversity in female, autistic, and LGBTQ+ individuals. Due to the structure of SPARK and study recruitment, we were only able to collect data from independent adults with autism or non-autistic parents of children with autism. Therefore, the elevated gender diversity in the autistic subset should be interpreted with the major caveat that the non-autistic parents were older and presumed to adhere to more traditional gender roles. Still, these results are in line with rigorous prior research that has shown the enrichment for gender diversity in autism [17]. Intriguingly, while our results showed higher gender diversity in LGBTQ+ individuals, many people who identify as cisgender also showed evidence of gender diversity. This underscores the value of the GSR in capturing dimensional gender diversity beyond self-endorsed identities. The formation of gender identity is a complex and multi-factorial process [47], and is contextualized by numerous factors like time (e.g., age, generation), region, and culture. Additionally, the conceptualization of these identities requires understanding of how they relate to other points of reference, which can be different for some autistic people [48] who may struggle with understanding social and gender norms.

In order to identify the possible pleiotropic relationships between gender diversity and other human behaviors, we first correlated the two GSR scores with twenty behavior polygenic scores (Figure 3A). The strongest correlation was cognitive performance polygenic scores positively correlated with Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.13,\ p < 0.05$), with a similar

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

correlation with Binary ($\rho = 0.09,\ p = 0.07$). This indicates that of the genetic factors that may contribute to gender diversity, the most immediately detectable in our small sample were those related to cognitive performance, which may suggest that cognitive capacity is a necessary ingredient in the development of more complex and nuanced gender identities. We also found same-sex sexual behavior (SSSB) polygenic scores to be positively correlated with both Binary ($\rho = 0.11,\ p < 0.05$) and Nonbinary ($\rho = 0.11,\ p < 0.05$). Considering SSSB is positively correlated with several neuropsychiatric conditions [13], we expected neuropsychiatric polygenic scores to also be positively correlated with the GSR scores. Interestingly, we did not find any significant positive correlations with GSR scores and neuropsychiatric polygenic scores, although the schizophrenia polygenic score correlation with Binary approached significance ($\rho = 0.07,\ p = 0.13$). However, GSR scores were positively correlated with our two measures of mental health outcomes from the Adult Self Report(ASR): Internalizing and Externalizing problems (Figure 4A).

Considering the GSR scores were strongly positively correlated with poorer mental health but not with neuropsychiatric polygenic scores, we next sought to understand how neuropsychiatric genetic risk might interact with gender diversity in mediating these mental health outcomes. To do this, we stratified our sample into two groups for each polygenic score: high polygenic risk (above the 75th percentile, N = 113) and low polygenic risk (below the 25th percentile, N = 113). We then performed GSR-ASR correlations and compared the correlations in the high polygenic group versus the low polygenic group, and observed dramatic differences in genetic risk and resilience (Figure 4C, D). The high-risk schizophrenia and bipolar polygenic groups produced the strongest GSR-ASR correlations, whereas the low-risk groups had correlations of roughy zero. This indicates that polygenic risk for schizophrenia and bipolar interact with gender diversity (or environmental factors related to gender diversity such as discrimination and/or minority stress) in determining mental health outcomes. In other words, our findings suggest the relationship between gender diversity and mental health outcomes is not solely environmental or genetic, but rather a combination of the two. Specifically, an individual's polygenic background contributes to determining the extent that their gender diversity (and the adversity that comes with it) impacts their mental health. Note that polygenic risk and polygenic resilience are related features: Lower risk implies higher resilience, and vice versa. The polygenic group at a higher risk of poorer mental health under stress has lower resilience; while the other polygenic group, the one that with lower polygenic risk, has higher resilience against poorer mental health outcomes when under stress. This is similar to analogous research in major depressive disorder (MDD) polygenic scores— they found that the individuals in the greatest MDD polygenic risk groups were more likely to have more depressive symptoms when under stress, and those in the lowest MDD polygenic risk group were least likely/most resilient under stress [49].

4.1 Limitations

Most common genetic analyses (genome-wide association studies, heritabilities, polygenic scores) require moderate sample sizes due to the small effects of individuals common variants. Our major limitation is the small sample size, and we therefore were only powered to detect strong polygenic score correlations. Future replication work in larger samples is crucial. Additionally, age, sex, at birth, and autism diagnostic status can be confounding with the results. Autism is confounding at the genetic level due to previous work showing autism and educational attainment to be positively genetically correlated [32] and higher autism polygenic scores positively correlated with cognitive performance in a general population sample [50]. Because of our small sample size, we could only residualize out the effects of age, sex at birth, and autism diagnostic status from both the GSR scores and the polygenic scores. However, future work should analyze the interaction between autism, sex, and polygenic scores in their associations with gender diversity by performing stratified analyses on autism and sex.

4.2 Conclusion

We demonstrate that gender diversity, as captured by the Gender Self Report, has dimensional properties that share common genetic factors with cognitive performance and same-sex sexual behavior. Furthermore, we find greater gender diversity to be correlated with poorer mental health, but the relationship between gender diversity and mental health is not directly due to genetics. Rather, one's polygenic background acts as a risk or resilient mechanism in interaction with gender diversity (and/or the adversity that comes with it) in determining mental health outcomes.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to our community advisory council for all of their feedback throughout the research and writing process. We are also grateful to all of the participants and families in SPARK, the SPARK clinical sites, and SPARK staff. We appreciate obtaining access to genetic and phenotypic data for SPARK data on SFARI Base.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Data availability statement

The SPARK genetic data can be obtained at SFARI Base: `https://base.sfari.org`
The SPARK Research Match data will be available to qualified, approved researchers through SFARI Base upon publication of this article.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (MH105527 and DC014489 to JM) and the National Institute of Mental Health (R01MH100028 to JS), as well as grants from the Simons Foundation (SFARI 516716 to JM), the Clinical and Translational Science Award (KL2TR001877 to JM), the Fahs-Beck Fellow Grant to JS, and the National Institutes of Health Predoctoral training grant (T32GM008629 to TT) This work was supported by the University of Iowa Hawkeye Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Research Center (Hawk-IDDRC) through the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (P50HD103556).

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Figures and Tables

Table 1. Working definitions of terms.
Some definitions from [7] and [51].

term	definition
sex	sex recorded around the time of birth based on physiological and anatomical sex characteristics; also referred to as assigned sex, natal sex, designated sex, or recorded sex; unless otherwise indicated, instances of "sex" in this work should be understood to mean sex at birth
gender	the behavioral norms for each sex that emerge at the population level, driven by a combination of biological, social, and cultural influences
gender identity	an individual's own inner experience and personal sense of their gender— being a boy/man/male; girl/woman/female; or another gender (e.g., gender queer, gender fluid)
transgender	a gender identity describing an individual whose gender is different from their sex at birth
cisgender	a gender identity describing an individual whose gender identity aligns with their sex at birth
nonbinary	an umbrella term encompassing those whose gender identity cannot be adequately described in a male-female axis. This may specific identities such as genderqueer, agender, gender fluid, third gender, and many others.
transgender and gender nonbinary (TGNB)	a term to describe individuals whose gender differs from their sex at birth (i.e. not exclusively cisgender)
gender expression	the way in which an individual expresses aspects of their gender through physical appearance, clothing choice, accessories, and behavior. Gender expression may or may not align with one's gender identity
gender diversity	an umbrella term used to describe divergence from gender identities, norms, and/or expressions often prescribed to those of the assigned sex; this may be measured either in a categorical or a continuous manner
gender dysphoria	clinically relevant distress resulting from an incongruence between one's gender identity and assigned sex at birth
sexual orientation	the self-endorsed community labels(s) one finds representative of the gender(s) of their sexual and/or romantic attractions
neurodivergent	individuals with cognitive differences from the neuromajority in the areas of social, thinking, and/or other neurocognitive process; autism and ADHD are often considered forms of neurodivergence

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. SPARK Research Match cohort demographics.

variable	N or mean	%
total sample size	450	
age	38	
male	93	21%
autistic	198	44%
cisgender identity	295	66%
gender-diverse identity	108	24%
no gender identity label(s)	47	10%

Table 3. Larger SPARK cohort demographics for secondary analysis.

variable	N or mean	%
total sample size	3,466	
age	38	
male	2,371	68%
autistic	3,466	100%
overlap with Research Match	194	6%
sex/gender discordant	88	3%

Table 4. Polygenic score differences between sex/gender concordances in the larger SPARK cohort.
Polygenic scores were tested from mean differences between the the sex/gender discordant group (N = 88) and sex/gender concordant group (N = 3,378).

PGS	t	disc. $\bar{X}$	conc. $\bar{X}$	p
cog perf	**1.60**	**0.19**	**0.00**	**0.11**
edu attain	**2.08**	**0.24**	**-0.01**	**0.04**
dep	0.38	0.04	0.00	0.70
extra	0.31	0.03	0.00	0.76
lonely	0.28	0.03	0.00	0.78
neurot	-0.80	-0.08	0.00	0.43
open	-0.66	-0.06	0.00	0.51
risky	-0.10	-0.01	0.00	0.92
SWB	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.94
AFB	0.73	0.07	0.00	0.47
NEB men	-0.19	-0.02	0.00	0.85
NEB women	**2.78**	**0.28**	**-0.01**	**0.01**
SSSB	0.84	0.09	0.00	0.40
ADHD	-1.18	-0.12	0.00	0.24
anorexia	1.20	0.12	0.00	0.23
autism	-0.77	-0.08	0.00	0.44
bipolar	0.97	0.12	0.00	0.33
MDD	0.36	0.04	0.00	0.72
OCD	1.03	0.09	0.00	0.30
SCZ	0.90	0.10	0.00	0.37

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 5. ASR score correlations with GSR scores with polygenic interactions.
ASR-GSR correlations stratified by polygenic score group (upper 75th percentile vs. lower 25th percentile).
p diff = upper ρ - lower ρ.
p int. = p-value for GSR score by polygenic group interaction effect.

		Externalizing		Internalizing	
PGS	GSR	ρ diff.	p int.	ρ diff.	p int.
cog perf	Binary	-0.10	0.92	0.02	0.64
	Nonbinary	**-0.26**	**0.13**	-0.03	0.78
edu attain	Binary	0.03	0.26	0.02	0.94
	Nonbinary	-0.09	0.51	0.00	0.98
dep	Binary	-0.08	0.84	-0.05	0.67
	Nonbinary	0.02	0.64	-0.03	0.95
extra	Binary	**-0.19**	**0.06**	-0.04	0.66
	Nonbinary	-0.06	0.43	0.20	0.31
lonely	Binary	**-0.13**	**0.17**	-0.04	0.88
	Nonbinary	0.12	0.22	**0.20**	**0.11**
neurot	Binary	-0.05	0.97	-0.01	0.97
	Nonbinary	0.08	0.59	0.02	0.73
open	Binary	-0.12	0.59	-0.09	0.66
	Nonbinary	-0.10	0.51	-0.07	0.66
risky	Binary	-0.08	0.83	0.02	0.89
	Nonbinary	0.01	0.76	**0.25**	**0.15**
SWB	Binary	-0.07	0.87	-0.02	0.96
	Nonbinary	-0.10	0.52	0.00	0.76
AFB	Binary	-0.10	0.38	**-0.22**	**0.04**
	Nonbinary	0.07	0.48	-0.10	0.63
NEB-men	Binary	-0.02	0.35	-0.03	0.68
	Nonbinary	-0.02	0.93	-0.12	0.29
NEB-women	Binary	-0.01	0.59	0.11	0.38
	Nonbinary	0.05	0.98	0.16	0.31
SSSB	Binary	0.02	0.77	0.10	0.37
	Nonbinary	-0.14	0.46	0.10	0.38
ADHD	Binary	-0.04	0.72	-0.08	0.43
	Nonbinary	-0.09	0.70	**-0.19**	**0.06**
anorexia	Binary	0.03	0.53	**0.19**	**0.09**
	Nonbinary	0.17	0.57	0.20	0.27
autism	Binary	-0.05	0.75	-0.06	0.47
	Nonbinary	0.00	0.62	-0.02	0.93
bipolar	Binary	0.04	0.46	**0.18**	**0.14**
	Nonbinary	**0.19**	**0.09**	**0.27**	**0.02**
MDD	Binary	0.00	0.59	0.03	0.40
	Nonbinary	0.08	0.41	0.06	0.43
OCD	Binary	-0.02	0.76	0.09	0.63
	Nonbinary	0.03	0.66	-0.10	0.54
SCZ	Binary	**0.08**	**0.17**	0.03	0.34
	Nonbinary	**0.26**	**0.12**	**0.32**	**0.03**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 1. Overview.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 2. Distribution of the two Gender Self Report (GSR) scores.
A Distribution of the GSR scores in N = 450, stratified by **B** designated sex at birth, **C** autism diagnostic status, **D** gender identity: cisgender or TGNB (transgender and gender nonbinary), and **E**, sexual orientation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 3. Polygenic score correlations with the GSR scores.
A Polygenic score correlations with the GSR scores. The dotted lines represents the minimal correlation coefficient for statistical significance (nominal $p < 0.05$), which is $\rho = 0.09$. Polygenic score abbreviations: cog perf = cognitive performance, edu attain = educational attainment, dep = depressive symptoms, extra = extraversion, lonely = loneliness, neurot = neuroticism, open = openness, risky = risky behavior, SWB = subjective well-being, AFB = age at first birth, NEB = number of children ever born, SSSB = same-sex sexual behavior, ADHD = attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, MDD = major depressive disorder, OCD = obsessive compulsive disorder, SCZ = schizophrenia.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 4. Correlations and interactions between GSR scores, ASR scores, and polygenic scores
A Correlations of the GSR scores (Binary and Nonbinary) with the two ASR scores (Externalizing and Internalizing). **B** Correlations of the ASR scores with the polygenic scores. The dotted lines represents the minimal correlation coefficient for statistical significance (nominal $p < 0.05$), which is $\rho = 0.09$. **C** Correlations of the GSR scores with the ASR scores stratified by polygenic scores: the upper 75th quartile and the lower 25th quartile groups (N = 113 for each group). The dotted lines represent the minimal correlation coefficient for statistical significance for N = 113, which is $\rho = 0.18$. **E** Four examples of the GSR-ASR score correlations stratified by polygenic group. The β in text is the interaction β.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. D. Westergaard, P. Moseley, F. K. H. Sørup, P. Baldi, and S. Brunak, "Population-wide analysis of differences in disease progression patterns in men and women," *Nature Communications*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2019.
2. I. Osika Friberg, G. Krantz, S. Määttä, and K. Järbrink, "Sex differences in health care consumption in Sweden: a register-based cross-sectional study," *Scandinavian journal of Public Health*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 264–273, 2016.
3. M. Romanelli and K. D. Hudson, "Individual and systemic barriers to health care: Perspectives of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender adults.," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, vol. 87, no. 6, p. 714, 2017.
4. E. A. Khramtsova, L. K. Davis, and B. E. Stranger, "The role of sex in the genomics of human complex traits," *Nature Reviews Genetics*, vol. 20, pp. 173–190, Mar. 2019.
5. A. E. Lloyd and M. P. Galupo, "What people with normative identities believe about sex, gender and sexual orientation," *Psychology & Sexuality*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 269–280, 2019.
6. R. E. Morgan, C. Dragon, G. Daus, J. Holzberg, R. Kaplan, H. Menne, and M. Spiegelman, "Updates on terminology of sexual orientation and gender identity survey measures (fcsm 20-03)," *Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology*, 2020.
7. T. R. Thomas, D. Hofammann, B. G. McKenna, A. IR van der Miesen, M. A. Stokes, P. Daniolos, and J. J. Michaelson, "Community attitudes on genetic research of gender identity, sexual orientation, and mental health," *PLOS One*, vol. 15, no. 7, p. e0235608, 2020.
8. M. P. Marshal, L. J. Dietz, M. S. Friedman, R. Stall, H. A. Smith, J. McGinley, B. C. Thoma, P. J. Murray, A. R. D'Augelli, and D. A. Brent, "Suicidality and depression disparities between sexual minority and heterosexual youth: A meta-analytic review," *Journal of Adolescent Health*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 115–123, 2011.
9. M. R. Woodford, G. Weber, Z. Nicolazzo, R. Hunt, A. Kulick, T. Coleman, S. Coulombe, and K. A. Renn, "Depression and attempted suicide among LGBTQ college students: Fostering resilience to the effects of heterosexism and cisgenderism on campus," *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 421–438, 2018.
10. T. J. C. Polderman, B. P. C. Kreukels, M. S. Irwig, L. Beach, Y.-M. Chan, E. M. Derks, I. Esteva, J. Ehrenfeld, M. D. Heijer, D. Posthuma, L. Raynor, A. Tishelman, L. K. Davis, and International Gender Diversity Genomics Consortium, "The biological contributions to gender identity and gender diversity: Bringing data to the table," *Behavior Genetics*, vol. 48, pp. 95–108, Mar. 2018.
11. A. Abdellaoui and K. J. H. Verweij, "Dissecting polygenic signals from genome-wide association studies on human behaviour," *Nature Human Behaviour*, vol. 5, pp. 686–694, June 2021.
12. J. G. Theisen, V. Sundaram, M. S. Filchak, L. P. Chorich, M. E. Sullivan, J. Knight, H.-G. Kim, and L. C. Layman, "The use of whole exome sequencing in a cohort of transgender individuals to identify rare genetic variants," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2019.
13. A. Ganna, K. J. H. Verweij, M. G. Nivard, R. Maier, R. Wedow, A. S. Busch, A. Abdellaoui, S. Guo, J. F. Sathirapongsasuti, 23andMe Research Team, P. Lichtenstein, S. Lundström, N. Långström, A. Auton, K. M. Harris, G. W. Beecham, E. R. Martin, A. R. Sanders, J. R. B. Perry, B. M. Neale, and B. P. Zietsch, "Large-scale GWAS reveals insights into the genetic architecture of same-sex sexual behavior," *Science*, vol. 365, no. 6456, 2019.
14. A. G. Cuevas, F. D. Mann, D. R. Williams, and R. F. Krueger, "Discrimination and anxiety: Using multiple polygenic scores to control for genetic liability," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 118, Jan. 2021.
15. T. M. Achenbach and L. Rescorla, "Manual for the ASEBA adult forms & profiles," 2003.
16. P. Feliciano, A. M. Daniels, L. G. Snyder, A. Beaumont, A. Camba, A. Esler, A. G. Gulsrud, A. Mason, A. Gutierrez, A. Nicholson, *et al.*, "Spark: a us cohort of 50,000 families to accelerate autism research," *Neuron*, vol. 97, no. 3, pp. 488–493, 2018.
17. E. Hisle-Gorman, C. A. Landis, A. Susi, N. A. Schvey, G. H. Gorman, C. M. Nylund, and D. A. Klein, "Gender dysphoria in children with autism spectrum disorder," *LGBT Health*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 95–100, 2019.
18. V. Warrier, D. M. Greenberg, E. Weir, C. Buckingham, P. Smith, M.-C. Lai, C. Allison, and S. Baron-Cohen, "Elevated rates of autism, other neurodevelopmental and psychiatric diagnoses, and autistic traits in transgender and gender-diverse individuals," *Nature Communications*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2020.
19. J. F. Strang, G. L. Wallace, G. Slesaransky-Poe, and J. S. Yang, "The gender self-report (gsr)," 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

20. S. Purcell, B. Neale, K. Todd-Brown, L. Thomas, M. A. Ferreira, D. Bender, J. Maller, P. Sklar, P. I. de Bakker, M. J. Daly, and P. C. Sham, "PLINK: A tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses," *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, vol. 81, pp. 559–575, sep 2007.
21. D. Karolchik, R. Baertsch, M. Diekhans, T. S. Furey, A. Hinrichs, Y. Lu, K. M. Roskin, M. Schwartz, C. W. Sugnet, D. J. Thomas, *et al.*, "The ucsc genome browser database," *Nucleic acids research*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 51–54, 2003.
22. J. C. Kässens, L. Wienbrandt, and D. Ellinghaus, "BIGwas: Single-command quality control and association testing for multi-cohort and biobank-scale GWAS/PheWAS data," *GigaScience*, vol. 10, June 2021.
23. J. Yang, S. H. Lee, M. E. Goddard, and P. M. Visscher, "GCTA: A tool for genome-wide complex trait analysis," *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, vol. 88, pp. 76–82, Jan. 2011.
24. D. Taliun, D. N. Harris, M. D. Kessler, J. Carlson, Z. A. Szpiech, R. Torres, S. A. G. Taliun, A. Corvelo, S. M. Gogarten, H. M. Kang, *et al.*, "Sequencing of 53,831 diverse genomes from the NHLBI TOPMed program," *Nature*, vol. 590, no. 7845, pp. 290–299, 2021.
25. S. Das, L. Forer, S. Schönherr, C. Sidore, A. E. Locke, A. Kwong, S. I. Vrieze, E. Y. Chew, S. Levy, M. McGue, *et al.*, "Next-generation genotype imputation service and methods," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 1284–1287, 2016.
26. P. Danecek, J. K. Bonfield, J. Liddle, J. Marshall, V. Ohan, M. O. Pollard, A. Whitwham, T. Keane, S. A. McCarthy, R. M. Davies, *et al.*, "Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools," *Gigascience*, vol. 10, no. 2, p. giab008, 2021.
27. F. Privé, J. Arbel, and B. J. Vilhjálmsson, "Ldpred2: better, faster, stronger," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 36, no. 22-23, pp. 5424–5431, 2020.
28. F. Privé, H. Aschard, A. Ziyatdinov, and M. G. Blum, "Efficient analysis of large-scale genome-wide data with two r packages: bigstatsr and bigsnpr," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 34, no. 16, pp. 2781–2787, 2018.
29. R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2013.
30. D. Demontis, R. K. Walters, J. Martin, M. Mattheisen, T. D. Als, E. Agerbo, G. Baldursson, R. Belliveau, J. Bybjerg-Grauholm, M. Bækvad-Hansen, *et al.*, "Discovery of the first genome-wide significant risk loci for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 63–75, 2019.
31. H. J. Watson, Z. Yilmaz, L. M. Thornton, C. Hübel, J. R. Coleman, H. A. Gaspar, J. Bryois, A. Hinney, V. M. Leppä, M. Mattheisen, *et al.*, "Genome-wide association study identifies eight risk loci and implicates metabo-psychiatric origins for anorexia nervosa," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 51, no. 8, pp. 1207–1214, 2019.
32. J. Grove, S. Ripke, T. D. Als, M. Mattheisen, R. K. Walters, H. Won, J. Pallesen, E. Agerbo, O. A. Andreassen, R. Anney, *et al.*, "Identification of common genetic risk variants for autism spectrum disorder," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 431–444, 2019.
33. N. Mullins, A. J. Forstner, K. S. O'Connell, B. Coombes, J. R. Coleman, Z. Qiao, T. D. Als, T. B. Bigdeli, S. Børte, J. Bryois, *et al.*, "Genome-wide association study of more than 40,000 bipolar disorder cases provides new insights into the underlying biology," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 817–829, 2021.
34. D. M. Howard, M. J. Adams, T.-K. Clarke, J. D. Hafferty, J. Gibson, M. Shirali, J. R. Coleman, S. P. Hagenaars, J. Ward, E. M. Wigmore, *et al.*, "Genome-wide meta-analysis of depression identifies 102 independent variants and highlights the importance of the prefrontal brain regions," *Nature Neuroscience*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 343–352, 2019.
35. P. D. Arnold, K. D. Askland, C. Barlassina, L. Bellodi, O. Bienvenu, D. Black, M. Bloch, H. Brentani, C. L. Burton, B. Camarena, *et al.*, "Revealing the complex genetic architecture of obsessive-compulsive disorder using meta-analysis," *Molecular psychiatry*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 1181–1181, 2018.
36. S. Ripke, J. T. Walters, M. C. O'Donovan, S. W. G. of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, *et al.*, "Mapping genomic loci prioritises genes and implicates synaptic biology in schizophrenia," *MedRxiv*, 2020.
37. J. J. Lee, R. Wedow, A. Okbay, E. Kong, O. Maghzian, M. Zacher, T. A. Nguyen-Viet, P. Bowers, J. Sidorenko, R. K. Linnér, *et al.*, "Gene discovery and polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1.1 million individuals," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 1112–1121, 2018.
38. J. Becker, C. A. Burik, G. Goldman, N. Wang, H. Jayashankar, M. Bennett, D. W. Belsky, R. K. Linnér, R. Ahlskog, A. Kleinman, *et al.*, "Resource profile and user guide of the polygenic index repository," *Nature Human Behaviour*, pp. 1–15, 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.22.21266696; this version posted March 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

39. D. M. Howard, M. J. Adams, T.-K. Clarke, J. D. Hafferty, J. Gibson, M. Shirali, J. R. Coleman, S. P. Hagenaars, J. Ward, E. M. Wigmore, *et al.*, "Genome-wide meta-analysis of depression identifies 102 independent variants and highlights the importance of the prefrontal brain regions," *Nature Neuroscience*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 343–352, 2019.

40. S. M. van den Berg, M. H. de Moor, K. J. Verweij, R. F. Krueger, M. Luciano, A. A. Vasquez, L. K. Matteson, J. Derringer, N. Amin, S. D. Gordon, *et al.*, "Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies for extraversion: Findings from the genetics of personality consortium," *Behavior Genetics*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 170–182, 2016.

41. Neale Lab, "Uk biobank gwas - round 2," 2018.

42. M. Nagel, P. R. Jansen, S. Stringer, K. Watanabe, C. A. De Leeuw, J. Bryois, J. E. Savage, A. R. Hammerschlag, N. G. Skene, A. B. Muñoz-Manchado, *et al.*, "Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies for neuroticism in 449,484 individuals identifies novel genetic loci and pathways," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 50, no. 7, pp. 920–927, 2018.

43. M. H. De Moor, P. T. Costa, A. Terracciano, R. F. Krueger, E. J. De Geus, T. Toshiko, B. W. Penninx, T. Esko, P. A. Madden, J. Derringer, *et al.*, "Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies for personality," *Molecular Psychiatry*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 337–349, 2012.

44. R. K. Linnér, P. Biroli, E. Kong, S. F. W. Meddens, R. Wedow, M. A. Fontana, M. Lebreton, S. P. Tino, A. Abdellaoui, A. R. Hammerschlag, *et al.*, "Genome-wide association analyses of risk tolerance and risky behaviors in over 1 million individuals identify hundreds of loci and shared genetic influences," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 245–257, 2019.

45. A. Okbay, B. M. Baselmans, J.-E. De Neve, P. Turley, M. G. Nivard, M. A. Fontana, S. F. W. Meddens, R. K. Linnér, C. A. Rietveld, J. Derringer, *et al.*, "Genetic variants associated with subjective well-being, depressive symptoms, and neuroticism identified through genome-wide analyses," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 624–633, 2016.

46. N. Barban, R. Jansen, R. De Vlaming, A. Vaez, J. J. Mandemakers, F. C. Tropf, X. Shen, J. F. Wilson, D. I. Chasman, I. M. Nolte, *et al.*, "Genome-wide analysis identifies 12 loci influencing human reproductive behavior," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 1462–1472, 2016.

47. J. D. Bosse and L. Chiodo, "It is complicated: gender and sexual orientation identity in LGBTQ youth," *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, vol. 25, no. 23-24, pp. 3665–3675, 2016.

48. J. F. Strang, A. I. van der Miesen, R. Caplan, C. Hughes, S. daVanport, and M.-C. Lai, "Both sex-and gender-related factors should be considered in autism research and clinical practice," 2020.

49. Y. Fang, L. Scott, P. Song, M. Burmeister, and S. Sen, "Genomic prediction of depression risk and resilience under stress," *Nature Human Behaviour*, vol. 4, pp. 111–118, Oct. 2019.

50. T.-K. Clarke, M. Lupton, A. M. Fernandez-Pujals, J. Starr, G. Davies, S. Cox, A. Pattie, D. Liewald, L. Hall, D. MacIntyre, *et al.*, "Common polygenic risk for autism spectrum disorder (ASD) is associated with cognitive ability in the general population," *Molecular Psychiatry*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 419–425, 2016.

51. A. P. Association, "A guide for working with transgender and gender nonconforming patients," 2017.