Genetic factors affecting immune phenotypes in type 1 diabetes

Xiaojing Chu[1,2,3,+], Anna W.M. Janssen[4,+], Hans Koenen[5,+], Linzhung Chang[1], Xuehui He[5],

Irma Joosten[5], Rinke Stienstra[4,6] Yunus Kuijpers[2,3], Cisca Wijmenga[1], Cheng-Jian Xu[2,3,4],

Mihai Netea[4,7], Cees J. Tack[*4], Yang Li[*1,2,3,4]

Affiliations:

[1.] Department of Genetics, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen

[2.] Centre for Individualised Infection Medicine, CiiM, a joint venture between the Hannover Medical School and the Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research, Hannover, Germany

[3.] TWINCORE, Centre for Experimental and Clinical Infection Research, a joint venture between the Hannover Medical School and the Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research, Hannover, Germany

[4.] Department of Internal Medicine, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

[5.] Department of Laboratory Medicine, Laboratory Medical Immunology, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

[6.] Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University, the Netherlands.

[7.] Department for Genomics & Immunoregulation, Life and Medical Sciences Institute (LIMES), University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany.

[+] **Shared first authors**

* Shared last and corresponding authors

Yang Li

Yang.Li@helmholtz-hzi.de

Cees J. Tack

Cees.Tack@radboudumc.nl

Abstract:

Large inter-individual variability in immunological cell composition and function determines

immune responses in general and susceptibility to immune-mediated diseases in particular.

While much has been learned about the genetic variants relevant for type 1 diabetes, the

pathophysiological mechanisms through which these variations exert their effects are unknown.

In this study, we characterize the genetic factors influencing immune responses in patients with

type 1 diabetes. Genetic variants that determine susceptibility to T1D significantly affect T cell

composition. Specifically, the CCR5+ regulatory T cells associate with T1D through the CCR

region, suggesting a shared genetic regulation. Genome-wide quantitative trait loci (QTL)

mapping analysis of immune traits revealed 15 genetic loci that influence immune responses in

T1D. Among them, 12 have never been reported in healthy population studies, implying a

disease-specific genetic regulation. Altogether this study provides new insights into the genetic

factors that affect immunological responses in T1D.

Key words: functional genomics, type 1 diabetes, immune function

Introduction

T1D is a common, chronic, autoimmune disease, characterized by destruction of insulin-

producing beta-cells in the pancreas that results in lifelong dependence on exogenous insulin and

is associated with a high morbidity and mortality *(Atkinson et al., 2014)*. The causes and

immunological pathways responsible for the development of T1D are still incompletely

understood, which hampers the efforts to identify an etiopathogenetic treatment.

Many studies have highlighted the role of environmental, genetical, and immunological factors

in the pathogenesis of T1D*(Pociot and Lernmark, 2016; Rewers and Ludvigsson, 2016)*.

Environmental factors such as overweight, infections, microbiome composition and dietary

deficiencies have been reported as risk factors for T1D*(Rewers and Ludvigsson, 2016)*. In turn,

the immunological pathogenesis*(Cabrera et al., 2016)* of T1D includes innate inflammation and

adaptive immunity, such as enhanced T cell responses*(Hundhausen et al., 2016)*. Large genome-

wide association studies (GWAS) performed in the last two decades have underscored the

contribution of genetic polymorphisms for the susceptibility to T1D: ~60 genomic loci

associated with T1D risk have been identified (Barrett et al., 2009; Bradfield et al., 2011; Cooper

et al., 2008; Grant et al., 2009; Huang et al., 2012; Onengut-Gumuscu et al., 2015; Ram et al.,

2016). While these loci show significant enrichment in specific immune-related biological

pathways such as cytokine signaling and T cell activation*(Barrett et al., 2009; Cooper et al.,*

2008), the functional consequences of many of these loci and genetic variants are still unknown.

We thus lack the information that could link the genetic susceptibility factors to the

immunological pathways potentially important for T1D pathogenesis. The genetically-regulated

inflammatory response signature in T1D may also be relevant for the inflammatory response in

general and may become modified by the chronic hyperglycemic state.

In the present study we aimed to comprehensively describe the immunopathological

consequences of the genetic variants linked to T1D susceptibility, using a high-throughput

functional genomics approach. As a part of the Human Functional Genomics Project

(HFGP)*(Netea et al., 2016)*, we carried out deep immunophenotyping in peripheral blood

samples from a cohort of 243 T1D patients (300DM), covering cell subpopulation composition

and cytokine production upon stimulations, as proxies of immunological function. Part of the

results were compared to those obtained in a population-based cohort of 500 healthy individuals

(500FG), that successfully characterized the impact of genetic factors *(Aguirre-Gamboa et al.,*

2016; Li et al., 2016) on immune responses in healthy individuals. Here, we systematically

evaluate the genetic regulation on the immune phenotypes in T1D, and show how genetic

variation affects immune cell traits and cytokine production in response to stimulations. In total,

we identified 15 genome wide significant genomic loci (P value $< 5 \times 10^{-8}$) associated with

immune phenotypes in the 300DM cohort. Among them, 12 loci have never been reported in any

healthy population study. These data provide a deeper understanding of the immune mechanisms

involved in the pathophysiology of T1D and affecting the general inflammatory response and

may open avenues towards the development of novel diagnostics and potentially

immunotherapies.

Results

Interrelationship between immune cell counts and cytokine production in T1D.

We collected blood samples from 243 T1D patients (300DM cohort, Figure 1—figure

supplement 1), following the same methodology as previously described (Aguirre-Gamboa et al.,

2016; ter Horst et al., 2016; Li et al., 2016). The baseline characteristics of the 300DM and a

cohort of healthy individuals (500FG) are shown in Supplementary file 1. Their median age was

53.5 years (range 20-85), and they had a median diabetes duration of 28 years (range 1-71 yrs).

Hence, the cohort generally consisted of middle-aged people with long standing type 1 diabetes.

We measured 72 types of immune cells covering both lymphocytes and monocyte lineages and

10/6 (300DM/500FG) different cytokines released in response to stimulation with four types of

human pathogens in both cohorts (Figure 1A, Figure 1—figure supplement 2).

The nonmetric multidimensional scaling plot illustrates the interrelationship among immune

cells' abundance (Figure 1B), and cytokine production levels (Figure 1C) in T1D patients. We

observed a separation of the B cell subpopulations cluster from the T cell, monocyte, and NK

cell population clusters. This observation suggests that T cells, monocytes, and NK cells have

more interplay than B cells at baseline, which is consistent with our previous finding in a healthy

cohort (500FG(Aguirre-Gamboa et al., 2016)). Furthermore, cytokine features are clustered

based on their cellular origins, with a partially overlapping cluster between monocyte-derived

cytokines and T cell-derived cytokines, Figure 1C). This may suggest activation of a co-

regulatory network of monocyte-derived and T cell-derived cytokine production capacity in

T1D.

To obtain a comprehensive interaction map between immune cells and cytokines, we correlated

each of the immune cell counts with each of the cytokine production profiles (IL-1β, IL-6, TNF-

α, IL-10, IL-1RA, IL-8, MCP-1, IFNγ, IL-17, and IL-22) in response to 21 stimulations.

Cytokine levels were hierarchically clustered based on correlation coefficients with immune cell

counts (Figure 1D). In line with the functional relationship between immune cells and cytokines,

we observed positive correlations between monocyte lineages and monocyte-derived cytokines

(IL-1β, IL-6, TNF-α, IL-10, IL-1RA, IL-8, and MCP-1), as well as between T cell subsets and T

cell-derived cytokines (IFNy, IL-17, and IL-22) (indicated by red color in Figure 1D). Besides,

we found a negative correlation between monocyte-derived cytokines production in response to

four distinct types of stimulations (bacteria, fungi, non-microbial and TLR ligands) and

lymphocyte counts (blue, Figure 1D). We observed similar correlation patterns in 500FG (Figure

1—figure supplement 3). This correlation matches the findings that a high abundance at baseline

of adaptive immune cells is associated with a lower production of monocytes derived cytokines

after stimulation*(Dong Kim et al., 2007)*, which is not altered by T1D status. Overall, the inter-

relationships between immune cells and cytokines in response to stimulations are rather similar

in T1D as compared to healthy individuals.

Impact of T1D GWAS SNPs on immune phenotypes in T1D patients

Considering that T1D is a multifactorial disease with a genetic component, we tested whether the

known risk variants of T1D affect immune phenotypes and function. We firstly checked SNPs

within HLA locus in our association studies on cell proportion and cytokine production level.

Consistent with our previous findings in 500FG, we did not observe any significant associations

of HLA allelic variants in 300DM.

Non-HLA genetic loci from published GWAS studies of European background were acquired

from the GWAS-catalog (Nov 2019)*(Buniello et al., 2019)*. Among them, genetic variants in 63

independent T1D loci were present in our data, and we found that 13 out of these 63, indeed

associated with susceptibility to T1D with nominal significance (P value < 0.05) (Supplementary

file 2).

Next, we investigated whether these genetic risk loci for T1D affect immune parameters and

function. The quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plot of the association of the 63 T1D GWAS loci with

different cell types and cytokines illustrates an inflated deviation from an expected uniform

distribution (Figure 2A, Figure 2—figure supplement 1). We further tested whether this

deviation can be explained by chance by comparing the association of immune traits with T1D

GWAS SNPs with that of 1000 randomly selected independent SNPs (Figure 2B, Methods). The

p value shows that the T1D GWAS SNPs are enriched in association with T-cell traits in the

T1D cohort (P value = 0.007).

A pair-wise association analysis between T1D GWAS loci and immune phenotypes shows that

261 out of 269 immune cell phenotypes and 53 out of 55 cytokine-stimulation pairs are

suggestively associated with at least one T1D GWAS locus (P value < 0.05, Supplementary files

3, 4). We further applied a permutation-based approach to test whether immune phenotypes were

significantly influenced by the accumulative effects of these 63 GWAS loci (Methods).

Compared to random sets of independent SNPs, the 63 T1D GWAS loci explain significantly

more variance of 27 cell sub proportions and 15 cytokine production traits (P value < 0.05,

Figure 2C, Figure 2—figure supplement 2A, B). As shown in the heatmap (Figure 2C,

arrowhead), a T1D risk allele rs11574435-T, in strong LD ($r^2 = 0.95$) with the T1D GWAS SNP

rs113010081*(Onengut-Gumuscu et al., 2015)*, is associated with higher percentage of many

CCR5+ CD4+ T-cell traits and lower percentage of CCR5- CD4+ T-cell traits. Chemokine

signaling pathways regulate the migration of cells from the circulation (PBMCs) to the tissue

(pancreases).

To further validate the importance of chemokine signaling mediated by *CCR5* in T1D, we

illustrated the transcriptional changes on *CCR5* and its corresponding ligand genes using publicly

available data from transcriptome analysis in PBMCs and pancreatic tissue from T1D patients

and controls *(Planas et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2015)*(See also Methods), and found significant

expression changes of *CCR5*, *CCL5*, and *CCL4* in T1D patients, suggesting the involvement of

this chemokine ligand - chemokine receptor pathway (Figure 3A). Besides, another top SNP-

rs35092096 within the *CCR* genes region has the strongest effects on many CCR5 Tregs

proportions in T1D. For example, the minor allele T in rs35092096 associates with a higher ratio

of CCR6+CCR7-CCR5+ Tregs/ CCR6+ T regs (Figure 3B, C). Together with the observed

regulation from a GWAS locus within the *CCR* region on CCR6+CCR7-CCR5+ Tregs

proportion, we tested whether CCR6+CCR7-CCR5+ Tregs and T1D shared the same causal

variants/genomic regions by integrating the cell proportion QTL of CCR6+CCR7-CCR5+ Tregs

and the latest T1D GWAS profile using colocalization analysis*(Giambartolomei et al., 2014)*.

The result strongly supports that CCR6+CCR7-CCR5+ Tregs share the same regulatory genomic

region with T1D, although the causal SNP might be different (Figure 3D, H3 = 0.95).

Altogether, these results support a role of the *CCR* region on Tregs function in the pathogenesis

of T1D.

Overall, we observed that T1D GWAS loci influence immune cell proportion and cytokine

production capacity, again stressing the importance of T cell immunity in the genetic regulation

of T1D.

Genetic regulation of immune phenotypes in T1D

To further explore potential genetic regulation of immune phenotypes on the whole-genome

level, we performed quantitative trait loci (QTL) mapping in 300DM. We identified nine

genome-wide significant QTLs (P value < 5×10^{-8}) associated with immune cell proportion,

including four associated with T cell subpopulations expressing specific chemokine receptors

(e.g., rs35092096 and rs7614884) (Figure 4A, top and middle panels, Supplementary file 5). A

pathway analysis of the cell proportion QTLs shows significant enrichment in chemokine and

cytokine signaling-related biological pathways (FDR < 0.05, Figure 4—figure supplement 1A),

highlighting the effects of immune signaling genes in cell proportion regulation.

In parallel, we detected six significant genomic loci associated with cytokine production in

response to stimulations by QTL mapping in 300DM (Figure 4A, bottom panel, Supplementary

file 5). TLR-related pathways significantly enrich cytokine production QTLs (FDR < 0.05,

Figure 4—figure supplement 1B). A missense variant, rs5743618, on the *TLR1* gene, affects IL-6

production in response to *S.pneumoniae* in PBMC. Previously, we observed the strong effect of

the TLR locus on cytokine levels in controls*(Li et al., 2016)*. Our results support the reported

function of TLRs in detecting pathogens (including bacterial) and triggering the release of

inflammatory cytokines*(Fitzgerald and Kagan, 2020)*.

Next, to identify the consistent immune phenotype QTLs within T1D patients and healthy

individuals, and to expand our understanding on genetic regulation of immune phenotypes, we

applied a meta-analysis by integrating the obtained QTLs from the 300DM and 500FG cohorts.

In total, we newly identified ten genetic loci that were associated with immune cell proportion

(Figure 4A, top panel, colored in red) and three genetic loci that were associated with cytokine

production (Figure 4A, bottom panel, colored in red), including a *CD5* locus significantly

associated with IgD+ CD5++ proportion in B cells (Supplementary file 5). This may be

important as recent studies report the relevance of IgD+ CD5++ B cells in T1D*(Saxena et al.,*

2017) as well as within other autoimmune diseases such as Graves' disease*(van der Weerd et al.,*

2013).

To summarize, we identified 28 genetic loci associated with either immune cell traits or cytokine

production phenotypes. Among them, the genes within 11 loci (+- 250kb window) are druggable

according to public drug database*(Finan et al., 2017),* including *COL13A1*, *CCR* family genes,

ROR2, *NOS1*, *IL-10*, *IL-6*, *STK33*, *NELL1*, *FCGR2A*, *CD5* and *TLR1* (Supplementary file 5).

Some of these genes are already therapeutic targets in other autoimmune diseases, such as the

STK33 inhibitor for rheumatoid arthritis treatment*(Rolf et al., 2015)*.

It is also worth mentioning that, as far as we know, 12 out of the 28 significant loci have never

been reported in other healthy individual population cohorts according to records in

PhenoScanner V2 (Kamat et al., 2019) (P value $< 1 \times 10^{-5}$, November, 2019), neither were they

identified in the 500FG cohort (P value < 0.05). An example of a T1D specific locus is that

rs4744112 located on chromosome 9 has an influence on CCR6+CXCR3+CCR4- Th1 like

helper proportion (Figure 4B), with minor allele G leading to a decrease in these cells relative to

major allele T (Figure 4C). rs4744112 is located within the transcriptional starting site (TSS) and

enhancer regions*(Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium et al., 2015)* of *ROR2*.

Functional Clues from the Associated Variants in T1D patients

In order to understand the mechanism behind the genetic regulations of immune response in

T1D, we next explored the function of identified genetic factors of immune phenotypes. We

noticed that SNPs within the 28 immune parameter QTLs are mostly located in the intergenic

and intronic region (Figure 4—figure supplement 2), suggesting that identified genetic variants

influence immune phenotypes through regulatory effects rather than through protein structure

alteration. Moreover, seven out of 28 loci influence blood gene expression in public

databases*(Carithers and Moore, 2015; Westra et al., 2013)* (Supplementary file 5) including

rs7512140: FCGR2B/FCRLB, rs35092096: CCR1/CCR3, rs4744112: ROR2/SPTLC1,

rs10840031: TRIM66, rs800139: C11orf21, rs1518110: IL10 and rs56350303: AC091814.2.

These indicate the potential functional genes behind the identified genetic loci.

Discussion

The present study applies a high-throughput functional genomics approach to identify the

association between genetic factors and the inflammatory phenotype in patients with T1D. The

results confirm a correlation between baseline immune cell populations and ex vivo cytokine

production in response to bacteria, fungi, non-microbial and TLR ligand stimulations. We

provide evidence for a direct link between T1D GWAS loci and immune functionality,

particularly on circulating T cell subpopulations. We show that T cell alteration is largely driven

by T1D genetics, while B cells do not show a significant association with T1D GWAS loci. The

association between the proportion of CCR5+ Tregs and T1D susceptibility through CCR genes

suggests that T1D associated genetic variants contribute to immune function alteration through

an accumulative effect. Finally, out of 28 genome-wide significant genetic loci regulating

immune cell proportions and cytokine production, we identified 12 immune phenotype QTLs

specific to 300DM. We also found 11 druggable genes as candidates for therapeutic intervention.

Altogether, this study provides several novel insights into the genetic variability of immune traits

in T1D.

Our finding of a correlation between baseline immune cells and cytokine production in response

to bacteria, fungi, non-microbial and TLR ligand stimulations, suggests that steady-state immune

cell abundance and alteration of immune cell proportion also affects immune response. This is in

line with earlier findings on the regulation between immune cells and cytokine production*(Dong*

Kim et al., 2007). This finding has two important consequences: the immune response variability

could be partly explained by variation in steady-state, and treatment of steady-state immune cells

before stimulation could also influence immune response after stimulation.

Studies comparing T1D patients and healthy controls show that immune-related genes are

physically located in T1D loci or differentially expressed. More studies highlight the importance

of T cell immunity in T1D pathology*(Farh et al., 2015).* In our study, we provide evidence for a

direct link between T1D GWAS loci to immune functionality, particularly on circulating T cell

subpopulations. We show that T cell alteration is largely genetically driven, while, interestingly,

B cells do not show a significant association with T1D GWAS loci. It is thus tempting to

speculate that the occurrence of auto-antibodies in T1D patients have limited pathophysiological

relevance, but are merely markers of an autoimmune process mainly driven by T-cells as

suggested before (Martin et al., 2001).

Importantly, we reveal that the effects of different GWAS loci on immune phenotypes vary.

Despite the strong effects of the CCR locus (mean absolute effect sizes = 0.017 (cell proportion),

0.15 (cytokine production)), we observed much weaker individual effects from other T1D

GWAS loci on immune cell proportion parameters (mean absolute effect size = 0.0060) and/or

cytokine production (mean absolute effect size = 0.10) (Figure 2C and Figure 2—figure

supplement 2). This finding indicates that T1D-associated genetic variants might alter immune

function through a cumulative effect. Considering the complexity of the immune system, it may

be an alternative explanation for our finding that T1D associated genetic variants that affect

immune functions differ from genetic variants that affect immune cell proportion and cytokine

production capacity.

Despite the limited sample size, we identified 28 genome-wide significant genetic loci regulating

immune cell proportions and cytokine production in T1D patients and health. Among them, 12

immune phenotype QTLs are specifically found in 300DM, but not in healthy volunteers,

suggesting a distinct regulatory mechanism of immune parameters and functions between disease

and health. More importantly, in our study, we highlight 11 druggable genes as candidates for

therapeutic intervention.

The data presented in our study are generated from PBMC. While these likely reflect overall

immune function, some immune cell types may not be captured and all over the findings refer to

changes in circulating factors that may not necessarily reflect changes occurring in relevant

immune organs, such as pancreatic islets, gut or lymph nodes. Still, islet infiltrating immune cells

do originate from circulating blood cells, and circulating chemokines/cytokines are important in

activating and recruiting immune cells. Hence, the circulating level of immune cells and cytokine

production capacity is probably relevant for local tissue immunity.

We acknowledge that our study has limitations. Firstly, 300DM and 500FG were recruited and

measured at two years apart, although established using an identical setting, the same protocol

and in the same lab. There may thus be some differences in the absolute immune cell counts or

cytokine levels due to a batch effect. Therefore, this study was not designed as a case-control

study, but the healthy controls were used to compare genetic associations identified in the T1D

cohort. Secondly, young people were overrepresented in 500FG. Although age has been

regressed out in both of the cohorts, there might be a bias in the genetic mapping. Finally, our

type 1 diabetes-specific analyses should be viewed exploratory as they have not been validated in

a separate cohort. Our study has also strengths: it applied cutting-edge technologies to assess

immune cell function and genetic variation, and it is the first study which comprehensively

combines 'omics' technologies to abundant phenotyping in a rather large group of participants to

explain between individuals' variation in immune responses.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we applied a novel high-throughput functional genomics approach, and show that

genetic factors regulate immune responses in T1D patients. We show genetic susceptibility to

immune phenotypes in patients with T1D, and highlight the importance of T cell immunity in the

genetic regulation of T1D. We identify specific cell populations that are likely involved in

pathophysiology of T1D (CCR5+ T-regs). Together, these findings may provide an avenue

towards identification of novel preventive and therapeutic treatments.

Materials and Methods

Study cohort. This study mainly focuses on a 300DM cohort, and involves a 500FG cohort (part

of HFGP*(Netea et al., 2016)*). In total, 132 males and 111 females of Caucasian origin with T1D

were recruited in the 300DM cohort at the Radboudumc, the Netherlands. Their age ranges from

20 to 84 years. Detailed information of 500FG cohort can be found in the previous

publications(Aguirre-Gamboa et al., 2016; ter Horst et al., 2016; Li et al., 2016).

Measurement of Immune Cell composition. Myeloid and lymphoid immune cell levels were

measured by 10-color flow cytometry. The parental and grandparental proportion from 73

manually annotated immune cells as well as the proportion of CD4+ T cells, CD8+ T cells,

memory T regulatory cells and monocytes carrying chemokine receptors: CCR6 (CD196),

CXCR3 (CD183), CCR4 (CD194), CCR5 (CD195) and CCR7 (CD197) were calculated

respectively, and end up with 269 immune cell traits of the 300DM cohort. We used the same

gating strategy of measuring cell subpopulations as 500FG (See reference*(Aguirre-Gamboa et*

al., 2016) and Figure 1—figure supplement 2).

Stimulation of PBMCs and measurement of Cytokine production capacity. Isolation of

PBMCs were washed twice with cold phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and suspended in Roswell

Park Memorial Institute (RPMI) 1640 Dutch-modified culture medium (Gibco/Invitrogen, Breda,

the Netherlands) supplemented with 50 mg/l gentamycin (Centraform), 1 mM pyruvate

(Gibco/Invitrogen) and 2mM L-glutamine (Gibco/Invitrogen). Cells were counted on a Sysmex

XN-450 Hematology Analyzer (Sysmex Corporation, Kobe, Japan).

For *in vitro* stimulation experiments, 5×10^5 cells/well were cultured for 24hr or 7 days at 37°C

and 5% CO_2 in 96-well round-bottom plates (Greiner). For the 7 days' cultures, medium was

supplemented with human pooled serum (pooled from healthy blood donors, end concentration

10%). Supernatants were collected and stored in -20°C until used for ELISA.

The following stimulations were used: (LPS (100ng/ml, 1ng/ml), Pam3cys, *Borrelia* mix, *C.*

albicans conidia, *C. albicans* hyphae, Imiquimod (IMQ), *S. aureus*, *S. pneumoniae*, palmitic acid

(C16), C16+ monosodium urate crystals (MSU), *E. coli*, *M. tuberculosis* (MTB), *B. burgdorferi*,

C. burnetii, *C. neoformans*, Oxidized low-density lipoprotein (OxLDL), OxLDL+ LPS,

Polyinosinic:polycytidylic acid (Poly IC), *Rhizopus* microspores, *Rhizopusoryzae*)*(Li et al.,*

2016). Concentrations of monocyte-derived cytokines (IL-1β, IL-6, TNF-α, IL-8, IL-10, IL-1Ra,

MCP-1) and T cell-derived cytokines (INF-γ, IL-17, IL-22) in response to various stimulations

were measured in peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) by ELISA kits following the

manufacturers protocol. For all cytokines commercially available kits were used (R&D Systems,

MN, USA or Sanquin, Amsterdam, the Netherlands).

Genotyping, quality control and imputation. DNA samples of 224 Dutch T1D patients were

collected and genotyped by the Infinium® Global Screening Array. The genotype calling was

performed using Opticall 0.7.0*(Shah et al., 2012)* with default settings (call rate > 0.99). Two

samples were removed due to contamination or mislabeling; one sample from a related

individual (identity be descent > 0.185) was removed and six genetic outliers were identified by

either heterozygosity rate check (individuals with heterozygosity rate heterozygosity rate ± 3

standard deviations from the mean were excluded) or multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) plots of

samples merging with 1000 Genomes data, leaving 215 samples, which show good consistence

with European samples from 1000 Genomes data (Figure 1—figure supplement 1) according to

standard protocol (Anderson et al., 2010). DNA samples from the 500FG cohort were genotyped

by Illumina Human OmniExpress Exome-8 v1.0 SNP chip. Outliers were excluded according to

population relationship, medication and disease information. Details can be found in our

previous studies in 500FG*(Aguirre-Gamboa et al., 2016; Li et al., 2016)*. Single-nucleotide

polymorphisms (SNPs) with a minor allele frequency (MAF) < 0.001 were removed from each

cohort, and a Hardy-Weinburg equilibrium (HWE) P value < 1×10^{-5} were removed for the

healthy cohort (500FG). By taking shared genetic variants, we merged the 300DM cohort and

500FG cohort, and we used an online genotype imputation service provided by Michigan

Imputation Server (https://imputationserver.sph.umich.edu)*(Das et al., 2016)* with HRC Panel

1.1 as reference. SNPs with low imputation quality (R2 < 0.3) and/or MAF < 0.01 in all imputed

samples and/or HWE p values < 1×10^{-5} in healthy individuals were excluded leaving 4304387

SNPs and 666 individuals (N_{300DM} = 215 and N_{500FG} = 451).

Preprocess of the data

Immune cell proportion was calculated by dividing counts of their parental and grandparental

cell types (Supplementary file 6). An inverse rank transformation(Aguirre-Gamboa et al., 2016;

Orrù et al., 2013) was applied on the proportion values for genetic association analysis. Cytokine

levels were log2 transformed.

Immune parameter QTL mapping. After intersecting with available genotype data and

excluding volunteers with a mixture or another genetic background, 214 were left for immune

parameter quantitative trait locus (QTL) mapping. We next evaluated covariates influencing

immune function. Associations with age, gender, seasonal effects were calculated using

previously described methods(Aguirre-Gamboa et al., 2016; ter Horst et al., 2016; Li et al.,

2016), i.e. Spearman correlation analysis and linear regression model. Significance was declared

after multiple testing correction (FDR < 0.05). Age significantly associated with 129/269

immune cell traits and 12/55 cytokine traits; gender associated with 59/269 immune cell traits

and 5/55 cytokine traits; seasonal effects associated with 121/269 immune cell traits and 38/55

cytokine traits (Figure 4—figure supplement 3). Thus, we took age, gender and seasonal effects

as covariates in the linear regression for both immune cell proportion QTL mapping as well as

cytokine QTL mapping. Besides, considering the effect of immune cell proportion on cytokine

production, we took major cell types, including monocyte, lymphocyte, T cell, B cell and NK

cell proportion in PBMC as covariates in a linear model for cytokine QTL mapping, as we

previously did*(Li et al., 2016)*. Linear regression function was applied with an R package

Matrix-eQTL*(Shabalin, 2012)* for immune parameter QTL mapping, and software

METAL*(Willer et al., 2010)* was applied to summary statistics from both cohorts for meta-

analysis, in which the model based on effect size and standard error with default settings were

used. P values $< 5 \times 10^{-8}$ were considered to be genome-wide significant. Lambda values were

calculated indicating no obvious inflations (0.977-1.026).

Extraction of T1D GWAS SNP list. We downloaded a summary of T1D GWAS results from

GWAS-catalog (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/)*(Buniello et al., 2019)* in November 2019, and

removed studies done in non-European-ancestry populations. Top SNPs within LD ($r^2 > 0.1$)

from different studies were considered as the same locus, and SNPs with the lowest p value were

taken into analysis. We noticed that the effect directions of some SNPs were unclear or

inconsistent in different studies. In this case, we assigned directions according to the newest

GWAS study*(Onengut-Gumuscu et al., 2015)*.

GWAS analysis of 300DM cohort for the known T1D loci. We extracted all proxies in strong

LD with top SNPs from published T1D GWAS (Case-Control) studies ($r^2 > 0.8$) and performed a

chi-square test on clinical status by using PLINK 1.9. Samples in 300DM were taken as cases

and samples in 500FG were controls.

Impact of T1D GWAS loci on immune phenotypes. In order to detect the impact of T1D

GWAS loci on immune cell populations, we grouped all traits into four categories (B cells, T

cells, monocytes and NK cells), and counted the number of suggestive associations (P value <

0.05) between 63 top SNPs from T1D GWAS loci and immune cell traits. 1000 permuted sets of

63 SNPs were randomly selected from independent SNPs ($r^2 > 0.2$) pruned from all genotyped

SNPs. We then compared the associations of the 63 top GWAS SNPs with associations between

1000 permutated sets and the same category of immune traits. P value was calculated by the

percent of association numbers from permuted sets greater than the association number of the 63

T1D GWAS SNPs.

We further applied a multivariate linear model to estimate the proportion of variance of each

immune phenotype explained by the top SNPs from T1D GWAS loci. We repeated this analysis

on 1000 permuted sets of 63 independent SNPs, which were used as reference set. We then

compared the null distribution with variance explained by 63 top SNPs from T1D GWAS loci. P

value was calculated by the percent of explained variance from permuted sets larger than the

variance explained by the 63 T1D GWAS SNPs.

Gene expression analysis on *CCR5* and its corresponding ligands genes. Normalized gene

expression data in PBMCs and Pancreases from T1D and controls were acquired from

https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gxa*(Papatheodorou et al., 2019)*. A *Student's* t-test was applied to

compare gene expression between groups.

Post-QTL analysis. An R package ggplot2 was used to generate Manhattan plots and boxplots.

Locus-zoom plots were made by an online tool(http://locuszoom.org)*(Pruim et al., 2010)*. We

used an R package coloc*(Giambartolomei et al., 2014)* to perform colocalization analysis with

T1D GWAS summary statistics and immune parameter QTLs profile. For pathway analysis**,**

genes located within +-10kb of genome wide significant SNPs (p value $< 5 \times 10^{-8}$) were extracted

and analyzed by an online tool FUMA*(Watanabe et al., 2017)* (https://fuma.ctglab.nl).

ANNOVAR was used for annotating genetic variants*(Wang et al., 2010)*.

Other packages used in this paper. Pheatmap was used to make heatmaps. Scatter plots and

bar plots were generated by ggplot2.

References and Notes:

Aguirre-Gamboa, R., Joosten, I., Urbano, P.C.M., van der Molen, R.G., van Rijssen, E., van
Cranenbroek, B., Oosting, M., Smeekens, S., Jaeger, M., Zorro, M., et al. (2016). Differential
Effects of Environmental and Genetic Factors on T and B Cell Immune Traits. Cell Reports *17*,
2474–2487.

Anderson, C.A., Pettersson, F.H., Clarke, G.M., Cardon, L.R., Morris, A.P., and Zondervan,
K.T. (2010). Data quality control in genetic case-control association studies. Nat Protoc *5*, 1564–
1573.

Atkinson, M.A., Eisenbarth, G.S., and Michels, A.W. (2014). Type 1 diabetes. The Lancet *383*,
69–82.

Barrett, J.C., Clayton, D.G., Concannon, P., Akolkar, B., Cooper, J.D., Erlich, H.A., Julier, C.,
Morahan, G., Nerup, J., Nierras, C., et al. (2009). Genome-wide association study and meta-
analysis find that over 40 loci affect risk of type 1 diabetes. Nat. Genet. *41*, 703–707.

Bradfield, J.P., Qu, H.-Q., Wang, K., Zhang, H., Sleiman, P.M., Kim, C.E., Mentch, F.D., Qiu,
H., Glessner, J.T., Thomas, K.A., et al. (2011). A genome-wide meta-analysis of six type 1
diabetes cohorts identifies multiple associated loci. PLoS Genet. *7*, e1002293.

Buniello, A., MacArthur, J.A.L., Cerezo, M., Harris, L.W., Hayhurst, J., Malangone, C.,
McMahon, A., Morales, J., Mountjoy, E., Sollis, E., et al. (2019). The NHGRI-EBI GWAS
Catalog of published genome-wide association studies, targeted arrays and summary statistics
2019. Nucleic Acids Research *47*, D1005–D1012.

Cabrera, S.M., Chen, Y.-G., Hagopian, W.A., and Hessner, M.J. (2016). Blood-based signatures
in type 1 diabetes. Diabetologia *59*, 414–425.

Carithers, L.J., and Moore, H.M. (2015). The Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) Project.
Biopreservation and Biobanking *13*, 307–308.

Carr, E.J., Dooley, J., Garcia-Perez, J.E., Lagou, V., Lee, J.C., Wouters, C., Meyts, I., Goris, A.,
Boeckxstaens, G., Linterman, M.A., et al. (2016). The cellular composition of the human
immune system isshaped by age and cohabitation. Nat Immunol *17*, 461–468.

Cooper, J.D., Smyth, D.J., Smiles, A.M., Plagnol, V., Walker, N.M., Allen, J.E., Downes, K.,
Barrett, J.C., Healy, B.C., Mychaleckyj, J.C., et al. (2008). Meta-analysis of genome-wide
association study data identifies additional type 1 diabetes risk loci. Nat. Genet. *40*, 1399–1401.

Das, S., Forer, L., Schönherr, S., Sidore, C., Locke, A.E., Kwong, A., Vrieze, S.I., Chew, E.Y.,
Levy, S., McGue, M., et al. (2016). Next-generation genotype imputation service and methods.
Nat Genet *48*, 1284–1287.

Di Benedetto, S., Derhovanessian, E., Steinhagen-Thiessen, E., Goldeck, D., Müller, L., and
Pawelec, G. (2015). Impact of age, sex and CMV-infection on peripheral T cell phenotypes:
results from the Berlin BASE-II Study. Biogerontology *16*, 631–643.

Dong Kim, K., Zhao, J., Auh, S., Yang, X., Du, P., Tang, H., and Fu, Y.-X. (2007). Adaptive
immune cells temper initial innate responses. Nat Med *13*, 1248–1252.

Dopico, X.C., Evangelou, M., Ferreira, R.C., Guo, H., Pekalski, M.L., Smyth, D.J., Cooper, N.,
Burren, O.S., Fulford, A.J., Hennig, B.J., et al. (2015). Widespread seasonal gene expression
reveals annual differences in human immunity and physiology. Nat Commun *6*, 7000.

Farh, K.K.-H., Marson, A., Zhu, J., Kleinewietfeld, M., Housley, W.J., Beik, S., Shoresh, N.,
Whitton, H., Ryan, R.J.H., Shishkin, A.A., et al. (2015). Genetic and epigenetic fine mapping of
causal autoimmune disease variants. Nature *518*, 337–343.

Finan, C., Gaulton, A., Kruger, F.A., Lumbers, R.T., Shah, T., Engmann, J., Galver, L., Kelley,
R., Karlsson, A., Santos, R., et al. (2017). The druggable genome and support for target
identification and validation in drug development. Sci. Transl. Med. *9*, eaag1166.

Fitzgerald, K.A., and Kagan, J.C. (2020). Toll-like Receptors and the Control of Immunity. Cell
180, 1044–1066.

Giambartolomei, C., Vukcevic, D., Schadt, E.E., Franke, L., Hingorani, A.D., Wallace, C., and
Plagnol, V. (2014). Bayesian Test for Colocalisation between Pairs of Genetic Association
Studies Using Summary Statistics. PLoS Genet *10*, e1004383.

Grant, S.F.A., Qu, H.-Q., Bradfield, J.P., Marchand, L., Kim, C.E., Glessner, J.T., Grabs, R.,
Taback, S.P., Frackelton, E.C., Eckert, A.W., et al. (2009). Follow-up analysis of genome-wide
association data identifies novel loci for type 1 diabetes. Diabetes *58*, 290–295.

ter Horst, R., Jaeger, M., Smeekens, S.P., Oosting, M., Swertz, M.A., Li, Y., Kumar, V.,
Diavatopoulos, D.A., Jansen, A.F.M., Lemmers, H., et al. (2016). Host and Environmental
Factors Influencing Individual Human Cytokine Responses. Cell *167*, 1111-1124.e13.

Huang, J., Ellinghaus, D., Franke, A., Howie, B., and Li, Y. (2012). 1000 Genomes-based
imputation identifies novel and refined associations for the Wellcome Trust Case Control
Consortium phase 1 Data. Eur. J. Hum. Genet. *20*, 801–805.

Hundhausen, C., Roth, A., Whalen, E., Chen, J., Schneider, A., Long, S.A., Wei, S., Rawlings,
R., Kinsman, M., Evanko, S.P., et al. (2016). Enhanced T cell responses to IL-6 in type 1
diabetes are associated with early clinical disease and increased IL-6 receptor expression. Sci.
Transl. Med. *8*, 356ra119-356ra119.

Kamat, M.A., Blackshaw, J.A., Young, R., Surendran, P., Burgess, S., Danesh, J., Butterworth,
A.S., and Staley, J.R. (2019). PhenoScanner V2: an expanded tool for searching human
genotype-phenotype associations. Bioinformatics *35*, 4851–4853.

Li, Y., Oosting, M., Smeekens, S.P., Jaeger, M., Aguirre-Gamboa, R., Le, K.T.T., Deelen, P.,
Ricaño-Ponce, I., Schoffelen, T., Jansen, A.F.M., et al. (2016). A Functional Genomics
Approach to Understand Variation in Cytokine Production in Humans. Cell *167*, 1099-1110.e14.

Martin, S., Wolf-Eichbaum, D., Duinkerken, G., Scherbaum, W.A., Kolb, H., Noordzij, J.G., and
Roep, B.O. (2001). Development of Type 1 Diabetes despite Severe Hereditary B-Cell
Deficiency. N Engl J Med *345*, 1036–1040.

Netea, M.G., Joosten, L.A.B., Li, Y., Kumar, V., Oosting, M., Smeekens, S., Jaeger, M., ter
Horst, R., Schirmer, M., Vlamakis, H., et al. (2016). Understanding human immune function
using the resources from the Human Functional Genomics Project. Nat Med *22*, 831–833.

Onengut-Gumuscu, S., Chen, W.-M., Burren, O., Cooper, N.J., Quinlan, A.R., Mychaleckyj,
J.C., Farber, E., Bonnie, J.K., Szpak, M., Schofield, E., et al. (2015). Fine mapping of type 1
diabetes susceptibility loci and evidence for colocalization of causal variants with lymphoid gene
enhancers. Nat. Genet. *47*, 381–386.

Orrù, V., Steri, M., Sole, G., Sidore, C., Virdis, F., Dei, M., Lai, S., Zoledziewska, M., Busonero,
F., Mulas, A., et al. (2013). Genetic Variants Regulating Immune Cell Levels in Health and
Disease. Cell *155*, 242–256.

Papatheodorou, I., Moreno, P., Manning, J., Fuentes, A.M.-P., George, N., Fexova, S., Fonseca,
N.A., Füllgrabe, A., Green, M., Huang, N., et al. (2019). Expression Atlas update: from tissues to
single cells. Nucleic Acids Research gkz947.

Planas, R., Carrillo, J., Sanchez, A., Ruiz de Villa, M.C., Nuñez, F., Verdaguer, J., James,
R.F.L., Pujol-Borrell, R., and Vives-Pi, M. (2010). Gene expression profiles for the human
pancreas and purified islets in Type 1 diabetes: new findings at clinical onset and in long-
standing diabetes. Clinical & Experimental Immunology *159*, 23–44.

Pociot, F., and Lernmark, Å. (2016). Genetic risk factors for type 1 diabetes. The Lancet *387*,
2331–2339.

Pruim, R.J., Welch, R.P., Sanna, S., Teslovich, T.M., Chines, P.S., Gliedt, T.P., Boehnke, M.,
Abecasis, G.R., and Willer, C.J. (2010). LocusZoom: regional visualization of genome-wide
association scan results. Bioinformatics *26*, 2336–2337.

Ram, R., Mehta, M., Nguyen, Q.T., Larma, I., Boehm, B.O., Pociot, F., Concannon, P., and
Morahan, G. (2016). Systematic Evaluation of Genes and Genetic Variants Associated with Type
1 Diabetes Susceptibility. J.I. *196*, 3043–3053.

Rewers, M., and Ludvigsson, J. (2016). Environmental risk factors for type 1 diabetes. The
Lancet *387*, 2340–2348.

Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium, Kundaje, A., Meuleman, W., Ernst, J., Bilenky, M., Yen,
A., Heravi-Moussavi, A., Kheradpour, P., Zhang, Z., Wang, J., et al. (2015). Integrative analysis
of 111 reference human epigenomes. Nature *518*, 317–330.

Rolf, M.G., Curwen, J.O., Veldman-Jones, M., Eberlein, C., Wang, J., Harmer, A., Hellawell,
C.J., and Braddock, M. (2015). In vitro pharmacological profiling of R406 identifies molecular
targets underlying the clinical effects of fostamatinib. Pharmacol Res Perspect *3*, e00175.

Saxena, A., Yagita, H., Donner, T.W., and Hamad, A.R.A. (2017). Expansion of FasL-
Expressing CD5+ B Cells in Type 1 Diabetes Patients. Front. Immunol. *8*.

Shabalin, A.A. (2012). Matrix eQTL: ultra fast eQTL analysis via large matrix operations.
Bioinformatics *28*, 1353–1358.

Shah, T.S., Liu, J.Z., Floyd, J.A.B., Morris, J.A., Wirth, N., Barrett, J.C., and Anderson, C.A.
(2012). optiCall: a robust genotype-calling algorithm for rare, low-frequency and common
variants. Bioinformatics *28*, 1598–1603.

Wang, K., Li, M., and Hakonarson, H. (2010). ANNOVAR: functional annotation of genetic
variants from high-throughput sequencing data. Nucleic Acids Research *38*, e164–e164.

Watanabe, K., Taskesen, E., van Bochoven, A., and Posthuma, D. (2017). Functional mapping
and annotation of genetic associations with FUMA. Nat Commun *8*, 1826.

van der Weerd, K., Van Hagen, P.M., Schrijver, B., Kwekkeboom, D.J., de Herder, W.W., ten
Broek, M.R.J., Postema, P.T.E., van Dongen, J.J.M., Staal, F.J.T., and Dik, W.A. (2013). The
peripheral blood compartment in patient with Graves' disease: activated T lymphocytes and
increased transitional and pre-naive mature B lymphocytes: T and B lymphocytes in Graves'
disease. Clin Exp Immunol n/a-n/a.

Westra, H.-J., Peters, M.J., Esko, T., Yaghootkar, H., Schurmann, C., Kettunen, J., Christiansen,
M.W., Fairfax, B.P., Schramm, K., Powell, J.E., et al. (2013). Systematic identification of trans
eQTLs as putative drivers of known disease associations. Nat Genet *45*, 1238–1243.

Willer, C.J., Li, Y., and Abecasis, G.R. (2010). METAL: fast and efficient meta-analysis of
genomewide association scans. Bioinformatics *26*, 2190–2191.

Yang, M., Ye, L., Wang, B., Gao, J., Liu, R., Hong, J., Wang, W., Gu, W., and Ning, G. (2015).
Decreased miR-146 expression in peripheral blood mononuclear cells is correlated with ongoing
islet autoimmunity in type 1 diabetes patients. Journal of Diabetes *7*, 158–165.

Acknowledgements:

We thank all of the volunteers in the 300DM and 500FG for their participation. We thank Marc

J. Bonder for discussions.

Funding:

This work was supported by an ERC starting Grant (no. 948207) and a Radboud University

Medical Centre Hypatia Grant (2018) to Y.L. and an ERC advanced grant (no. 833247) and a

Spinoza grant of the Netherlands Association for Scientific Research to M.G.N. C.T received

funding from the Perspectief Biomarker Development Center Research Programme, which is

(partly) financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). AJ was

funded by a grant from the European Foundation for the Study of Diabetes (EFSD/AZ

Macrovascular Programme 2015). X.C was supported by China Scholarship Council

(201706040081).

Author contributions:

Y.L., C.T. and M.G.N designed the study. X.C. performed statistical analysis supervised by Y.L., A.J., H.K., X.H. and I.J. performed the experiments and processed the data. L.C. and C.X. helped with the data analysis. Y.L., C.T., M.G.N, C.W and X.C interpreted the data. Y.L., C.T., M.G.N. and X.C wrote the manuscript with input from all authors.

Competing interests:

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data and code availability

All raw data of immune phenotypes have been deposited in Dryad (https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.4f4qrfjd0). Individual genetic data and other privacy-sensitive individual information are available upon request to corresponding authors by email or at Human Functional Genomics Project website (http://hfgp.bbmri.nl). This dataset is not publicly available because it contains information that could compromise research participant privacy, while summary statistics directly generated from genetic data that will precisely reproduce published results are all deposited in Dryad (https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.4f4qrfjd0). Custom scripts for generating summary statistics and all results are deposited in GitHub (https://github.com/Chuxj/Gf_of_ip_in_T1D).

Ethical statement

The 500FG-DM study was approved by the ethical committee of Radboud University Nijmegen

(NL-number: 54214.091.15). Experiments were conducted according to the principles expressed

in the Declaration of Helsinki. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Figure legends:

Figure 1. Overview of data and experimental design. **A**, Schematic study design. **B**,**C**, Cell (**B**)

and cytokine (**C**) type relationship visualized by non-metric multidimensional scale

(NMDS) analysis in 300DM, where B cell traits (red) are clustered separately from T cell

and monocyte traits (B) and cytokines with same cellular origins are clustered together

(C) In panel **B**, Small dots indicate the proportion of subpopulations and large dots

indicate counts of their parental cell types. Circles represent the calculated centroid of the

grouped cell and cytokine types at confidence level 0.95. **D**, Heatmap of correlation

coefficients between immune cell counts (y-axis) and cytokine production in response to

stimulations (x-axis) in T1D patients. Significant correlations (FDR <0.05) are labeled by

dots, with the color indicating correlation coefficients. Positive correlations (red) are

observed between monocyte traits and monocyte-derived cytokines (top left), and

between adaptive immune cell counts and T cell-derived cytokines (bottom right).

Negative correlations (blue) are observed between adaptive immune cell counts and

monocyte-derived cytokines.

Figure 2. Impact of T1D GWAS SNPs on immune phenotypes. **A**, QQ plots of QTL profiles of

62 T1D GWAS loci grouped by cell populations. The distribution of P values of

associations with T cells traits (blue) show a significant deviation from an expected

uniform distribution (dashed line). **B**, Histogram showing number of associations

observed (red line) and those in permutations (blue bars). **C**, Heatmap of QTL profiles of

cell proportion carrying certain chemokine receptors across 62 T1D GWAS loci, colored

by -log10(p values) and effect direction of T1D risk allele. Arrowhead indicates a T1D

risk allele rs11574435-T.

Figure 3. Impact of T1D GWAS SNPs on immune phenotypes. **A**, Expression of *CCR5*, *CCL5*

and *CCL4* in PBMCs (top) and Pancreases (bottom) altered in T1D patients (blue, green

and purple) compared to healthy controls (red). **B**, A locus zoom plot showing SNPs

around rs35092096 located in CCR region are associated with CCR6+CCR7-CCR5+ T

reg proportion. **C**, A boxplot showing CCR6+CCR7-CCR5+ T reg proportion differs in

different rs35092096 genotypes (TT: red, TG: green and GG: blue). **D**, Two locus zoom

plots indicating colocalization between CCR6+CCR7-CCR5+ T reg proportion QTL

profiles (top, red) and T1D GWAS profile (bottom, blue) within CCR regions.

Figure 4. Genetic regulators on immune phenotypes. **A**, Three Manhattan plots showing genetic

regulators of immune cell proportion (top), proportion of immune cells expressing CCR

(middle) and cytokines production in response to stimulations (bottom). P values of SNPs

identified in meta-analysis were colored in red. **B**, A locus zoom plot showing a T1D

specific regulatory locus around rs4744112 that effects CCR6+CXCR3+CCR4- T

helper1 proportion. **C**, A boxplot showing CCR6+CXCR3+CCR4- T helper1 proportion

varies in different rs4744112 genotypes (TT: red, TG: green and GG: blue).

Figure supplement legends:

Figure 1--figure supplement 1. Heterozygosity check.

Left-side panel, an overview of missingness vs heterozygosity for all samples represented by

circle; x-axis: Proportion of missing genotypes, y-axis: Heterozygosity rate) and ancestry

clustering. Right-side panel, multiple dimensional scaling plot for our T1D samples (red dots) in

comparison with reference samples from 1000G. X and y axis correspond to component 1 and

component 2 in multiple dimensional scaling plot, respectively. In total, six outliers (red symbols

from either left or right panel) were removed in further analysis.

Figure 1 - Figure supplement 2. Flow cytometry gating strategy of the chemokine receptor

panel.

Figure1 - Figure supplement 3. Correlation between cell counts and cytokine production in

healthy individuals.

Heatmap of correlation coefficients (indicated by colors) between immune cell counts (y-axis)

and cytokine production in response to stimulations (x-axis) in healthy individuals (500FG),

which is consistent with 300DM.

Figure 2 - Figure supplement 1. QQplots of QTL profiles of 62 T1D GWAS loci grouped by

cytokine types.

Figure 2 - Figure supplement 2. Impact of T1D GWAS SNPs on immune phenotypes.

A,**B**, Heatmap of QTL profiles of immune phenotypes across 62 T1D GWAS loci, colored by -

log10(p values) and effect direction of T1D risk allele (**A**: immune cell proportion traits; **B**:

cytokine production upon stimulations).

Figure 4 -- Figure supplement 1. Enriched pathways of QTLs found for immune phenotypes.

Pathway enrichment analysis using genes located within immune cell proportion QTLs (**A**) and

cytokine production QTLs (**B**).

Figure 4—figure supplement 2. Functional annotation of the immune phenotypes associated

SNPs ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$).

Stacked boxplots showing the percentage of genomic elements where the immune phenotypes

associated SNPs located.

Figure 4—figure supplement 3. Impact of age, gender and seasons on immune phenotypes.

A, B, Heatmaps of correlation between immune cell counts (y-axis) and age, gender, seasons (x-

axis). Correlation coefficients were indicated by colors, and significant correlations (FDR <0.05)

are labeled by dots. **C**, Heatmap of correlation between cytokines levels upon stimulations and

age, gender, seasons. Correlation coefficients were indicated by colors, and significant

correlations (FDR <0.05) are labeled by dots.

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 3

Fig. 4

Figure 1—figure supplement 1.

Figure 1—figure supplement 2.

Figure 1—figure supplement 3.

Figure 2—figure supplement 1.

Figure 2—figure supplement 2.

Figure 4—figure supplement 1.

Figure 4—figure supplement 2.

Figure 4—figure supplement 3.