medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The effect of maternal BMI, smoking and alcohol on congenital heart diseases: a Mendelian randomization study

Authors and affiliations:

Kurt Taylor[1,2,*], Robyn Wootton[1,2,3], Qian Yang[1,2], Sam Oddie[5], John Wright[6], Tiffany C Yang[6], Maria Magnus[1,2,7], Ole A. Andreassen[8,9], Maria Carolina Borges[1,2], Massimo Caputo[4,10], Deborah A Lawlor[1,2,4]

* Corresponding author: kurt.taylor@bristol.ac.uk – Oakfield House, MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit Bristol, Population Health Science Institute, University of Bristol, BS8 2BN.

[1] Population Health Science, Bristol Medical School, Bristol BS8 2BN, UK

[2] MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 2BN UK

[3] Nic Waals Institute, Lovisenberg Diaconal Hospital, Oslo, Norway.

[5] University of York, Heslington, York, United Kingdom

[6] Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Bradford, United Kingdom

[7] Centre for Fertility and Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway

[8] NORMENT Centre, Division of Mental Health and Addiction, Oslo University Hospital & Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

[9] KG Jebsen Centre for Neurodevelopmental disorders, Oslo University Hospital & Institute of Clinical Medicine, Oslo, Norway

[10] Translational Science, Bristol Medical School, Bristol, United Kingdom

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Congenital heart diseases (CHDs) remain a significant cause of infant morbidity and mortality. Epidemiological studies have explored maternal risk factors for CHDs, but few have used genetic epidemiology methods to improve causal inference.

Methods: Three birth cohorts, including 38,662 mother/offspring pairs (N = 319 CHD cases) were included. We used one-sample Mendelian randomization (MR) analyses to explore the effects of genetically predicted maternal body mass index (BMI), smoking and alcohol on offspring CHDs. We generated genetic risk scores (GRS) using summary data from large scale genome-wide association studies and validated the strength of the genetic instrument for exposure levels during pregnancy. Logistic regression was used to estimate the odds ratio (OR) of CHD per 1 standard deviation (SD) change in GRS. Results for the three cohorts were combined using random-effects meta-analyses. We performed several sensitivity analyses including multivariable MR to check the robustness of our findings.

Results: The GRSs associated with the exposures during pregnancy in all three cohorts, with somewhat weaker associations for the alcohol GRS. There was no relationship between the maternal GRS for BMI and offspring CHDs (pooled OR (95% confidence interval) per 1SD higher GRS: 1.01 (0.90, 1.13)). Similarly, there was no effect of an increase in maternal GRS for lifetime smoking on offspring odds of CHDs (pooled OR: 0.97 (0.87, 1.08)). We observed weak evidence of an increased odds of offspring CHDs with increase in the maternal GRS for alcoholic drinks per week (pooled OR: 1.09 (0.98, 1.22)). Sensitivity analyses yielded similar results.

Conclusions: We found no robust evidence of an effect for maternal BMI or smoking on offspring CHDs using MR. The modest effect of maternal alcohol intake on offspring CHDs needs to be replicated in larger study populations. Future larger studies that employ a range of causal methods including two-sample MR are warranted to further interrogate maternal gestational risk factors for offspring CHDs.

Keywords: Congenital heart disease; Mendelian randomization; Risk factors; ALSPAC, BiB; MoBa

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Congenital heart diseases (CHDs) are the most common congenital anomaly, affecting 6-8 per 1000 live births and 10% of stillbirths [1]. CHDs are a leading cause of childhood mortality and many CHD patients experience health problems that persist into adulthood [2,3]. The causes of CHDs are largely unknown, but the pregnancy environment (intrauterine factors) may play a role in the underlying pathophysiology [4]. Identifying modifiable risk factors for CHDs is important for improving aetiological understanding and developing preventive interventions to reduce disease burden.

Several modifiable maternal characteristics have been found to be associated with increased risk of CHDs, including maternal pre/early pregnancy body mass index (BMI) [5–7], smoking [8] and alcohol [9] consumption in pregnancy. Previously, using parental negative exposure control analyses, we found that positive associations between maternal overweight and obesity with offspring CHDs may be being driven by confounding factors [10]. This work found some evidence of an intrauterine effect of maternal smoking on offspring CHDs. For alcohol consumption, results were inconclusive due to limited data [10]. The causal relevance of the results from meta-analyses is unclear, due to many studies not controlling for key confounders and for the risk of residual confounding. Negative control analyses attempt to address the issue of residual confounding in observational studies [10,11], but have strong assumptions that are difficult to prove.

Mendelian randomization (MR) uses genetic variants as instrumental variables (IVs) to test causal effects in observational data [12]. The key assumptions for MR are: (i) relevance assumption - the genetic instruments are robustly associated with the exposure, (ii) independence assumption - there is no confounding of the genetic instrument-outcome association, (iii) exclusion restriction criteria - the genetic variant is not related to the outcome other than via its association with the exposure [13]. Genetic variants are less likely to be confounded by the socioeconomic and environmental factors that might bias causal estimates in conventional multivariable regression [14], but may be biased by violation of their assumptions due to weak or irrelevant instruments, population stratification (causing confounding of the genetic instrument-outcome association) and a path from the genetic instrument to CHD not mediated by the exposure, for example via horizontal pleiotropy or fetal genotype [15]. Triangulating results from negative control and MR analyses, whereby the key sources of bias differ can help improve the causal understanding of maternal risk factors on CHDs [16]. Consistent results from both would increase confidence that the relationship is causal. The recent acquisition of genotype information on a large number of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

maternal-offspring dyads means that we now have relevant data to further test the potential effects of BMI, smoking and alcohol with a complementary method to those used previous. The objective of this study was therefore to explore associations between genetically predicted maternal BMI, smoking and alcohol on offspring CHD.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Methods

Inclusion criteria and participating cohorts

To be eligible for inclusion in this study, cohorts and participants were required to have genome-wide data in mothers and CHD data in the offspring. From previous work with large consortia, including MR-PREG [17] and LifeCycle [18], we identified three cohorts meeting these criteria: The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC), Born in Bradford cohort (BiB), and the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). ALSPAC is a UK prospective birth cohort study which was devised to investigate the environmental and genetic factors of health and development [19–21]. Pregnant women resident in Avon, UK with expected dates of delivery 1st April 1991 to 31st December 1992 were invited to take part in the study. The initial number of pregnancies enrolled is 14,541 (for these at least one questionnaire has been returned or a "Children in Focus" clinic had been attended by 19/07/99). Of these initial pregnancies, there was a total of 14,676 fetuses, resulting in 14,062 live births and 13,988 children who were alive at 1 year of age. BiB is a population-based prospective birth cohort including 12,453 women across 13,776 pregnancies who were recruited at their oral glucose tolerance test at approximately 26–28 weeks' gestation [22]. Eligible women had an expected delivery between March 2007 and December 2010. MoBa is a nationwide, pregnancy cohort comprising family triads (mother-father-offspring) who are followed longitudinally. All pregnant women in Norway who were able to read Norwegian were eligible for participation. The first child was born in October 1999 and the last in July 2009 [23,24]. One singleton pregnancy per mother in each cohort were included in analyses. **Figure 1** shows the inclusion of participants, after excluding those with missing maternal genotype data and those that did not pass genetic quality control (QC). A total of 38,662 mother-offspring pairs contributed to the main analyses and 28,485 to the adjusted (for fetal genotype) analyses.



Figure 1. An overview of included cohorts and selection of study participants.

Abbreviations: ALSPAC, Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children; BiB, Born in Bradford; MoBa, Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort; QC, quality control; UKSeRP, the secure research platform containing CHD data for ALSPAC; CHD, congenital heart disease; GWAS, genome-wise association study

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Genetic data

Genotyping in each cohort

ALSPAC mothers were genotyped using Illumina human660K quad single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) chip, and ALSPAC children were genotyped using Illumina HumanHap550 quad genome-wide SNP genotyping platform. Genotype data for both ALSPAC mothers and children were imputed against the Haplotype Reference Consortium v1.1 reference panel, after performing the QC procedure (minor allele frequency (MAF) ≥1%, a call rate ≥95%, in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE), correct sex assignment, no evidence of cryptic relatedness, and of European descent). The samples of the BiB cohort (mothers and offspring) were processed on three different type of Illumina chips: HumanCoreExome12v1.0, HumanCoreExome12v1.1 and HumanCoreExome24v1.0. Genotype data were imputed against UK10K + 1000 Genomes reference panel, after a similar QC procedure (a call rate ≥99.5%, correct sex assignment, no evidence of cryptic relatedness, correct ethnicity assignment). In MoBa, blood samples were obtained from both parents during pregnancy and from mothers and children (umbilical cord) at birth [25]. Genotyping has had to rely on several projects - each contributing with resources to genotype subsets of MoBa over the last decade. The data used in the present study was derived from a cohort of genotypes samples from four MoBa batches. The MoBa genetics QC procedure involved MAF ≥1%, a call rate ≥95%, in HWE, correct sex assignment, and no evidence of cryptic relatedness. Further details of the genotyping methods for each cohort are provided in the Supplementary Material (Text S1).

GWAS data and SNP selection

We selected SNPs from the largest and most relevant GWAS of European ancestry participants for each exposure (further information for each GWAS shown in Table S1). Selected SNPs were those with a p-value below a p-value threshold used to indicate genome-wide significance after accounting for multiple testing. Of those reaching this threshold we ensured that we only took forward independent SNPs to create the GRS's. This was done either by methods used in the GWAS or by applying our own criteria if the GWAS did not report independent SNP associations. For BMI, there were 941 near-independent SNPs in a combined GWAS of ~700,000 individuals as reported in Yengo et al [26] (near-independent SNPs defined as SNPs with a $P < 1x10^{-8}$ after a conditional and joint multiple SNP analysis to take into account linkage disequilibrium (LD) between SNPs at a given locus). For smoking analyses, there were 126 independent

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

SNPs (genome-wide significant ($p<5x10^{-8}$) SNPs that achieved independence at LD $r^2 = 0.001$ and a distance of 10,000 kb). The study was a GWAS of a lifetime smoking index (which combined smoking initiation, duration, heaviness and cessation), conducted in a sample of 462,690 current, former and never smokers in UK Biobank [27]. For the alcohol weighted GRS, there were 99 conditionally independent SNPs (MAF ≥1% and $P<5x10^{-8}$), measured as number of alcoholic drinks per week [28]. This GRS has also previously been shown to be associated with alcohol consumption during pregnancy as well as the general population [29]. The ALSPAC cohort was included within the original GWAS for alcohol by Liu et al, accounting for 8,913 participants out of a total sample size of 941,280 (0.9%). Previous work has suggested any bias introduced by this level of overlap would be minimal [30]. Furthermore, a recent study explored this by excluding ALSPAC from the summary statistics and results were unbiased and largely unchanged [29]. Therefore, we proceeded using the full summary data for generating the alcohol GRS. All GRSs were generated using summary GWAS data that was derived in both men and women. We were unable to obtain female-specific summary data for these GWAS data. However, we perform checks to ensure the GRSs are robustly associated with the maternal exposure during pregnancy.

Genetic risk score generation

Weighted GRSs were calculated for BMI, smoking and alcohol consumption by adding up the number of risk factor increasing alleles among the selected SNPs after weighting each SNP by its effect on the corresponding risk factor:

$$GRS = w1 \times SNP1 + w2 \times SNP2 + \cdots wn \times SNPn$$

where w is the weight (i.e., the beta-coefficient for the SNP-exposure association reported from the published GWAS) and SNP is the genotype dosage of exposure-increasing alleles at that locus (i.e., 0, 1, or 2 exposure-increasing alleles). Selected SNPs were extracted from the imputed genotype data in dosage format using QCTOOL (v2.0) and VCF tools (v 0.1.12b) in ALSPAC and BiB, respectively. PLINK (v1.9) was then used to construct the GRS for each exposure coded so that an increased score associated with increased exposure. In MoBa, we constructed the GRSs from the QC'd data in PLINK format. Further information on GRS construction for each cohort is shown in Text S2.

Phenotype data

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

CHD data

In the ALSPAC cohort, cases were obtained from a range of data sources, including health record linkage and questionnaire data up until age 25 following European surveillance of congenital anomalies (EUROCAT) guidelines [31]. In BiB, cases were identified from either the Yorkshire and Humber congenital anomaly register database, which will tend to pick up most cases that diagnosed antenatally and in the early postnatal period of life, and through linkage to primary care (up until aged 5), which will have picked up any additional cases, in particular those that might have been less severe and not identified antenatally/in early life [32]. All these cases were confirmed postnatally and were assigned international classification of disease Version 10 (ICD-10) codes. ICD-10 codes were used to assign CHD cases according to EUROCAT guidelines. In MoBa, information on whether a child had a CHD or not (yes/no) was obtained through linkage to the Medical Birth Registry of Norway (MBRN). All maternity units in Norway must notify births to the MBRN, and information on malformations are reported to the registry up to 12 months postpartum [33]. Further details on defining CHDs including ICD codes used (in ALSPAC and BiB) are shown in Text S3 and Table S2.

Pregnancy phenotype data

As noted above, the SNP selection and weights for the GRS were taken from GWAS in women and men [26–28]. To determine their relevance in women during pregnancy we examined the associations of the GRS with pre/early pregnancy BMI, and pregnancy smoking and alcohol consumption in each cohort. In ALSPAC and MoBa, pre-pregnancy weight and height were self-reported during the first pregnancy questionnaires. In BiB, weight and height were measured at the recruitment assessment. As the timing of questions and the details requested for smoking during pregnancy differed across the three cohorts [34–36] we were only able to generate a simple binary variable of any smoking in pregnancy versus none. There was insufficient data and/or power across the cohorts to be able to generate a measure of smoking heaviness in pregnancy. As with smoking, the aim for alcohol was to determine whether the GRS was robustly associated with drinking status during pregnancy. We used questionnaire data in each cohort and used binary variables (yes/no) for whether women consumed any alcohol during pregnancy or not. Further details regarding these phenotype data, including questionnaire information are described in Text S4.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Statistical analysis

This study is reported using the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology using Mendelian randomisation (STROBE-MR) guidelines (see Supplementary File: STROBE-MR Checklist) [37,38]. Analyses were performed in R version 4.0.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). We undertook one sample MR in each of the 3 cohorts, including all ALSPAC, BiB and MoBa participants, with maternal genetic data and offspring CHD data. Logistic regression was used to estimate the odds ratio (OR) of CHD per 1 standard deviation (SD) change in GRS, with adjustment for the first 10 genetic principal components (PCs) with additional adjustment for genetic chip, genetic batch, and imputation batch in MoBa. Statistical analyses in relation to the verification of MR assumptions are described below.

The key assumptions of MR are: (i) relevance assumption, (ii) independence assumption and (iii) exclusion restriction criteria and are described above in the introduction. Regarding the first assumption, to explore the relevance of the GRS to each exposure in pregnancy, we undertook linear (BMI) and logistic (smoking and alcohol) regression to derive the difference in mean BMI and OR of pregnancy smoking and pregnancy alcohol consumption per 1SD higher GRS in each cohort. Results are presented with 95% confidence intervals (CI) in each cohort. For BMI, instrument strength was assessed with F-statistics and R^2. For smoking and alcohol, instrument strength was assessed using the area under the ROC curve and pseudo-R^2 by the Nagelkerke method [39].

To minimise the potential for confounding of the GRS-CHD association due to population stratification (second assumption), we adjusted for the first 10 ancestry-informative principal components [40]. We also repeated the MR analyses without the inclusion of BiB, given that BiB has a unique ethnic structure of South Asians and White Europeans. GRS-CHD association results were pooled using a random effects meta-analysis for all three cohorts and fixed-effect meta-analyses when excluding BiB in sensitivity analyses (i.e., ALSPAC and MoBa). Between study heterogeneity was assessed using the Cochrane Q-statistic and I^2 [41].

The third assumption may be violated when the genetic instruments influence other risk factors for the outcome independently of the exposure of interest (horizontal pleiotropy) [42]. To explore horizontal pleiotropy, we checked the association of GRSs with known risk factors for CHD that we had data on. We explored the relationship between 1 SD increase in the GRS with risk factors for CHD (education, parity and diabetes) using linear or logistic regression. We describe methods for these variables in each cohort

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

in the Supplementary Material (Text S4). If any of the GRSs were associated with a risk factor, we considered that a potential pleiotropic effect. We then performed multivariable MR (MVMR) analyses if GWAS data for the potential pleiotropic variable was available [43]. Methods for these GRSs and the rationale for selecting these risk factors are described in Text S5. In this paper, we are asking whether BMI, smoking and alcohol are risk factors for CHDs. Therefore, we also explored the relationship between the GRS's for the different exposures of interest. We acknowledge that we are unable to tease apart horizontal from vertical pleiotropy from these analyses. In sensitivity analyses to explore potential bias via fetal genotype we repeated the PC (and batch) adjusted GRS-CHD association in the subsample of participants with fetal genome wide data (**Figure 1**) and then compared those results with the same associations additionally adjusted for the fetal GRS.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Results

Participant characteristics

MR analyses included 38,662 mother-offspring pairs, of which 319 offspring had CHD (**Figure 1**). The distributions of offspring and maternal characteristics for these analyses in ALSPAC, BiB and MoBa are displayed in **Table 1**. The prevalence of any CHD, mean maternal age and pre-/early-pregnancy BMI were similar in the three cohorts. Women in ALSPAC were more likely to smoke during pregnancy in comparison to those in BiB and MoBa although, the overall prevalence in BiB masks marked differences between the two largest ancestral groups, with 3.4% of South Asian women reporting smoking during pregnancy compared to 34% of White European women. Women in ALSPAC and BiB were more likely to consume alcohol to those in MoBa, although, in BiB, there are limited data available on alcohol consumption with very few South Asians responding to questions relating to alcohol in questionnaires.

Table 1. Participant characteristics for the 3 studies included in Mendelian randomization analyses.

Characteristic	Category	ALSPAC (N = 7,360)	BiB (N = 7,433)	MoBa (N = 23,869)
Offspring				
CHD	Yes	61 (0.8)	81 (1.1)	177 (0.7)
Sex	Male	3,703 (50.3)	3,818 (51.4)	12,139 (50.9)
	Female	3,657 (49.7)	3,615 (48.6)	11,704 (49.0)
Maternal				
Age, years		29.2 (4.6)	27.4 (5.6)	30.1 (4.5)
Parity	Primiparous	3,257 (46.6)	2,963 (40.1)	11,288 (47.3)
BMI, kg/m^2		22.5 (4.2)	26.2 (5.7)	24.1 (4.3)
Ethnicity	White European	7,360 (100.0) [a]	3,084 (42.6)	23,869 (100.0) [b]
	South Asian	-	3,503 (48.4)	-
	Other	-	656 (9.1)	-
Any smoking during pregnancy	Yes	1,679 (26.1)	1,175 (18.1)	1,814 (8.6)
Any alcohol during pregnancy	Yes	4,866 (79.9)	1,040 (49.3)	6,209 (31.5)

Data are means ± SD or n (%) unless stated. % are based on data available (data were not complete).

[a] All non-white European women with ethnicity data were not included in the analysis.

[b] Individuals of non-European ancestries were removed based on principal component analysis

Abbreviations: BiB, Born in Bradford; ALSPAC, Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children; MoBa, Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study; CHD, congenital heart disease; BMI, body mass index; kg, kilograms; m, meters.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

MR results

There were similar statistically strong positive associations of the BMI GRS with pre-pregnancy BMI and the smoking GRS with pregnancy smoking in all three cohorts (**Table 2**). The alcohol GRS also associated positively with alcohol consumption during pregnancy in all three cohorts with a somewhat weaker association in BiB and MoBa in comparison to ALSPAC.

Table 2. Relevance and strength of the genetic risk scores with exposures in pregnancy.

Study	N participants	N SNPs in GRS	Coefficient (95% CI)[a]	P-Value	R^2/ pseudo R^2 [b]	F statistic [c]	AUC
Association of GRS for BMI with pre-/early-pregnancy BMI							
ALSPAC	6,253	941	0.24 (0.21, 0.26)	1×10^{-80}	5.6%	372	-
BiB	6,196	939	0.20 (0.18, 0.23)	5×10^{-59}	4.1%	268	-
MoBa	22,533	868	0.25 (0.24, 0.27)	$< 1 \times 10^{-100}$	6.5%	1,555	-
Association of GRS for a lifetime smoking index with any smoking during pregnancy							
ALSPAC	6,428	126	1.27 (1.20, 1.35)	1×10^{-16}	1.6%	-	0.56
BiB	6,482	126	1.36 (1.27, 1.45)	2×10^{-20}	2.2%	-	0.59
MoBa	20,981	119	1.23 (1.17, 1.29)	7×10^{-17}	0.8%	-	0.56
Association of GRS for drinks per week with any alcohol consumption in pregnancy							
ALSPAC	6,087	98	1.14 (1.07, 1.21)	3×10^{-5}	0.4%	-	0.53
BiB	2,110	99	1.08 (0.99, 1.18)	0.09	0.2%	-	0.52
MoBa	19,737	73	1.02 (0.99, 1.05)	0.13	0.02%	-	0.51
MoBa sensitivity [d]	19,737	73	1.06 (1.01, 1.10)	0.01	0.07%	-	0.52

[a] Effect estimates (coefficient) are difference in mean (BMI) or odds ratio (smoking or drinking yes/no during pregnancy) per SD increase in genetic risk score.
[b] for the binary outcomes (smoking and alcohol) pseudo-R^2 are presented
[c] for BMI F-statistic is presented; for binary outcomes (smoking and alcohol) AUC is presented.
[d] in MoBa 7,356/23,784 consumed any alcohol during pregnancy. However, 4,754 of the 7,356 consumed alcohol "less than once per month" based on the questionnaire data. In the sensitivity analysis shown above, we re-coded the variable so that those that consumed alcohol less than once per month were classed as non-drinkers (N.B. due to the small numbers in each individual category, we were not able to analyze these separately). This was performed as an additional check to ensure the GRS was associated with pregnancy alcohol consumption in MoBa.
Abbreviations: SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism; GRS, genetic risk score; CI, confidence interval; AUC, area under the curve; ALSPAC, Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children; BiB, Born in Bradford; MoBa, Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The MR effects in each study and pooled across studies of each exposure and offspring CHDs are shown in **Figure 2**. There was no strong evidence that the maternal GRS for BMI influenced offspring CHD (OR (95%CI) per 1SD higher GRS: 1.01 (0.90, 1.13), with no statistical evidence of between study heterogeneity (**Figure 2A**). When excluding BiB from these analyses, the pooled point estimate showed a weak positive effect, although confidence intervals spanned the null (OR: 1.06 (0.93, 1.20); Figure S1B Supplementary Material). The BMI GRS associated with smoking, education, and diabetes across all three cohorts (Table S3). Results were unchanged in MVMR models including GRSs for education and smoking (Figures S1C & S1D). When further adjusting for offspring genotype, the pooled result attenuated to below the null, although this may be explained by the low number of CHD cases in BiB and should therefore be treated with caution. In offspring genotype adjusted analyses excluding BiB, the pooled result was null (OR: 0.97 (0.83, 1.14)) (Figures S1E-S1H).

The maternal GRS for maternal lifetime smoking index was also not associated with offspring CHD (OR (95%CI) per 1SD higher GRS: 0.97 (0.87, 1.08), with no statistical evidence of between study heterogeneity (**Figure 2B)**. The smoking GRS associated with BMI and education across the cohorts (Table S4). Results were consistent and unchanged in additional analyses excluding BiB (Figure S2B), MVMR analyses adjusting for education or BMI (Figures S2C & S2D) and in offspring genotype adjusted analyses (Figures S2E-S2H).

There was weak evidence of a positive association between maternal GRS for alcoholic drinks per week and offspring CHDs, with the strongest associations seen in MoBa (pooled OR: 1.09 (0.98, 1.22)) (**Figure 2C**). In analyses excluding BiB, the pooled estimated was consistent with main analyses (OR: 1.10 (0.97, 1.25)). Although there was no statistical evidence of heterogeneity between ALSPAC and MoBa, results suggest this estimate is largely being driven by MoBa (Figure S3B). The alcohol GRS showed consistent association with smoking across the cohorts (Table S5). The positive association remained in MVMR analyses adjusting for a GRS of smoking (Figure S3C) and in analyses adjusting for offspring genotype (Figures S3D-S3G).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

A: Genetically predicted maternal BMI and offspring CHDs



B: Genetically predicted maternal smoking and offspring CHDs



C: Genetically predicted maternal alcohol consumption and offspring CHDs



Figure 2. Forest plots showing the mendelian randomisation results for genetically predicted maternal body mass index (Panel A), smoking (GRS of a lifetime smoking index: Panel B), and alcohol consumption (GRS of drinks per week: Panel C) with offspring congenital heart disease.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Odds ratios (ORs) of CHD for a 1SD difference in maternal GRS in each study and pooled across studies using random effects meta-analysis. Adjusted for top 10 genetic principal components in all cohorts with additional adjustment for genetic chip, genetic batch, and imputation batch in MoBa. Abbreviations: ALSPAC, Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children; BiB, Born in Bradford; MoBa, Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study; BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; CHD, congenital heart disease; SD, standard deviation; GRS, genetic risk score.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Discussion

In the current study, using one-sample MR across three birth cohorts, we found no strong evidence for an effect of genetically predicted maternal BMI or smoking on risk of offspring CHD, but did find evidence of a potential causal effect of genetically predicted greater alcohol consumption on risk of offspring CHD. However, for alcohol there may have been weak instrument bias given that the GRS had somewhat weaker associations for pregnancy alcohol consumption, in comparison to GRSs of BMI and smoking. In one sample MR, a weak instrument would be expected to bias results toward the confounded observational result. To the best of our knowledge this is the first MR of these maternal exposures with offspring CHD, and it complements our previous negative paternal control study [10]. The findings from MR analyses of BMI are consistent to what we saw in the negative control study, with both suggesting that higher maternal BMI may not causally influence offspring CHD. We have not replicated our previous result for smoking, which suggested an increased risk of offspring CHD in women who smoked in pregnancy, whereas here there was no strong evidence for this. Conversely the possible effect of alcohol consumption on CHD seen here was not conducted in our previous multivariable adjusted observational analyses as lack of paternal data on alcohol consumption meant we were unable to explore paternal negative control analyses [10].

Results from this study using a GRS from GWAS of BMI produced comparable null results from linear BMI analyses presented in previous work [10]. Other work including large record linkage studies and pooled results from meta-analyses suggest that increasing maternal obesity severity increases offspring CHD risk [5,7]. However, parental negative control analyses suggested that these increased risks could be a result of confounding [10]. Exploring non-linear effects using MR with the data that were available was beyond the scope of this paper due to data availability. Nevertheless, recent work has used MR to explore non-linear effects [44] and future work of this nature could help further disentangle the causal relationship between maternal exposures on offspring CHDs. Overall, with the negative control analyses providing evidence that associations of higher maternal BMI are due to confounding, and the lack of an effect in the MR analyses presented here, the evidence suggests that previous associations between maternal BMI and any offspring CHD are unlikely to be causal.

The present results from a GRS derived from a lifetime smoking GWAS found no strong evidence of an association for genetically predicted maternal smoking and any offspring CHD. Despite this, there is still a considerable body of evidence (e.g., a meta-analysis of >8 million participants (137,575 CHD cases)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

that found maternal smoking increase offspring CHD risk. This, coupled with the evidence from parental negative control analyses provides good evidence that these results may be causal. The MR results from this study do not definitively rule out an effect. Larger datasets are needed to increase the precision of these findings. One possible reason that could have biased the MR results to the null is using "any CHD" grouped as one outcome. In our previous work, we showed that effects of maternal smoking on offspring CHD could mainly be being driven by non-severe CHDs [10]. Sub-categorising CHDs was not possible in the present study due to data availability and the numbers required for meaningful analyses. Another reason that may explain the null finding could be the use of a lifetime smoking index to instrument smoking. We believe that this was the best option for the MR analyses presented here as CHDs are rare meaning we were unable to stratify into current smokers or smoking heaviness. However, a GRS of lifetime smoking is different to e.g., a GRS of smoking heaviness because it also includes smoking initiation SNPs, which tend to capture personality traits related to initiating smoking such as impulsivity [27]and these are unlikely to be causal for CHD. Future work exploring the effects of maternal smoking on offspring CHDs should include MR analyses in larger datasets to increase the precision of the findings we present here as well as exploring the possibility of including two-sample MR analyses which would require publicly available GWAS datasets for CHD [45].

The current results, based on GRS derived from an alcohol GWAS, suggest a possible causal relationship between maternal alcohol consumption and offspring CHDs. Recent meta-analyses found consistent modest increases in risk of offspring CHD in mothers reporting alcohol consumption in pregnancy, however, many of the included studies did not adjust for confounders [9,46], meaning that it is difficult to determine whether the association is as of a result of alcohol or other characteristics that are related to alcohol and offspring CHDs. Results from parental negative control analyses had limited data and were thus inconclusive [10]. Results from this present study found a positive association between a maternal GRS derived from a GWAS of drinks per week (which is different from any alcohol consumption) and offspring CHDs. Although this is not definitive evidence for a causal relationship between maternal alcohol consumption and offspring CHDs, these results contribute to the overall body of evidence. The possibility remains that previous observational studies finding an effect of maternal alcohol consumption could be due to confounding, given that parental negative control analyses were inconclusive. In the present MR study, it is possible that the MR effects for alcohol could have been biased by weak instrument which would bias results towards the confounded observational estimate. Genetic instruments explain a small proportion of the exposure, despite using GRSs (as opposed to single SNPs) to improve statistical power [47]. Therefore, going forward, research should incorporate alcohol data in large numbers in mums

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

and fathers (for negative control analyses to robustly explore residual confounding) and include larger MR studies, in particular two-sample MR for which weak instrument bias would bias estimates in the opposite direction towards the null.

There are several strengths of the results presented in the current study. To date, few studies have used an MR approach to investigate the role of the pregnancy environment in the aetiology of offspring CHDs. The inclusion of 3 cohorts to maximise numbers and explore heterogeneity improves the robustness of the findings. We were able to adjust for offspring genotype in a large subsample of each cohort, which is important in attempting to separate the influence of genetic inheritance from a possible intrauterine effect [15]. A limitation of this study is that despite a relatively large sample size (N = 38,662) the effect estimates were often imprecise due to CHD being a rare condition and for alcohol may have been biased by the weak instrument. The inclusion of BiB increases the risk of confounding due to population stratification in MR. However, we tried to address this by adjusting for ancestry principal components and exploring consistency of results without BiB. In relation to this, the cohorts and the GWAS data used to construct the GRSs both aimed to test potential causal effects in a largely European population. Therefore, our results may not be generalizable to other populations. Next, we have only explored the effects of any CHD and therefore could have missed potential effects of these exposures on specific CHD subtypes. Related to this, the MoBa cohort only had cases diagnosed antenatally or around the time of birth (first year of life) which would increase the chances of outcome misclassification by assigning CHD cases which were diagnosed later in life as non-CHD cases. This is particularly pertinent for smoking analyses, given that we previously showed stronger potential effects in non-severe cases which would be more likely to suffer from misclassification in the case described here. Lastly, our results could have been affected by selection bias [48,49], although, we anticipate that by including multiple different birth cohorts and exploring consistency would help mitigate this.

Identifying causal risk factors is important for developing public health preventive interventions and to understand the mechanisms that link maternal lifestyle factors to offspring CHDs. The analysis steps taken in this paper aimed to explore the presence of a causal effect of maternal BMI, smoking and alcohol on offspring CHDs. In summary, we found no robust evidence of an effect for maternal genetically determined BMI or smoking on offspring CHD. We did observe a weak relationship between genetically predicted maternal alcohol intake on offspring CHDs, but this may be explained by weak instrument bias. Many of the results, such as those for smoking, produced imprecise estimates. Future larger studies that

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

employ a range of causal methods with information on CHD subtypes are warranted to further interrogate maternal gestational risk factors for offspring CHDs.

List of abbreviations

- CHD: congenital heart disease
- BMI: body mass index
- MR: Mendelian randomization
- MoBa: Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study
- GRS: genetic risk score
- GWAS: genome-wide association study
- ALSPAC: Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children
- BiB: Born in Bradford
- QC: quality control
- SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism
- MAF: minor allele frequency
- HWE: Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium
- LD: linkage disequilibrium
- EUROCAT: European surveillance of congenital anomalies
- MBRN: medical birth registry of Norway
- ICD-10: international classification of disease version 10
- STROBE-MR: strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology using mendelian randomization
- OR: odds ratio
- SD: standard deviation
- PC: principal component
- CI: confidence interval
- MVMR: multivariable Mendelian randomization

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval for ALSPAC was obtained from the ALSPAC Law and Ethics committee and local research ethics committees (NHS Haydock REC: 10/H1010/70). Informed consent for the use of data collected via questionnaires and clinics was obtained from participants following the recommendations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

of the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee at the time. At age 18, study children were sent 'fair processing' materials describing ALSPAC's intended use of their health and administrative records and were given clear means to consent or object via a written form. Data were not extracted for participants who objected, or who were not sent fair processing materials. For BiB, Ethics approval has been obtained for the main platform study and all of the individual sub studies from the Bradford Research Ethics Committee. Written consent was obtained from all participants. The establishment of MoBa and initial data collection was based on a license from the Norwegian Data Protection Agency and approval from The Regional Committees for Medical and Health Research Ethics. The MoBa cohort is now based on regulations related to the Norwegian Health Registry Act.

Availability of data and materials

The ALSPAC data management plan (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/data-access/documents/alspac-data-management-plan.pdf) describes in detail the policy on data sharing, which is through a system of managed open access. Scientists are encouraged to make use of the BiB study data, which are available through a system of managed open access. Please note that the study website contains details of all the data that is available through a fully searchable data dictionary and variable search tool" and reference the following webpage:

http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/. Before you contact BiB study, please make sure you have read the Guidance for Collaborators: https://borninbradford.nhs.uk/research/guidance-for-collaborators/). MoBa data are used by researchers and research groups at both the Norwegian Institute of Public Health and other research institutions nationally and internationally. The research must adhere to the aims of MoBa and the participants' given consent. All use of data and biological material from MoBa is subject to Norwegian legislation. More information can be found on the study website (https://www.fhi.no/en/studies/moba/for-forskere-artikler/research-and-data-access/).

Competing interests

DAL has received support from Medtronic Ltd. and Roche Diagnostics for biomarker research unrelated to those presented in this paper. DAL is on the editorial board for BMC Medicine. OAA is a consultant to HealthLytix.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Funding

K. Taylor is supported by a British Heart Foundation Doctoral Training Program (FS/17/60/33474). K. Taylor, Dr Wootton, Q. Yang, Dr Borges, and Prof Lawlor work in a unit that is supported by the University of Bristol and UK Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00011/6). Prof Lawlor is supported by a British Heart Foundation Chair in Cardiovascular Science and Clinical Epidemiology (CH/F/20/90003) and a NIHR Senior Investigator (NF-0616-10102). Prof Caputo is supported by the British Heart Foundation Chair in Congenital Heart Disease (CH/1/32804). Dr. Magnus has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 947684). This research was also supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence funding scheme (Project No. 262700). Dr Wootton is supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from the Norwegian South-Eastern Regional Health Authority (2020024). Q. Yang is funded by a China Scholarship Council PhD Scholarship (CSC201808060273). Dr Borges is supported by the University of Bristol Vice-Chancellor's Fellowship. Prof Lawlor and Dr Borges are supported by the British Heart Foundation (AA/18/7/34219).

Core funding for ALSPAC is provided by the UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (217065/Z/19/) and the University of Bristol. Many grants have supported different data collections, including for some of the data used in this publication, and a comprehensive list of grant funding is available on the ALSPAC website (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf). GWAS data was generated by Sample Logistics and Genotyping Facilities at Wellcome Sanger Institute and LabCorp (Laboratory Corporation of America) using support from 23andMe. BiB study has received core support from Wellcome Trust (WT101597MA), a joint grant from the UK Medical Research Council and UK Economic and Social Science Research Council (MR/N024397/1), the British Heart Foundation (CS/16/4/32482), and the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration Yorkshire and Humber (NIHR200166) and Clinical Research Network. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care. The Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services and the Ministry of Education and Research. This research is part of the HARVEST collaboration, supported by the Research Council of Norway (#229624). The NORMENT Centre provided genotype data, funded by the Research Council of Norway (#223273).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Authors contributions

K.T. and D.A.L. conceived the study. D.A.L., R.W., J.W., T.Y. and M.M. performed the data curation. K.T. conducted the analysis. K.T. and D.A.L. drafted the original version of the manuscript. All authors provided data interpretation, critical review, and commentary to the revised versions of the manuscript. All authors have seen and approved the final versions of this manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all the families who took part in the ALSPAC (Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children), the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists, and nurses. BiB (Born in Bradford) study is only possible because of the enthusiasm and commitment of the children and parents. We are grateful to all the participants, practitioners, and researchers who have made BiB study happen. We are grateful to all the participating families in Norway who take part in the ongoing MoBa (Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Wang H, Naghavi M, Allen C, Barber RM, Bhutta ZA, Carter A, et al. Global, regional, and national life expectancy, all-cause mortality, and cause-specific mortality for 249 causes of death, 1980–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. The Lancet [Internet]. 2016 Oct [cited 2020 Feb 20];388(10053):1459–544. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673616310121

2. McCracken Courtney, Spector Logan G., Menk Jeremiah S., Knight Jessica H., Vinocur Jeffrey M., Thomas Amanda S., et al. Mortality Following Pediatric Congenital Heart Surgery: An Analysis of the Causes of Death Derived From the National Death Index. Journal of the American Heart Association [Internet]. 2018 Nov 20 [cited 2020 May 7];7(22):e010624. Available from: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/JAHA.118.010624

3. van der Bom T, Zomer AC, Zwinderman AH, Meijboom FJ, Bouma BJ, Mulder BJM. The changing epidemiology of congenital heart disease. Nature Reviews Cardiology [Internet]. 2011 Jan [cited 2020 May 7];8(1):50–60. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/nrcardio.2010.166

4. Jenkins KJ, Correa A, Feinstein JA, Botto L, Britt AE, Daniels SR, et al. Noninherited Risk Factors and Congenital Cardiovascular Defects: Current Knowledge: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association Council on Cardiovascular Disease in the Young: *Endorsed by the American Academy of Pediatrics*. Circulation [Internet]. 2007 Jun 12 [cited 2020 Feb 5];115(23):2995–3014. Available from: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.106.183216

5. Liu X, Ding G, Yang W, Feng X, Li Y, Liu H, et al. Maternal Body Mass Index and Risk of Congenital Heart Defects in Infants: A Dose-Response Meta-Analysis. Biomed Res Int. 2019;1315796.

6. Persson M, Cnattingius S, Villamor E, Söderling J, Pasternak B, Stephansson O, et al. Risk of major congenital malformations in relation to maternal overweight and obesity severity: cohort study of 1.2 million singletons. BMJ [Internet]. 2017 Jun 14 [cited 2020 Feb 5];j2563. Available from: http://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.j2563

7. Persson M, Razaz N, Edstedt Bonamy A-K, Villamor E, Cnattingius S. Maternal Overweight and Obesity and Risk of Congenital Heart Defects. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019 08;73(1):44–53.

8. Zhao L, Chen L, Yang T, Wang L, Wang T, Zhang S, et al. Parental smoking and the risk of congenital heart defects in offspring: An updated meta-analysis of observational studies. Eur J Prev Cardiol. 2019 Mar 23;27(12):1284–93.

9. Zhang S, Wang L, Yang T, Chen L, Zhao L, Wang T, et al. Parental alcohol consumption and the risk of congenital heart diseases in offspring: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Prev Cardiolog [Internet]. 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Mar 20];27(4):410–21. Available from: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2047487319874530

10. Taylor K, Elhakeem A, Thorbjørnsrud Nader JL, Yang TC, Isaevska E, Richiardi L, et al. Effect of Maternal Prepregnancy/Early-Pregnancy Body Mass Index and Pregnancy Smoking and Alcohol on

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Congenital Heart Diseases: A Parental Negative Control Study. JAHA [Internet]. 2021 Jun [cited 2021 Jun 1];10(11). Available from: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/JAHA.120.020051

11. Davey Smith D. Negative Control Exposures in Epidemiologic Studies: Epidemiology [Internet]. 2012 Mar [cited 2020 Mar 20];23(2):350–1. Available from: http://journals.lww.com/00001648-201203000-00027

12. Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. 'Mendelian randomization': can genetic epidemiology contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease?*. International Journal of Epidemiology [Internet]. 2003 Feb [cited 2020 Nov 13];32(1):1–22. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/ije/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/ije/dyg070

13. Davies NM, Holmes MV, Davey Smith G. Reading Mendelian randomisation studies: a guide, glossary, and checklist for clinicians. BMJ [Internet]. 2018 Jul 12 [cited 2021 Oct 11];k601. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.k601

14. Smith GD, Lawlor DA, Harbord R, Timpson N, Day I, Ebrahim S. Clustered Environments and Randomized Genes: A Fundamental Distinction between Conventional and Genetic Epidemiology. Cardon L, editor. PLoS Med [Internet]. 2007 Dec 11 [cited 2020 Dec 10];4(12):e352. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0040352

15. Lawlor DA, Richmond R, Warrington N, McMahon G, Smith GD, Bowden J, et al. Using Mendelian randomization to determine causal effects of maternal pregnancy (intrauterine) exposures on offspring outcomes: Sources of bias and methods for assessing them. Wellcome Open Res [Internet]. 2017 Feb 14 [cited 2020 Nov 11];2:11. Available from: https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/articles/2-11/v1

16. Lawlor DA, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Triangulation in aetiological epidemiology. Int J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2017 Jan 20 [cited 2020 Mar 27];dyw314. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/ije/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/ije/dyw314

17. Yang Q, Borges MC, Sanderson E, Magnus MC, Kilpi F, Collings PJ, et al. Associations of insomnia on pregnancy and perinatal outcomes: Findings from Mendelian randomization and conventional observational studies in up to 356,069 women. medRxiv [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1;2021.10.07.21264689. Available from: http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/10/10/2021.10.07.21264689.abstract

18. Jaddoe VWV, Felix JF, Andersen A-MN, Charles M-A, Chatzi L, Corpeleijn E, et al. The LifeCycle Project-EU Child Cohort Network: a federated analysis infrastructure and harmonized data of more than 250,000 children and parents. Eur J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2020 Jul 23 [cited 2020 Jul 27];709–24. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-020-00662-z

19. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort Profile: The 'Children of the 90s'—the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. International Journal of Epidemiology [Internet]. 2013 Feb [cited 2020 Mar 3];42(1):111–27. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/ije/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/ije/dys064

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

21. Northstone K, Lewcock M, Groom A, Boyd A, Macleod J, Timpson N, et al. The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): an update on the enrolled sample of index children in 2019. Wellcome Open Res [Internet]. 2019 Mar 14 [cited 2020 Mar 10];4:51. Available from: https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/articles/4-51/v1

22. Wright J, Small N, Raynor P, Tuffnell D, Bhopal R, Cameron N, et al. Cohort Profile: The Born in Bradford multi-ethnic family cohort study. International Journal of Epidemiology [Internet]. 2013 Aug 1 [cited 2020 Mar 23];42(4):978–91. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/ije/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/ije/dys112

23. Magnus P, Birke C, Vejrup K, Haugan A, Alsaker E, Daltveit AK, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). Int J Epidemiol. 2016;45(2):382–8.

24. Magnus P, Irgens LM, Haug K, Nystad W, Skjaerven R, Stoltenberg C, et al. Cohort profile: the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). Int J Epidemiol. 2006 Oct;35(5):1146–50.

25. Rønningen KS, Paltiel L, Meltzer HM, Nordhagen R, Lie KK, Hovengen R, et al. The biobank of the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study: a resource for the next 100 years. Eur J Epidemiol. 2006;21(8):619–25.

26. Yengo L, Sidorenko J, Kemper KE, Zheng Z, Wood AR, Weedon MN, et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies for height and body mass index in ∼700000 individuals of European ancestry. Hum Mol Genet. 2018 Oct 15;27(20):3641–9.

27. Wootton RE, Richmond RC, Stuijfzand BG, Lawn RB, Sallis HM, Taylor GMJ, et al. Evidence for causal effects of lifetime smoking on risk for depression and schizophrenia: a Mendelian randomisation study. Psychol Med. 2020 Oct;50(14):2435–43.

28. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, Li Y, Brazel DM, Chen F, et al. Association studies of up to 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol use. Nat Genet [Internet]. 2019 Feb [cited 2021 Jun 3];51(2):237–44. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/s41588-018-0307-5

29. Easey KE, Wootton RE, Sallis HM, Haan E, Schellhas L, Munafò MR, et al. Characterization of alcohol polygenic risk scores in the context of mental health outcomes: Within-individual and intergenerational analyses in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. Drug and Alcohol Dependence [Internet]. 2021 Apr [cited 2021 Jun 3];221:108654. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0376871621001496

30. Burgess S, Davies NM, Thompson SG. Bias due to participant overlap in two-sample Mendelian randomization. Genet Epidemiol [Internet]. 2016 Nov [cited 2021 Jun 18];40(7):597–608. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/gepi.21998

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

31. Taylor K, Thomas R, Mumme M, Golding J, Boyd A, Northstone K, et al. Ascertaining and classifying cases of congenital anomalies in the ALSPAC birth cohort. Wellcome Open Res [Internet]. 2020 Oct 6 [cited 2020 Oct 13];5:231. Available from: https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/articles/5-231/v1

32. Bishop C, Small N, Mason D, Corry P, Wright J, Parslow RC, et al. Improving case ascertainment of congenital anomalies: findings from a prospective birth cohort with detailed primary care record linkage. bmjpo [Internet]. 2017 Nov [cited 2020 Mar 4];1(1):e000171. Available from: http://bmjpaedsopen.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmjpo-2017-000171

33. Leirgul E, Fomina T, Brodwall K, Greve G, Holmstrøm H, Vollset SE, et al. Birth prevalence of congenital heart defects in Norway 1994-2009—A nationwide study. American Heart Journal [Internet]. 2014 Dec [cited 2022 Jan 18];168(6):956–64. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0002870314004980

34. Brand JS, Gaillard R, West J, McEachan RRC, Wright J, Voerman E, et al. Associations of maternal quitting, reducing, and continuing smoking during pregnancy with longitudinal fetal growth: Findings from Mendelian randomization and parental negative control studies. PLoS Med [Internet]. 2019 Nov 13 [cited 2020 Jul 1];16(11):e1002972. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6853297/

35. Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, Fraser A, Nelson SM, Lawlor DA. Established preeclampsia risk factors are related to patterns of blood pressure change in normal term pregnancy: findings from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. J Hypertens. 2011 Sep;29(9):1703–11.

36. Hernáez Á, Wootton RE, Page CM, Skåra KH, Fraser A, Rogne T, et al. Smoking and subfertility: multivariable regression and Mendelian randomization analyses in the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study. medRxiv [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1;2021.10.25.21265469. Available from: http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/10/25/2021.10.25.21265469.abstract

37. Skrivankova VW, Richmond RC, Woolf BAR, Davies NM, Swanson SA, VanderWeele TJ, et al. Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology using mendelian randomisation (STROBE-MR): explanation and elaboration. BMJ [Internet]. 2021 Oct 26 [cited 2022 Jan 3];n2233. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.n2233

38. Skrivankova VW, Richmond RC, Woolf BAR, Yarmolinsky J, Davies NM, Swanson SA, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology Using Mendelian Randomization: The STROBE-MR Statement. JAMA [Internet]. 2021 Oct 26 [cited 2022 Jan 3];326(16):1614. Available from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2785494

39. Nagelkerke NJD. A note on a general definition of the coefficient of determination. Biometrika [Internet]. 1991 [cited 2022 Jan 21];78(3):691–2. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/biomet/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/biomet/78.3.691

40. Wang C, Zhan X, Liang L, Abecasis GR, Lin X. Improved ancestry estimation for both genotyping and sequencing data using projection procrustes analysis and genotype imputation. Am J Hum Genet. 2015 Jun 4;96(6):926–37.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.27.22269962; this version posted January 29, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

41. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ [Internet]. 2003 Sep 6 [cited 2020 May 22];327(7414):557–60. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC192859/

42. Davey Smith G, Hemani G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal inference in epidemiological studies. Human Molecular Genetics [Internet]. 2014 Sep 15 [cited 2021 Jun 7];23(R1):R89–98. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/hmg/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/hmg/ddu328

43. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Multivariable Mendelian randomization: the use of pleiotropic genetic variants to estimate causal effects. Am J Epidemiol. 2015 Feb 15;181(4):251–60.

44. Arvanitis M, Qi G, Bhatt DL, Post WS, Chatterjee N, Battle A, et al. Linear and Nonlinear Mendelian Randomization Analyses of the Association Between Diastolic Blood Pressure and Cardiovascular Events: The J-Curve Revisited. Circulation [Internet]. 2021 Mar 2 [cited 2021 Sep 21];143(9):895–906. Available from: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.049819

45. Lawlor DA. Commentary: Two-sample Mendelian randomization: opportunities and challenges. Int J Epidemiol. 2016 Jun;45(3):908–15.

46. Wen Z, Yu D, Zhang W, Fan C, Hu L, Feng Y, et al. Association between alcohol consumption during pregnancy and risks of congenital heart defects in offspring: meta-analysis of epidemiological observational studies. Ital J Pediatr. 2016 Feb 3;42:12.

47. Burgess S. Sample size and power calculations in Mendelian randomization with a single instrumental variable and a binary outcome. Int J Epidemiol. 2014 Jun;43(3):922–9.

48. Nilsen RM, Vollset SE, Gjessing HK, Skjaerven R, Melve KK, Schreuder P, et al. Self-selection and bias in a large prospective pregnancy cohort in Norway. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol. 2009 Nov;23(6):597–608.

49. Munafò MR, Tilling K, Taylor AE, Evans DM, Davey Smith G. Collider scope: when selection bias can substantially influence observed associations. International Journal of Epidemiology [Internet]. 2018 Feb 1 [cited 2021 Dec 21];47(1):226–35. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/47/1/226/4259077