Examining the association between genetic risk for depression, wellbeing and

schizophrenia, and proximity to greenspace

Zoe E. Reed[1,2*], Tim T. Morris[2,3], Oliver S.P. Davis[2,3,4,5], George Davey Smith[2,3],

Marcus R. Munafò[1,2,4], Gareth J. Griffith[2,3]

*Corresponding author

1 School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1TU, UK

2 Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of

Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK

3 Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, Oakfield House, Oakfield

Grove, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK

4 National Institute for Health Research Bristol Biomedical Research Centre,

University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and University of Bristol, Bristol,

BS8 2BN, UK

5 Alan Turing Institute, British Library, London, NW1 2DB, UK

Abstract

It is unclear whether associations between between greenspace and mental health reflects those with better mental health seeking out greener environments.

To examine this we 1) test associations between depression, wellbeing and schizophrenia polygenic scores (PGS) with two greenspace measures in UK Biobank (N=238,306 and 293,922), 2) estimate multilevel-models (MLM), clustering individuals by local geography and, 3) conduct one-sample Mendelian randomisation (MR) to estimate causal effects.

Depression and schizophrenia PGS were associated with lower greenspace, whilst wellbeing PGS was associated with higher greenspace. Locally-clustered MLM demonstrated attenuation for the individual wellbeing PGS association and a reversal of effect for the schizophrenia PGS association. MR revealed evidence of a causal effect of increased depression liability on decreased greenspace.

Therefore, greater liability to depression may cause selection into less green neighbourhoods. Our results also highlight how individual-level PGS associations can be biased by contextual, between-area differences in outcome.

Introduction

Living in areas with greater greenspace has been shown to associate with both decreased prevalence (and symptoms) of mental health conditions and increased wellbeing[1,2]. Evidence has been found across many indicators of greenspace, measured in terms of both land use[3,4] and vegetation[5–7], and across mental health outcomes, for instance, decreased psychological distress and depression[5,8–10] and increased wellbeing[11]. In this research we consider two of the most commonly used and widely validated indicators. The first uses the natural reflective properties of photosynthesising plants to infer vegetation density from satellite imagery[12], and the second uses administrative data from the land use database to estimate greenspace availability[13].

Similarly, residing in more urban areas, which have less greenspace, is associated with increased prevalence of mental health conditions[14], including depression and schizophrenia[15–19]. Recent meta-analyses of urbanicity and mental health studies found that risk for a range of mental health conditions was higher in urban areas[15,18], with odds ratios (ORs) between 1.13 and 1.33. A recent Danish population-based study found incidence rate ratios between 1.15 and 2.17 for the most urban areas compared to rural areas across multiple mental health conditions[20]. Greenspace has been suggested to drive a component of urban-rural differences in health outcomes[21].

These associations are commonly ascribed to the "social drift" hypothesis[22]. Social drift proposes that those with greater risk of current or future mental health conditions may migrate, or "drift", to more deprived, urban areas, driving the

observed concentration of such conditions in urban centres[14], and in turn be less

likely to have access to greenspace[19]. There is, however, a long history of research

contesting the causal directionality of this relationship[23,24]. In the contrary hypothesis,

socioeconomic position (SEP) or greenspace are considered causal risk factors for

developing a mental health condition, rather than simply confounding the relationship

between poor mental health and selective migration. Such debates are further

complicated by spatial confounding, as urbanicity and greenspace are intimately

related to many socio-demographic variables known to associate with mental

health[1,21,25]. Therefore, identifying a causal effect of greenspace over that which

might be caused by correlated, contextual confounds is difficult. The resulting

identification issues contribute to the ongoing uncertainty around the causal nature of

the mental health and greenspace, or urbanicity, relationship.

Previous studies exploring causal relationships between mental health and urbanicity

found evidence for a causal effect of increased genetic risk for schizophrenia on

living in more densely populated and deprived areas[22,26]. Recent systematic reviews

found evidence for mental health effects of environmental interventions to increase

greenspace was absent for adults[27]. However, risk-of-bias assessments in this study

indicated that only four of the 14 studies provided robust data, so studies with more

robust designs are needed to draw reliable conclusions.

Further evidence is therefore required to establish whether a causal relationship

between greenspace and mental health liability does exist. Furthermore, such

analyses must determine whether it is greenspace specifically and not urbanicity or

SEP confounds driving these associations.

In this study, we assessed the association between genetic risk for several mental

health outcomes and current residential greenspace for participants in UK Biobank.

We also tested whether observed associations may be causal using one-sample

Mendelian randomisation (MR)[28–30]. MR exploits the randomisation of genotypes at

conception to estimate causal effects of modifiable exposures on outcomes, here

mental health on greenspace. We used polygenic scores (PGS) for depression,

wellbeing and schizophrenia. We suggest that an association would support that

those with a genetic predisposition for more positive mental health outcomes may

preferentially select into environments with more greenspace.

Results

Sample characteristics

Sample characteristics for our UK Biobank sample are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	N with data available	Mean (SD) or percentage (%)
Age	336,997	56.87 (8.00)
Sex	336,997	53.79% females
NDVI	238,306	0.16 (0.17)
Percentage greenspace	293,922	36.86 (23.64)
Depression diagnosis	336,997	12.53%
MHQ depression	79,946	26.82%
Wellbeing	109,943	4.59 (0.78)
Schizophrenia diagnosis	293,922	0.17%

SD=Standard Deviation, NDVI=Normalised Difference Vegetation Index, MHQ=Mental Health

Questionnaire

Phenotypic associations

Results from linear regression models between depression, wellbeing and

schizophrenia and two greenspace outcomes, adjusting for age and sex are

presented in Supplementary Table S1. The two measures of greenspace we used

were the mean Normalised Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) and the percentage

of an area within a 300m radius of the participants home classified as greenspace

(see Methods for further details). We found negative associations between the

depression and schizophrenia diagnosis phenotypes and greenspace measures,

although there was weaker evidence of this for the Mental Health Questionnaire

(MHQ) depression measure. We found positive associations between wellbeing and

the greenspace measures, although evidence for this was weaker with the NDVI

outcome.

Linear regression model associations between polygenic scores and NDVI and

percentage greenspace

Results from the linear regression model adjusting for age, sex and the first 25

principal components (PCs) are presented in Table 2 for NDVI and Table 3 for

percentage greenspace. Table 2 and 3 present results for PGS calculated at a p-

value threshold of 0.05 (see Supplementary Tables S2 and S3 for other p-value

thresholds). Polygenic risk for depression was negatively associated with residing in

green areas for both NDVI (*b*=-0.008; 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.004; *p*=0.0001) and

percentage greenspace (*b*=-0.005; 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.001; *p*=0.01). This was in a

broadly consistent direction across most PGS p-value thresholds (Supplementary

Tables S2 and S3); however, we only found strong evidence of this association at

less stringent thresholds (1×10^{-03} for the NDVI measure and 0.01 for percentage

greenspace).

The wellbeing PGS was positively associated with residing in greener areas for

percentage greenspace only (*b*=0.01; 95% CI: 0.003 to 0.01; *p*=0.0005). This was in

a consistent direction across all PGS p-value thresholds. However, we again only

found strong evidence of this using a p-value threshold above 0.01 for percentage

greenspace. We did not find strong evidence of this association with the NDVI

measure (*b*=-0.0004; 95% CI: -0.004 to 0.003; *p*=0.83), although the direction of

effect was positive for most other p-value thresholds.

For the schizophrenia PGS, we found strong evidence of an association with

percentage greenspace only (*b*=-0.004; 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.001; *p*=0.02). This was

in a consistent direction across most PGS p-value thresholds, although there is only

strong evidence of this using a p-value threshold above 0.05 (Supplementary Table

S3). We did not find evidence of an association with the NDVI measure (*b*=0.0005;

95% CI: -0.004 to 0.005; *p*=0.80).

Table 2. Associations between polygenic scores for depression, wellbeing and

schizophrenia and NDVI for p-value threshold of 0.05 (N=238,306)

Phenotype	Beta*	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	P
Depression	-0.008	-0.01	-0.004	0.0001
Wellbeing	-0.0004	-0.004	0.003	0.83
Schizophrenia	0.0005	-0.004	0.005	0.80

132   *CI=Confidence Interval. *Beta reflects the NDVI SD change predicted by an SD increase in the PGS*

133   Table 3. Associations between polygenic scores for depression, wellbeing and

134   schizophrenia and percentage greenspace for p-value threshold of 0.05 (N=293,922)

Phenotype	Beta*	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	P
Depression	-0.005	-0.009	-0.001	0.007
Wellbeing	0.006	0.003	0.01	0.0005
Schizophrenia	-0.004	-0.008	-0.0006	0.02

*CI=Confidence Interval. *Beta reflects the percentage greenspace SD change predicted by an SD*

increase in the PGS

Multilevel model associations between polygenic scores and NDVI and percentage

greenspace, accounting for census area

The random-intercept models allowing neighbourhood or district differentials both fit

better than the linear model (Supplementary Table S4 shows comparisons of fit

statistics for all three models). The level-2 VPC, which assesses the proportion of

total, unexplained variation in outcome accounted for by a specific level in the model

(see Supplementary Material Section 1 for further details), for the neighbourhood

and district models respectively were 0.83 and 0.52 for the NDVI measure, and 0.48

and 0.24 for percentage greenspace. This implies that after adjusting for mental

health PGS (across any measure), and 25 principal components, 83% of the

remaining unexplained variation in individual-level NDVI exposure can be explained

by the neighbourhood of the individual, or equally (from the ICC definition) we would

expect a correlation of 0.83 between NDVI measures taken from pairs of individuals

within the same neighbourhood.

Results from these models are presented in Table 4 for NDVI (and Supplementary

Table S5) and Table 5 for percentage greenspace (and Supplementary Table S6).

Results from these models are comparable to those from the linear model for

depression liability with NDVI under both the neighbourhood specification (b=-0.002;

95% CI: -0.003 to -0.0004; p=0.01) and the district specification (b=-0.004; 95% CI: -

0.01 to -0.002; p=2.60x10^{-04}). They were also comparable for the percentage

greenspace measure for neighbourhood (b=-0.004; 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.001;

p=5.31x10^{-03}) and district specifications (b=-0.01; 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.004;

p=1.61x10^{-05}). For these variables, within-area effect estimates were consistent

direction with global effect estimates.

The coefficient for wellbeing and percentage greenspace attenuated in both the

neighbourhood specification (b=0.002; 95% CI: -0.001 to 0.005; p=0.12) and district

specification (b=0.004; 95% CI: 0.001 to 0.01; p=0.01), indicating that the initial

association may reflect aggregate differences in the wellbeing PGS between

neighbourhoods and/or districts. However, there was still no clear evidence of an

association with the NDVI measure in either specification.

Finally, for schizophrenia liability we still did not find any evidence of an effect on

NDVI in either neighbourhood or district specification. However, for the percentage

greenspace measure we observed an interesting effect in that the direction of the

association was reversed in both the neighbourhood (b=0.003; 95% CI: 0.0002 to

0.01; p=0.03) and district specifications (b=0.001; 95% CI: -0.002 to 0.005; p=0.50).

There was weaker evidence of this for the district specification; however, for the

neighbourhood specification this effect was observed for all p-value thresholds. In

specifying a random intercept model, we allow for between-neighbourhood (and

between-district) differences in NDVI to be estimated as normally distributed

residuals from a global mean. This means that the beta estimates functionally

represent a within-area estimate, for instance, the effect of PGS on NDVI, given that

you are in a neighbourhood with a higher-than-average NDVI. The change in

direction of this sign implies that although the global relationship between

schizophrenia PGS and greenspace was negative, this is mostly driven by

neighbourhoods with high NDVI tending to have lower than average PGS for

schizophrenia. When we account for between-area differences in our intercept, we

see that within-neighbourhoods the relationship was positive. This can be considered

an example of Simpson's paradox[52,53] where an individual model would fail to

address the important context of neighbourhood in determining an individual's NDVI.

Table 4. Associations between polygenic scores for depression, wellbeing and schizophrenia and NDVI measure, with neighbourhood or district level random intercepts, for p-value threshold of 0.05 (N=238,306).

	Neighbourhood				District			
Phenotype	Beta*	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	P	Beta*	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	P
Depression	-0.002	-0.003	-0.0003	0.02	-0.004	-0.006	-0.002	2.13×10^{-04}
Wellbeing	0.001	-0.0006	0.003	0.22	0.002	-0.0004	0.004	0.11
Schizophrenia	-0.0006	-0.002	0.001	0.45	-0.0007	-0.003	0.001	0.52

*Neighbourhood= Middle Layer Super Output Area or intermediate zone, District= Local Authority District or Local Authority, CI=Confidence Interval. **Beta reflects the NDVI SD change predicted by an SD increase in the PGS, for the average individual in a typical neighbourhood or district.*

Table 5. Associations between polygenic scores for depression, wellbeing and schizophrenia and percentage greenspace with neighbourhood or district level random intercepts, for p-value threshold of 0.05 (N=293,922).

	Neighbourhood				District			
Phenotype	Beta*	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	P	Beta*	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	P
Depression	-0.004	-0.006	-0.001	6.06×10^{-03}	-0.007	-0.01	-0.004	1.10×10^{-05}
Wellbeing	0.002	-0.0006	0.005	0.14	0.004	0.0009	0.007	0.01
Schizophrenia	0.003	0.0003	0.006	0.03	0.001	-0.002	0.004	0.51

*Neighbourhood= Middle Layer Super Output Area or intermediate zone, District= Local Authority District or Local Authority, CI=Confidence Interval. *Beta reflects the percentage greenspace SD change predicted by an SD increase in the PGS, for the average individual in a typical neighbourhood or district.*

One-sample Mendelian randomisation for depression and wellbeing on greenspace

measures

We used one-sample MR analyses to assess whether there was evidence of a

causal effect of depression liability on the NDVI measure and percentage

greenspace, of wellbeing on percentage greenspace, and of schizophrenia liability

on percentage greenspace. Results from the one-sample MR analyses are shown in

Table 6 and results from sensitivity analyses are presented in Supplementary Table

S7. We found strong evidence for a causal effect of the liability of having a diagnosis

of depression on lower percentage greenspace (*b*=-0.51; 95% CI: -0.93 to -0.10;

p=0.01). This was not apparent for the MHQ depression measure, although the

direction of effect was the same. We did not find strong evidence of a causal effect of

liability for the depression measures on the NDVI outcome; however, the direction of

effect was the same for both measures. We did not find strong evidence of a causal

effect of wellbeing on percentage greenspace for the PGS constructed for genome-

wide significant SNPs or at the p-value threshold of 1×10^{-05}, although the direction of

effect was positive. Finally, we did not find strong evidence of a causal effect of

schizophrenia liability on percentage greenspace.

We did not find any strong evidence for causal effects in the sensitivity analyses

(Supplementary Table S7), although the direction of effect was consistent with our

main results for depression liability and percentage greenspace.

Table 6. One-sample Mendelian randomisation results

Exposure	Outcome	N	Beta*	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	P
Depression	NDVI	238,306	-0.26	-0.74	0.23	0.30

diagnosis						
MHQ depression	NDVI	64,740	-0.01	-0.51	0.50	0.97
Depression diagnosis	Percentage greenspace	293,922	-0.51	-0.93	-0.10	0.01
MHQ depression	Percentage greenspace	77,358	-0.54	-1.14	0.06	0.08
Wellbeing (GW PGS)	Percentage greenspace	97,099	0.16	-0.49	0.81	0.63
Wellbeing (PGS at 1x10^{-05})	Percentage greenspace	97,099	0.06	-0.75	0.87	0.88
Schizophrenia	Percentage greenspace	293,922	6.75	-7.95	21.45	0.37

220 *CI=Confidence Interval, GW=Genome-wide, PGS=Polygenic score, NDVI=Normalised Difference*

221 *Vegetation Index, MHQ=Mental Health Questionnaire. *Beta reflects the NDVI or percentage*

222 *greenspace SD change predicted by an increased genetic liability for depression and schizophrenia*

223 *or every one unit increase in the wellbeing score*

Discussion

Our results indicate that genetic risk for depression and wellbeing are associated

with the greenspace of the areas which participants reside in. We found the

strongest evidence for depression, with increased genetic risk associated with

decreased greenspace for two different measures of greenspace. We also found

evidence that this effect might be causal for percentage greenspace – in other

words, that those at a higher genetic risk for depression may select into less green

areas. Our MR sensitivity analyses did not provide strong evidence of a causal

effect; therefore, our results should be interpreted with caution. However, the

sensitivity analyses used individual SNPs and our results may therefore have been

impacted by low statistical power. The positive association with wellbeing was only

observed for the percentage greenspace measure, but the direction of effect was the

same with the NDVI measure. Our results support previous observational studies

which found an association between greenspace and depression and

wellbeing[2,5,9,17,18] and extend these findings by suggesting a causal effect of liability to

depression diagnosis on greenspace. As greenspace cannot cause genetic risk for

these mental health outcomes, this overcomes issues around reverse causation.

In addition, models specifying a random intercept specification for local context

indicated that the relationship for depression and greenspace was negative both

within- and between-neighbourhoods and districts. Our concern that global effect

estimates may produce misleading PGS relationships was borne out for all

phenotypes, as the inclusion of an area-level random intercept attenuated results for

depression liability and wellbeing, and inverted the sign of the schizophrenia liability

relationship. For this study (and, we argue, for other genetically informed study

designs) the effect estimate of interest is the relationship between PGS and outcome

over and above that which is due to area-level compositional differences and other

residual area-level confounding.

This suggests that at least part of the PGS-greenspace relationships we see were

due to aggregate between-area differences, and not due to the impact of those PGS

within an area. For instance, attenuation for random effects model estimates for

wellbeing with percentage greenspace suggests that the initial association was likely

due to individuals' wellbeing PGS being consistent within an area. Thus, when we

accounted for between-area differences via the random intercept specification, the

observed relationship within-area became far less strong, as most of this initial

relationship was driven by certain areas having both high wellbeing PGS and high

greenspace levels.

This is evidenced more explicitly by the extremely high level-2 VPC values. We note

that these were not identical for all mental health PGS but the amount of variance

explained by each PGS was very small, so the VPC was almost the same for each

model. A VPC of 0.83 implies that simply knowing individuals' neighbourhoods would

allow you to account for 83% of the unexplained, observed variation in phenotypic

NDVI. This is important as, coupled with the reversal of sign of the effect estimate in

our schizophrenia liability model, it implies our initial global effect estimate was

mostly driven by individuals living within the same area (both neighbourhood or

district areas) being more phenotypically and genetically similar to their immediate

neighbours than to those living in other areas. This is particularly concerning as this

is what adjustment for genetic principal components is often cited as insulating

against, with the implication that adjustment for genetic ancestry should deal with

spatial confounding between UK Biobank participants. This appears to not be the

case, and as such we propose that local neighbourhood random intercept

specifications be included in PGS analyses as a routine robustness check to ensure

that global PGS estimates are not being biased by such spatial confounding. That

said, our study design is likely an extreme case of such confounding, as the

greenspace value for any given individual can be reasonably inferred to be nearly

identical of that of their immediate neighbours, simply because the outcome is

defined within a spatial boundary.

Our results for depression and wellbeing PGS are consistent with the social drift

hypothesis, which supports a role of the movement of genetically similar individuals

into more urban/less green areas. Here, this suggests those with greater genetic risk

of poor mental health may select into areas with less greenspace. We did not test a

bidirectional effect for mental health with greenspace as we were unable to construct

strong genetic instruments for greenspace. We did run GWAS for both greenspace

measures in UK Biobank, but only found one genome-wide significant SNP for NDVI,

and none for percentage greenspace so analyses would be impossible, or

underpowered to detect any effects. If larger GWAS of contextual phenotypes were

to be conducted, this may help investigate causation in this direction.

The relationship we observe for schizophrenia liability is particularly interesting. We

found that for both greenspace measures when we modelled the association with

schizophrenia liability the direction of the association reversed when specifying an

area-level random-intercept parameter, an example of Simpson's paradox[54]. There

are multiple reasons why this may occur, but one which is consistent with known UK

Biobank selection issues is that this is caused by non-random selection within areas.

UK Biobank participation is known to be patterned by both phenotypic schizophrenia

and schizophrenia PGS[36]. We suggest that the results we see are consistent with

collider bias where, within-areas, those with low schizophrenia PGS and in greener

areas are more likely to have participated in UK Biobank. Assuming no complex

interactions, this would induce a positive relationship between schizophrenia PGS

and greenness as a result of collider bias, where individuals with a high

schizophrenia PGS are more likely to have high greenspace values. What is striking,

however, is that schizophrenia PGS and greenspace are still clustered strongly

enough that between areas we see the anticipated relationship, implying that areas

with higher greenspace tend to be populated with individuals with lower

schizophrenia PGS to a strong enough degree that the global effect estimate is

negative in the full UK Biobank population.

Our results also differed between the NDVI and greenspace measure used. Our

results are consistent with previous observational studies showing increased NDVI,

which indicates visible greenness of an area was associated with fewer depressive

symptoms, decreased job-related stress and psychological distress[5–7]. However, in

other studies using a similar measure to ours based on data from the Generalized

Land Use Database (i.e., percentage of greenspace in an area), associations with

mental health outcomes were not generally found[3,55,56].

Our study has several limitations. First, PGS analyses have well known limitations;

for example, different p-value thresholds to construct scores affects the predictive

accuracy of the score. More SNPs may increase the variance explained but may

also suffer from overfitting. In our main analyses we focused on one p-value

threshold but included other thresholds as sensitivity analyses (see Supplementary

Tables S2 and S3) and found consistent results across these. Second, our large

sample size means that the estimated associations will have increased precision and

we may overstate confidence in associations which may not generalise to a wider

population. Similarly, these results were obtained from a European ancestry sample

and may not be generalisable to other ancestry groups. Third, it is possible that the

GWAS for our mental health phenotypes also include some SNPs associated with

"upstream" traits like greenspace (i.e., the primary phenotype is mis-specified)[57]. As

we do not know what SNPs influence greenspace, we are unable to account for this.

However, the PRS analyses are more likely to be impacted by this than the MR

analyses given the less stringent p-values used and therefore the greater number of

SNPs included that may capture these "upstream" traits. Fourth, whilst we may

increase the likelihood of obtaining generalisable estimates by including a random

intercept for area-context, participation in UK Biobank at baseline was extremely

non-random as we outline above. Fifth, we were not able to be prescriptive with our

operationalisation of greenspace. A recent study illustrated the sensitivity of results

to greenspace specification; for instance, availability, accessibility, and visibility of

greenspace produced very different results when included in analyses[58].The NDVI

measure likely offers a more bespoke measure of greenspace in rural settings as it is

calculated at a household level, rather than at OA level (rural OAs are sparser and

larger). However, NDVI simply captures surface reflectivity from satellite imagery, so

has no sensitivity to the accessibility of the greenspace it is capturing, unlike the

percentage greenspace measure. Future research into this must carefully consider

which components of greenspace are of interest for each research question. Sixth, in

our MR analyses we were possibly underpowered to detect an effect for wellbeing

due to the small number of genome-wide significant SNPs identified in the GWAS.

Seventh, a key limitation of MLM approaches is that endogenous, omitted variables

associated with the higher-level contexts can reduce generalisability. If the aim of an

analysis is solely to adjust for higher level context, then a fixed effects approach

might be more appropriate (see Abdellaoui et al[59]). Finally, we also need to consider

that geographical location will also be, to some extent, accounted for in our PGS[60],

as well as other types of structure, which may include population stratification and

assortative mating[61].

In conclusion, we found evidence to suggest that those at risk of poorer mental

health outcomes, specifically depression and wellbeing, may select into less green

areas. Further studies investigating bidirectionality are called for as if lack of

greenspace further exacerbates poor mental health then interventions targeting

greenspace may be important. Finally, our study highlights the potential for spatial

confounding to bias genetic analyses of geographically clustered phenomena. We

suggest therefore, that increasing availability of genetic datasets with geographical

location will allow for future research to understand and quantify these potential

biases.

Methods

Cohort description

The UK Biobank is a large population-based prospective health research resource of

503,317 participants, aged between 38 and 73 years at recruitment, recruited

between 2006 and 2010, from across the UK[31]. The study aimed to identify

determinants of human disease in middle and old age. A range of data have been

collected across sociodemographic, health status, lifestyle, cognitive function, self-

reported measures and physical and mental health measures. Data were collected

via a number of methods, including paper and web-based questionnaires, computer

assisted interviews, clinic visits and data linkage. Baseline assessment took place at

22 assessment centres in the UK to enable recruitment from a range of locations.

Further information can be found on the UK Biobank website

(www.ukbiobank.ac.uk). UK Biobank received ethical approval from the Research

Ethics Committee (REC reference for UK Biobank is 11/NW/0382). We excluded

participants based on the latest withdrawal lists at the time of data extraction

(04/02/2020) for our UK Biobank project (project number: 21829).

Phenotypic measures

The proposed mechanism of greenspace impact is inconsistently defined in the

literature[32]. Therefore, we used two measures to capture participants' residential

access to greenspace. These measures were made available to UK Biobank by

Sarkar et al., and were derived using exact postcodes[33]. Both measures were

standardised prior to inclusion in models.

Normalised Difference Vegetation Index

Our first outcome was the mean Normalised Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI),

calculated for a 500m radius of the participant's home location. NDVI is a commonly

used parameterisation of green-space access as it can be calculated from satellite

imagery, rather than requiring administrative land use information[6,7], and closely

approximates subjective exposure estimates[12]. The NDVI ranges between -1 and +1,

with positive values indicating greener areas based on reflectance measures in

Colour InfraRed (CIR) satellite data[33]. The distribution in UK Biobank was -0.50 to

0.70. After exclusions based on withdrawn consent and quality control filtering for

genetic data (described below) and including only those with genetic data, the final

sample size for NDVI was 238,306 (see Figure 1).

Percentage greenspace

Our second outcome refers to the percentage of an area within a 300m radius of the

participants home classified as greenspace. This is based on land use data from the

Generalized Land Use Database (GLUD)[13] for England 2005 data at the 2001

census output area (OA) level. Census output areas were designed to have a

consistent population, thus their area varies considerably with population density.

Each participant's home location was allocated an area weighted mean of these data

for output areas intersecting the 300m radius of a home. After exclusions and

including only those with genetic data, the final sample size used in analyses with

this outcome was 293,922 (see Figure 1).

The percentage greenspace measure was only weakly correlated with the NDVI

measure (r=0.16). This is likely because they capture different aspects of

greenspace; the NDVI measure captures greenness via the reflectance of the land

surface, whereas the percentage greenspace classification captures functional

greenspace, including areas of natural agricultural land, recreational areas and other

areas of grassland, and excluding domestic gardens[13].

Figure 1. Flowchart of number of participants included in analyses

Depression

For one-sample MR analyses, we also require phenotypic data on mental health

outcomes. We used data from a combination of both ICD-10 diagnoses and

diagnoses reported in verbal interviews with a nurse at the assessment centre.

Anyone who had a diagnosis of depression from any of these sources was coded as

having depression. Anyone without a diagnosis indicated in these data sources was

coded as not having depression. We refer to this combined measure as diagnosis of

depression. Data were also available for a sub-sample of UK Biobank participants

who completed questions related to depressive and manic symptoms during the final

two years of recruitment. From these data, a variable for having bipolar disorder and

major depression was derived, where a participant reporting both was coded only as

having the most severe condition[34]. We excluded participants who had bipolar

disorder type 1 or 2 and identified those as having depression if they had probable

recurrent major depression (severe or moderate) or a single probable major

depression episode. We refer to this as the mental health questionnaire (MHQ)

depression measure.

Wellbeing

As part of an on-line mental health self-assessment questionnaire issued in 2016,

participants were asked the question 'In general how happy are you?'. Participants

could select from the following options: 'Prefer not to answer', 'Do not know',

'Extremely happy', 'Very happy', 'Moderately happy', 'Moderately unhappy, 'Very

unhappy' and 'Extremely unhappy'. We excluded participants who selected either of

the first two options and coded the other options so that a higher number indicated a

more positive response.

Schizophrenia

Similar to the depression diagnosis variable, we used data from a combination of both ICD-10 diagnoses and diagnoses reported in verbal interviews with a nurse at the assessment centre. Participants with a diagnosis of schizophrenia from any of these sources were coded as having schizophrenia. Participants without a diagnosis indicated in these data sources were coded as not having schizophrenia. In UK Biobank 0.17% of participants were coded as having schizophrenia, compared to 0.7% reported for psychotic disorders in England[35]. This is consistent with known selection pressures in UK Biobank , as demonstrated previously with reduced participation in individuals with greater liability to schizophrenia[36].

Potential confounders

We included age at time of initial assessment and sex in all of our analyses. As we examined phenotypes related to geographical location, we also included the first 25 principal components of population structure (PCs) as confounders in all of our models including PGS. The number of PCs was chosen to reduce geographical confounding. A recent study found that adjusting for 18 PCs was a sensible correction for population structure[37], but in this study we corrected for 25 PCs as this was where we saw a flattening in the variance explained by the PCs in our outcomes (Supplementary Figure S1).

Structural Variables

In our multilevel models we specified geographical clustering using the administrative area that each participant resided in at the time of recruitment. Participant locations were matched on easting and northing coordinates[38] to the

most recently defined local administrative units at two spatial scales, one to

represent local neighbourhood context, and one the broader city and commuting

context. We consider Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOAs, average population

= 7,200) for England and Wales analogous to Intermediate Zones (IZ, average

population = 4,200) for Scotland – hereafter, "neighbourhoods". Similarly, we

consider Local Authority Districts (LADs, average population 140,000) analogous to

Local Authorities (LAs, average population 170,000) for Scotland, hereafter

"districts". Supplementary Figures S2 and S3 show the number of UK Biobank

participants per neighbourhood and district respectively. Data were rounded to the

nearest kilometre to preserve anonymity, meaning some participants' recorded

locations fell outside of census boundaries (0.6% of participants). These participants

were assigned to the nearest neighbourhood or district based on Euclidean distance

to the census output area centre.

Genetic data

There were 488,377 participants with genotyped samples, of which 49,979 were

genotyped using the UK BiLEVE array and 438,398 using the UK Biobank axiom

array. Pre-imputation quality control, phasing and imputation have been described

elsewhere[39]. In summary, multiallelic SNPs and those with a MAF≤1% were

removed. Phasing of genotype data was performed using a modified version of the

SHAPEIT2 algorithm. The SNPs used were imputed to the Haplotype Reference

Consortium (HRC) reference panel, using IMPUTE2 algorithms. A graded filtering

with different imputation qualities for different MAF ranges was used (Info>0.3 for

MAF>3%, Info>0.6 for MAF 1-3%, Info>0.8 for MAF 0.5-1% and Info>0.9 for MAF

0.1-0.5%), where MAF and info scores were recalculated on an in-house derived

'European' subset. Individuals with sex-mismatch or sex-chromosome aneuploidy

were excluded (N=814). In-house quality control filtering of the UK Biobank data is

described in a published protocol[40]. We restricted the sample to individuals of white

British ancestry who self-report as "White British" and who have very similar

ancestral backgrounds according to principal components analysis (N=409,703), as

described by Bycroft and colleagues[39]. Estimated kinship coefficients using the KING

toolset[41] identified 107,162 pairs of related individuals. An in-house algorithm was

then applied to this list and preferentially removed the individuals related to the

greatest number of other individuals until no related pairs remain. These individuals

were excluded (N=79,450).

Polygenic scores

We constructed 12 different PGS using Plink (version 2)[42] for each phenotype using

summary statistics from genome wide association studies (GWAS) of major

depressive disorder (MDD)[43], wellbeing[44] and schizophrenia[45]. The summary

statistics for the MDD and wellbeing GWAS excluded UK Biobank to avoid sample

overlap, and also excluded 23andMe participants. The PGS we constructed were

based on different p-value thresholds of the trait GWAS (0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1, 0.05,

0.01, 1×10^{-3}, 1×10^{-4}, 1×10^{-5}, 1×10^{-6}, 5×10^{-8}). We used the PGS constructed at a p-

value threshold of 0.05 for our main analyses due to this explaining the largest

proportion of variance in depression[43] and schizophrenia[45] in the original GWAS

studies. This was not reported for wellbeing; therefore, we used a p-value threshold

of 0.05 for these analyses for consistency. We present results from other p-value

thresholds as sensitivity analyses to assess the consistency of the observed effects

across different thresholds. For the PGS constructed at a p-value threshold of 0.05,

the depression PGS explained 0.4% of the variance in having a diagnosis of

depression in the UK Biobank, the wellbeing PGS explained 0.3% of the variance in

wellbeing, and the schizophrenia PGS explained 2.7% of the variance in having a

diagnosis of schizophrenia. SNPs from the GWAS and UK Biobank were

harmonised, aligning the effect estimates and alleles. SNPs were clumped used the

European subsample of the 1000 genomes project, with $R^2 < 0.25$ and a window of

500 kb. The PGS were created by multiplying the number of effect alleles for each

participant in UK Biobank by the effect estimate of the SNP from the relevant GWAS,

then summing across all SNPs associated with each trait. PGS were z-standardised;

results should be interpreted as per standard deviation (SD) increase in score.

Statistical analysis

Linear regression models

Initial analyses were conducted in R version 3.5.1 and 3.6.2[46] using linear regression

models. We first conducted analyses to examine phenotypic associations in UK

Biobank where NDVI or percentage greenspace were the outcomes and the mental

health phenotypes were the exposures. We then conducted analyses where NDVI or

percentage greenspace were the outcomes and the PGS for MDD, wellbeing and

schizophrenia were the exposures in separate analyses. These global regression

models cannot meaningfully distinguish within- and between-area components of a

given relationship but are useful to demonstrate aggregate relationships across a

dataset. It also allows us to observe whether there are differences when accounting

for geographical context which may indicate contextually varying relationships.

Multilevel models (MLM)

Our interest for this study is in modelling the impact of the mental health PGS on

greenspace, but also in quantifying the degree to which the ostensibly individual

relationship can be distorted by higher level spatial confounding. As such, we fit

multilevel (or mixed or hierarchical) models (MLM) to efficiently estimate the within-

area effect of PGS exposure, whilst we account for between-area differences in

greenspace and PGS, retaining the capacity to quantify the impact of contextual

clustering that is sacrificed in traditional fixed effect approaches[47]. We present this as

a Variance Partitioning Coefficient (VPC), for the area level, which gives the

proportion of unexplained variation in a coefficient, that is explained by the area level

rather than solely being assumed a result of individual differences. In the two level

case, this is exactly equivalent to the intra-class correlation (ICC), giving the

expected correlation between randomly selected pairs of individuals within the same

higher level unit[48]. This ensures we do not misattribute between-area aggregate

variation in mental-health PGS exposures, to independent between-individual

variation. The MLM's are further described in the Supplementary Material (Section

1).

For MLMs we used the R package *lme4*[49]. We fitted two MLMs, adjusting for sex,

age and 25 PCs as fixed effects. The first model included a normally distributed

random effect around the modelled intercept, which varies at neighbourhood level.

By allowing each area to have its own modelled intercept, we account for the fact

that different geographical areas have different mean values for exposure and

outcome. This means our PGS effect estimate represents the effect of a unit

increase in PGS *within* a given neighbourhood. The second MLM extends the

formulation above but with random effects specified for district rather than

neighbourhood. We evaluated the model fit using Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC)

and compared across all three models, taking the best fitting model as the one with

lowest AIC. We also present the proportion of the total residual variance attributable

to variation between neighbourhoods or districts, rather than between-individual,

within-area variation, by calculating ICCs.

One-sample Mendelian randomisation analyses

Where we found evidence of an association between the PGS and the greenspace

outcomes, we ran one-sample MR analyses, with externally derived weights, to

assess whether these relationships may be causal. MR is a causal inference method

which uses genetic variants (typically SNPs), which are randomly assigned at

conception, as instrumental variables (IVs) for an exposure of interest. MR is more

robust to assumptions of confounding and reverse causation than conventional

observational analyses. There are three underlying core assumptions for MR, which

are i) that the genetic IV is robustly associated with the exposure (relevance), ii) the

genetic IV is only associated with the outcome via the exposure i.e., no direct effects

on the outcome (exclusion restriction), and iii) there is no confounding of the genetic

IV and outcome (independence).

In these analyses, for the genetic IV for depression, wellbeing and schizophrenia, we

used weighted PGS created using SNPs that reached genome-wide significance

($p<5\times10^{-8}$) in the GWAS including all samples. For schizophrenia we used the

corresponding weights from the GWAS including all samples, however for

depression and wellbeing we used weights from the GWAS excluding UK Biobank

and 23andMe samples[43–45]. For the genetic IV for wellbeing, we also used a

weighted PGS created at $p<1\times10^{-05}$, due to the low number of SNPs (n=3) reaching

genome-wide significance.

We used a two-stage least squares regression approach, with the Applied

Econometrics with R (AER) package (v1.2-9), to estimate the causal effects of

depression liability, wellbeing and schizophrenia liability on the greenspace

outcomes. Two-stage least squares regression allows the IV-exposure effect to be

estimated in the first step and then in the second step the effect on the outcome is

estimated by regressing the outcome on the estimates from step one. For

depression, we used the variable for diagnosis of depression to estimate the genetic

IV and exposure relationship in our main analyses, and we used the MHQ

depression measure in sensitivity analyses. For schizophrenia we used the variable

for diagnosis of schizophrenia to estimate the genetic IV and exposure relationship.

We also ran sensitivity analyses for all one-sample MR analyses using individual

SNP data (as these were not possible to apply to the PGS), except for the genome-

wide p-value threshold wellbeing analysis as there were too few SNPs. We used the

collider-correction approach[50], which applies two-sample MR methods to one-sample

MR data. This approach artificially induces collider bias between the exposure and

outcome and then corrects for it, in order to facilitate simple adjustment for weak

instrument bias and pleiotropy. We used collider-corrected inverse-variance

weighted (IVW), Simulation Extrapolation (SIMEX) adjusted MR-Egger and least

absolute deviation approaches. The IVW approach constrains the regression

intercept to pass through zero and assumes there is no unbalanced pleiotropic

effects of SNPs. The IVW estimate ignores uncertainty in the SNP-exposure

estimate by assuming that its variance is negligible (known as the NO Measurement

Error [NOME] assumption). MR Egger assesses and counteracts unbalanced

pleiotropy by not constraining the intercept to pass through zero. SIMEX allows for

adjustment due to regression dilution bias from weak instruments. Finally, IVW and

MR Egger rely on the InSIDE assumption (that the SNP-exposure association is not

correlated with a path from the SNP to the outcome, independent of the exposure)

and the least absolute deviation approach does not. The least absolute deviation

approach is also SIMEX adjusted. We also calculated the I-squared statistic

(indicative of strength of NOME violation for MR Egger) and the mean F-statistic

(indicative of instrument strength)[51]. Finally, we ran MR Robust Adjusted Profile

Score (RAPS) for the wellbeing MR using a p-value threshold of $p < 1 \times 10^{-05}$. As it

allows large numbers of weak instruments below the conventional GWAS threshold

(5×10^{-08}) to be included, accounting for weak instrument bias.

Data availability

UK Biobank data are available through a procedure described at

https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/enable-your-research.

Code availability

The analysis code that forms the basis of the results presented here is available from

https://github.com/ZoeReed/Greenspace_MH_PGS_analysis.

Acknowledgements: This research has been conducted using data from UK

Biobank, a major biomedical database (www.ukbiobank.ac.uk, application No

21829). We thank the participants of UK Biobank. Quality Control filtering of the UK

Biobank data was conducted by R.Mitchell, G.Hemani, T.Dudding, L.Corbin,

S.Harrison, L.Paternoster as described in the published protocol (doi:

10.5523/bris.1ovaau5sxunp2cv8rcy88688v).

Funding: This work was supported in part by the UK Medical Research Council

Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol (Grant ref:

MC_UU_00011/1, MC_UU_00011/7). GG was supported by an ESRC Postdoctoral

Fellowship (Grant ref: ES/T009101/1). MRM is supported by the National Institute for

Health Research Bristol Biomedical Research Centre. OSPD is funded by the Alan

Turing Institute under the EPSRC grant EP/N510129/1. MRM and OSPD were also

supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research

Centre at the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of

Bristol.

Conflicts of interest: There were no conflicts of interest

Author contributions: Conceptualization: ZER, MRM, GJG; Methodology: ZER,

GJG, TTM; Formal Analysis: ZER; Resources: MRM, OSPD, GDS; Data Curation:

ZER; Writing—Original Draft: ZER, GJG; Writing—Review and Editing: ZER, GJG,

TTM, OSPD, GDS, MRM; Supervision: MRM; Project Administration: MRM; Funding

Acquisition: MRM, GDS, OSPD.

References

1. Gong, Y., Palmer, S., Gallacher, J., Marsden, T. & Fone, D. A systematic review of the relationship between objective measurements of the urban environment and psychological distress. *Environment International* **96**, 48–57 (2016).

2. Zhang, Y., Mavoa, S., Zhao, J., Raphael, D. & Smith, M. The association between green space and adolescents mental well-being: A systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **17**, 1–26 (2020).

3. Feng, X. & Astell-Burt, T. The relationship between neighbourhood green space and child mental wellbeing depends upon whom you ask: Multilevel evidence from 3083 children aged 12–13 years. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* vol. 14 235 (2017).

4. White, M. P., Alcock, I., Wheeler, B. W. & Depledge, M. H. Would You Be Happier Living in a Greener Urban Area? A Fixed-Effects Analysis of Panel Data. *Psychological Science* **24**, 920–928 (2013).

5. Bezold, C. P. *et al.* The Association Between Natural Environments and Depressive Symptoms in Adolescents Living in the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health* **62**, 488–495 (2018).

6. Herrera, R. *et al.* Greenness and job-related chronic stress in young adults: A prospective cohort study in Germany. *BMJ Open* **8**, e021599 (2018).

7. Wang, P., Meng, Y. Y., Lam, V. & Ponce, N. Green space and serious psychological distress among adults and teens: A population-based study in California. *Health and Place* **56**, 184–190 (2019).

8. Sarkar, C., Webster, C. & Gallacher, J. Residential greenness and prevalence of major depressive disorders: a cross-sectional, observational, associational study of 94 879 adult UK Biobank participants. *The Lancet Planetary Health* **2**, e162–e173 (2018).

9. Bezold, C. P. *et al.* The relationship between surrounding greenness in childhood and adolescence and depressive symptoms in adolescence and early adulthood. *Annals of Epidemiology* **28**, 213–219 (2018).

10. Li, D., Deal, B., Zhou, X., Slavenas, M. & Sullivan, W. C. Moving beyond the neighborhood: Daily exposure to nature and adolescents' mood. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **173**, 33–43 (2018).

11. Ward, J. S., Duncan, J. S., Jarden, A. & Stewart, T. The impact of children's exposure to greenspace on physical activity, cognitive development, emotional wellbeing, and ability to appraise risk. *Health and Place* **40**, 44–50 (2016).

12. Rhew, I. C., Vander Stoep, A., Kearney, A., Smith, N. L. & Dunbar, M. D. Validation of the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index as a Measure of Neighborhood Greenness. *Annals of Epidemiology* **21**, 946–952 (2011).

13. Department for Communities and Local Government. Generalised Land Use Database Statistics for England 2005 (Enhanced Basemap). (2007).

14. Faris, R. E. L. & Dunham, H. W. *Mental disorders in urban areas: an ecological study of schizophrenia and other psychoses. Mental disorders in urban areas: an ecological study of schizophrenia and other psychoses.* (Univ. Chicago Press, 1939).

15. Purtle, J. *et al.* Urban–Rural Differences in Older Adult Depression: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Comparative Studies. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* **56**, 603–613 (2019).

16. Solmi, F., Dykxhoorn, J. & Kirkbride, J. B. Urban-Rural Differences in Major Mental
Health Conditions. in 27–132 (Springer, Singapore, 2017). doi:10.1007/978-981-10-
2327-9_7.
17. Vassos, E., Agerbo, E., Mors, O. & Bøcker Pedersen, C. Urban-rural differences in
incidence rates of psychiatric disorders in Denmark. *British Journal of Psychiatry* **208**,
435–440 (2016).
18. Peen, J., Schoevers, R. A., Beekman, A. T. & Dekker, J. The current status of urban-
rural differences in psychiatric disorders. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* **121**, 84–93
(2010).
19. Pedersen, C. B. Persons with schizophrenia migrate towards urban areas due to the
development of their disorder or its prodromata. *Schizophrenia Research* **168**, 204–
208 (2015).
20. Vassos, E., Agerbo, E., Mors, O. & Bøcker Pedersen, C. Urban-rural differences in
incidence rates of psychiatric disorders in Denmark. *British Journal of Psychiatry* **208**,
435–440 (2016).
21. Verheij, R. A., Maas, J. & Groenewegen, P. P. Urban-rural health differences and the
availability of green space. *European Urban and Regional Studies* **15**, 307–316 (2008).
22. Sariaslan, A. *et al.* Schizophrenia and subsequent neighborhood deprivation:
Revisiting the social drift hypothesis using population, twin and molecular genetic
data. *Translational Psychiatry* **6**, e796–e796 (2016).
23. Giggs, J. A. The Distribution of Schizophrenics in Nottingham. *Transactions of the*
Institute of British Geographers **59**, 55–76 (1973).
24. Giggs, J. A. The Distribution of Schizophrenics in Nottingham: A Reply. *Transactions of*
the Institute of British Geographers **64**, 150–156 (1975).
25. March, D. *et al.* Psychosis and place. *Epidemiologic Reviews* vol. 30 84–100 (2008).
26. Colodro-Conde, L. *et al.* Association between population density and genetic risk for
schizophrenia. *JAMA Psychiatry* **75**, 901–910 (2018).
27. Moore, T. H. M. *et al.* The effects of changes to the built environment on the mental
health and well-being of adults: Systematic review. *Health and Place* vol. 53 237–257
(2018).
28. Davey Smith, G. & Ebrahim, S. "Mendelian randomization": can genetic epidemiology
contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *International*
Journal of Epidemiology **32**, 1–22 (2003).
29. Davey Smith, G. & Hemani, G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal
inference in epidemiological studies. *Human molecular genetics* **23**, R89-98 (2014).
30. Lawlor, D. A., Harbord, R. M., Sterne, J. A. C., Timpson, N. & Davey Smith, G.
Mendelian randomization: Using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in
epidemiology. *Statistics in Medicine* **27**, 1133–1163 (2008).
31. Sudlow, C. *et al.* UK Biobank: An Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a
Wide Range of Complex Diseases of Middle and Old Age. *PLoS Medicine* **12**, e1001779
(2015).
32. Cusack, L., Larkin, A., Carozza, S. E. & Hystad, P. Associations between multiple green
space measures and birth weight across two US cities. *Health and Place* **47**, 36–43
(2017).
33. Sarkar, C., Webster, C. & Gallacher, J. UK Biobank Urban Morphometric Platform
(UKBUMP) – a nationwide resource for evidence-based healthy city planning and
public health interventions. *Annals of GIS* **21**, 135–148 (2015).

34. Smith, D. J. *et al.* Prevalence and characteristics of probable major depression and
bipolar disorder within UK Biobank: Cross-sectional study of 172,751 participants.
PLoS ONE **8**, e75362 (2013).
35. McManus, S. *et al. Mental health and wellbeing in England : Adult Psychiatric
Morbidity Survey 2014*. (2016).
36. Tyrrell, J. *et al.* Genetic predictors of participation in optional components of UK
Biobank. *Nature Communications* **12**, 886 (2021).
37. Sarmanova, A., Morris, T. & Lawson, D. J. Population stratification in GWAS meta-
analysis should be standardized to the best available reference datasets. *bioRxiv*
(2020) doi:10.1101/2020.09.03.281568.
38. Office for National Statistics. 2011 Census: Aggregate Data. (2020)
doi:http://doi.org/10.5257/census/aggregate-2011-2.
39. Bycroft, C. *et al.* The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data.
Nature **562**, 203–209 (2018).
40. Mitchell, R. *et al.* UK Biobank Genetic Data: MRC-IEU Quality Control, Version 2.
(2019) doi:https://doi.org/10.5523/bris.1ovaau5sxunp2cv8rcy88688v.
41. Manichaikul, A. *et al.* Robust relationship inference in genome-wide association
studies. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 2867–2873 (2010).
42. Purcell, S. *et al.* PLINK: A Tool Set for Whole-Genome Association and Population-
Based Linkage Analyses. *The American Journal of Human Genetics* **81**, 559–575
(2007).
43. Wray, N. R. *et al.* Genome-wide association analyses identify 44 risk variants and
refine the genetic architecture of major depression. *Nature Genetics* **50**, 668–681
(2018).
44. Okbay, A. *et al.* Genetic variants associated with subjective well-being, depressive
symptoms, and neuroticism identified through genome-wide analyses. *Nature
Genetics* **48**, 624–633 (2016).
45. Ripke, S. *et al.* Biological insights from 108 schizophrenia-associated genetic loci.
Nature **511**, 421–427 (2014).
46. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (2016).
47. Bell, A. & Jones, K. Explaining Fixed Effects: Random Effects Modeling of Time-Series
Cross-Sectional and Panel Data. *Political Science Research and Methods* **3**, 133–153
(2015).
48. Merlo, J., Chaix, B., Yang, M., Lynch, J. & Råstam, L. A brief conceptual tutorial of
multilevel analysis in social epidemiology: Linking the statistical concept of clustering
to the idea of contextual phenomenon. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community
Health* **59**, 443–449 (2005).
49. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. M. & Walker, S. C. Fitting linear mixed-effects
models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**, (2015).
50. Barry, C. *et al.* Exploiting collider bias to apply two-sample summary data Mendelian
randomization methods to one-sample individual level data. *PLOS Genetics* **17**,
e1009703 (2021).
51. Bowden, J. *et al.* Assessing the suitability of summary data for two-sample mendelian
randomization analyses using MR-Egger regression: The role of the I 2 statistic.
International Journal of Epidemiology **45**, 1961–1974 (2016).
52. Hernán, M. A., Clayton, D. & Keiding, N. The simpson's paradox unraveled.
International Journal of Epidemiology **40**, 780–785 (2011).

53.   Julious, S. A. & Mullee, M. A. Confounding and Simpson's paradox. *BMJ (Clinical*
research ed.) **309**, 1480–1 (1994).

54.   Kievit, R. A., Frankenhuis, W. E., Waldorp, L. J. & Borsboom, D. Simpson's paradox in
psychological science: A practical guide. *Frontiers in Psychology* **4**, 513 (2013).

55.   Weeland, J., Laceulle, O. M., Nederhof, E., Overbeek, G. & Reijneveld, S. A. The
greener the better? Does neighborhood greenness buffer the effects of stressful life
events on externalizing behavior in late adolescence? *Health and Place* **58**, 102163
(2019).

56.   Mueller, M. A. E., Flouri, E. & Kokosi, T. The role of the physical environment in
adolescent mental health. *Health and Place* **58**, 102153 (2019).

57.   Richmond, R. C. & Davey Smith, G. Mendelian Randomization: Concepts and Scope.
Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Medicine a040501 (2021)
doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a040501.

58.   Labib, S. M., Lindley, S. & Huck, J. J. Estimating multiple greenspace exposure types
and their associations with neighbourhood premature mortality: A socioecological
study. *Science of the Total Environment* **789**, 147919 (2021).

59.   Abdellaoui, A., Verweij, K. J. H. & Nivard, M. G. Geographic Confounding in Genome-
Wide Association Studies. *bioRxiv* 2021.03.18.435971 (2021)
doi:10.1101/2021.03.18.435971.

60.   Haworth, S. *et al.* Apparent latent structure within the UK Biobank sample has
implications for epidemiological analysis. *Nature Communications* **10**, 333 (2019).

61.   Morris, T. T., Davies, N. M., Hemani, G. & Smith, G. D. Population phenomena inflate
genetic associations of complex social traits. *Science Advances* **6**, eaay0328 (2020).