Genome-wide association study meta-analysis of suicide attempt in 43,871 cases identifies twelve genome-wide significant loci

Dr. Anna R. Docherty, Ph.D.[1,2,3*†], Dr. Niamh Mullins, Ph.D.[4*], Dr. Allison E. Ashley-Koch, PhD[5,6*], Dr. Xue J. Qin, Ph.D.[7,5], Dr. Jonathan Coleman, Ph.D.[9], Dr. Andrey A. Shabalin, Ph.D.[1,2], Dr. Jooeun Kang, M.D.[8], Dr. Balazs Murnyak, Ph.D.[1,2], the International Suicide Genetics Consortium, the Suicide Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, the VA Million Veteran Program (MVP), the MVP Suicide Exemplar Workgroup, Dr. Benjamin H. McMahon, Ph.D.[13], Dr. David W. Oslin, M.D.[14,15], Dr. Elizabeth R. Hauser, Ph.D.[7,5], Dr. Michael A. Hauser, Ph.D.[5,6], Dr. Qingqin Li, Ph.D.[16], Prof. Hilary Coon, Ph.D.[1‡] Dr. Nathan A. Kimbrel, Ph.D.[7,11,12,17‡] Dr. Jean C. Beckham, Ph.D.[7,12,17‡] Prof. Douglas Ruderfer, PhD.[8‡]

1. Department of Psychiatry, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT USA
2. Huntsman Mental Health Institute, Salt Lake City, UT USA
3. Virginia Institute for Psychiatric & Behavioral Genetics, Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine, Richmond, VA USA
4. Pamela Sklar Division of Psychiatric Genomics, Department of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA
5. Duke Molecular Physiology Institute, Duke University Health System, Durham, NC, USA
6. Department of Medicine, Duke University Health System, Durham, NC, USA
7. Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Health Care System, Durham, NC, USA
8. Department of Psychiatry, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine
9. Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, United Kingdom
10. Utah State Office of the Medical Examiner, Utah Department of Health, Salt Lake City, UT USA
11. VA Health Services Research and Development Center of Innovation to Accelerate Discovery and Practice Transformation, Durham, NC, USA
12. Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA
13. Theoretical Biology and Biophysics, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, USA
14. VISN 4 Mental Illness Research, Education, and Clinical Center, Center of Excellence, Corporal Michael J. Crescenz VA Medical Center, Philadelphia, PA, USA
15. Department of Psychiatry, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, PA, USA
16. Janssen Research & Development, LLC, Neuroscience Therapeutic Area, Titusville, NJ USA
17. VA Mid-Atlantic Mental Illness Research, Education and Clinical Center, Durham, NC, USA

* These authors have contributed equally.
† Corresponding author
‡ Senior authors

Previous presentation: World Congress of Psychiatric Genetics, 2021, Virtual; American Society of Human Genetics, 2021, Virtual; Society of Biological Psychiatry, 2022, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA.

Address for reprint: Corresponding author, Anna R. Docherty, Department of Psychiatry, University of Utah School of Medicine, 501 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84110, USA, tel. +1 763 516 7367. Email: anna.docherty@utah.edu.

Disclosures: Dr. Qingqin Li, a co-author, is employed by Janssen Pharmaceuticals. All other authors have no financial relationships with commercial interests.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (R01MH123619, R01MH123489, R01MH099134, K01MH093731, R01MH116269, R01MH121455). This research is also based on data from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) Million Veteran Program (MVP) program and was supported by Award #I01CX001729 from the Clinical Science Research and Development Service of the Veterans Health Administration Office of Research and Development. J.C. Beckham was also supported by a Senior Research Career Scientist Award (#IK6BX003777) from CSR&D. Research reported in this publication was also supported by NIGMS of the National Institutes of Health under award number T32GM007347 (J.K.). This work was also supported by the Brain & Behavior Research Foundation (NARSAD Young Investigator Awards No. 29551 to N.M., No. 28686 to A.S., and No. 28132 to E.D.), the Huntsman Mental Health Institute, the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention (AD, AS, EB, AB, HC), and the Clark Tanner Research Foundation. This work was also supported by research funding from Janssen Research & Development, LLC to University of Utah. Data from the Utah cohort is available through the Utah Population Database, which is partially supported by the Huntsman Cancer Institute and award number P30CA42014 from the National Cancer Institute. Several statistical analyses were carried out on the Mount Sinai high performance computing cluster (http://hpc.mssm.edu), which is supported by the Office of Research Infrastructure of the National Institutes of Health (Grant Nos. S10OD018522 and S10OD026880). This work was also conducted in part using the resources of the Advanced Computing Center for Research and Education at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN and the Huntsman Mental Health Institute at the University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT. This publication does not represent the views of the Department of Veteran Affairs or the United States Government. We also thank and acknowledge MVP, the MVP Suicide Exemplar Workgroup, and the ISGC for their contributions to this manuscript. A complete listing of contributors from the MVP, MVP Suicide Exemplar Workgroup, and the ISGC is provided in the Supplementary Materials.

Abstract

Objective: Suicidal behavior is moderately heritable and a major cause of death worldwide. Two large-scale genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have recently discovered and cross-validated genome-wide significant (GWS) loci for suicide attempts (SA). The current study leveraged the genetic cohorts from these two studies to conduct the largest GWAS meta-analysis of SA to date. Ancestry-specific GWAS meta-analyses were also conducted with African, East Asian, and European ancestry cohorts.

Methods: This study comprised 22 cohorts, including 43,871 SA cases and 915,025 ancestry-matched controls. Analytical methods across multi-ancestry and African, East Asian, and European ancestral groups included inverse variance-weighted fixed effects models, gene/gene set and tissue enrichment testing, drug-gene interaction analyses, and summary-based Mendelian Randomization with eQTL MetaBrain data.

Results: Multi-ancestry and European GWAS meta-analyses identified 12 risk loci, including 28 independent GWS variants at $p<5x10^{-8}$. Risk loci were mostly intergenic and implicated *DRD2, SLC6A9, FURIN, NLGN1, SOX5, PDE4B,* and *CACNG2*. The SNP-based heritability estimate of SA was 5.7% on the liability scale (SE=0.003, $p = 5.70x10^{-80}$). Significant brain tissue gene expression and drug set enrichment was observed, along with shared genetic variation of SA with ADHD, smoking, and risk tolerance after conditioning on both major depressive disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder.

Conclusions: This multi-ancestry GWAS identified several loci contributing to risk of suicide attempt, and suggests significant shared genetic covariation with relevant clinical phenotypes that is not accounted for by major depressive disorder or post-traumatic stress disorder. These findings outline molecular pathways of risk for suicide, and provide new insight into shared genetic architecture with psychiatric phenotypes across ancestries.

Introduction

Suicide was the fourth leading cause of death among 15–29-year-olds in 2019, accounting for more than 700,000 deaths worldwide[1]. Suicide attempts—defined as self-injurious behavior with intent to die—are even more common[2,3,4]. Suicide attempts are strongly associated with psychiatric conditions, poor quality of life, traumatic experiences, and social and economic burden[5], and are the single strongest predictor of future suicide death[6].

Heritability estimates for suicidal thoughts and behaviors range from 30-55%[7], and recent large-scale genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have yielded promising and replicable results. The International Suicide Genetics Consortium (ISGC; total *N*=549,743; 29,782 cases) identified two loci reaching genome-wide significance for suicide attempts on chromosomes 6 ($p = 1.97\text{x}10^{-8}$) and 7 ($p = 1.91\text{x}10^{-10}$)[8]. The locus on chromosome 7 remained significant after conditioning on psychiatric disorders, and was independently replicated ($p = 3.27\text{x}10^{-3}$)[9] within the Million Veteran Program (MVP) cohort[10].

In the MVP study, the largest study of suicide attempts among military veterans to date (total *N*=409,153; 14,089 cases), there were two genome-wide significant multi-ancestry loci on chromosomes 20 ($p = 3.64\text{x}10^{-9}$) and 1 ($p = 3.69\text{x}10^{-8}$) in the MVP[9]. A top signal identified at the *Dopamine Receptor D2* locus ($p = 1.77\text{x}10^{-7}$) was replicated in the ISGC cohort ($p = 7.97\text{x}10^{-4}$)[8].

These studies established the complexity of the common variant genetic architecture of suicide attempt, and the critical role of sample size for discovering novel, replicable risk loci for complex phenotypes through GWAS[11]. Together, these GWAS suggested that larger studies will identify additional genomic risk loci and refine genetic risk metrics.

The objective of the current study was to conduct a meta-analysis of the ISGC and MVP studies (total *N*=958,896; 43,871 suicide attempt and suicide death cases). Moreover, there is considerable need to increase the diversity and generalizability of GWAS data[12]. Combining all ISGC and MVP cohorts allowed for the largest ancestry-specific GWAS meta-analyses in European, African/African-American and East Asian ancestral cohorts to date, and to test for gene set enrichment and functional follow-up specific to these ancestral populations.

Methods

GWAS Cohorts and Phenotype Ascertainment

The International Suicide Genetics Consortium (ISGC) Cohort
The ISGC analyses included 29,782 suicide attempt (SA) and/or suicide death (SD) cases and 519,961 controls from 18 cohorts (15 SA, 2 SD, and 1 both), 12 of which were ascertained clinically for the purpose of studying psychiatric disorders. Details about the specific cohorts have been described previously,[8] and cohort references and ascertainment methods are summarized in Supplementary Table S1. Twelve SA cohorts ascertained information on SA via in-person structured psychiatric interviews conducted by trained clinicians/researchers, two SA cohorts used self-report, and two SA cohorts used diagnostic codes or hospital records. All interviews and self-report items asked explicitly about SA rather than self-harm (which would include nonsuicidal self-injury). Diagnostic codes were coupled with information from emergency room settings, reason for contact information, and attempt methods that were mined from physician notes, in order to maximize evidence that suicidal intent was present. For the cohorts using interviews or self-report to ascertain SA information, the SA was non-fatal. An additional

two cohorts explicitly ascertained cases of suicide death (SD). The majority of SD cases were ascertained from the Utah Office of the Medical Examiner (Utah *n* = 4,692). In these cases, suicide cause-of-death determination results from a detailed investigation of the scene of the death and circumstances of death, determination of medical conditions by full autopsy, review of medical and other public records concerning the case, interviews with survivors, and standard toxicology workups. Suicide determination is traditionally conservative due to its impact on surviving relatives. In the 746 suicide deaths from Kobe University in Japan, autopsies on suicides were performed and assignment of the status "suicide" was made through discussion with the Medical Examiner's Office and the Division of Legal Medicine in the Kobe University Graduate School of Medicine. The Columbia University cohort of both SA and SD included 317 suicide deaths that were determined by psychological autopsy and the coroner or medical examiner.

The Million Veteran Program (MVP) Cohort
MVP recruitment and study procedures have been described previously[9] and included veterans providing a blood sample, consenting to genetic analyses and the linking of one's genetic information to the VA's electronic health records (EHR), and completing two optional surveys[10,13]. SA was defined as an act of deliberate self-harm with the intent to cause death that occurred at any point over the lifetime. Briefly, cases were defined as veterans with a documented history of SA in the EHR (N=14,089) and controls were defined as veterans with no documented history of suicidal thoughts or behaviors in the EHR (N=395,064). VA EHR sources were utilized to create a SA phenotype using: (a) diagnostic codes for intentional self-harm; (b) suicidal behavior reports from the VA's Suicide Prevention Applications Network (SPAN) database; and (c) mental health survey responses from the VA's Mental Health Assistant database indicating a history of attempting suicide. Veterans who had a history of suicidal ideation but no SA were excluded from analysis. For all ISGC and MVP cohorts, it remains undetermined which individuals with SA may have later died by suicide. Details of sample sizes by genetic ancestry for the ISGC and MVP cohorts are presented in Table 1.

Genotyping, quality control, and imputation

Details of genotyping, quality control (QC), and imputation for the ISGC and MVP data sets have been described previously[8,9]. In ISGC analyses, genotyping was performed locally by each of the new collaborating research teams using comparable procedures[8]. Appropriate parameters were used to retain individuals and single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) after QC for missingness (<2%), Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium ($P>1x10^{-6}$) and allele frequency >1%. MVP samples with call rates below 98.5% or with questionable identity were excluded. Release 3 of the MVP imputed data was used in this analysis, excluding markers with a minor allele frequency (MAF) < 0.01 in the entire MVP data set. Appropriate parameters were used to retain individuals and SNPs after QC for missingness (<2%) and Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium ($P>1x10^{-6}$). QC procedures included the examination of both the INFO and HWE scores within MVP ancestry groups for MAFs <5%. We confirmed the comparability of imputation across the cohorts by comparing the final set of SNPs in the meta-analysis, including the number of cohorts in which they were present, and the INFO scores across cohorts and within ancestry groups.

Genetic ancestry was defined by the contributing cohorts, and we include all the ascertainment, QC, and analysis details of the ISGC and MVP cohorts in Supplemental Table 1. Imputation was performed with the largest available ancestrally matched reference panels, using the TOPMed imputation server, with either 1000 Genomes or Haplotype Reference Consortium reference panels. Sample overlap and/or cryptic relatedness across cohorts was assessed and

corrected for using the meta-analytic tools described below. Eight of the cohorts had high control:case ratios (using an arbitrary cut-off of >15:1). In these cases, the LDSC attenuation ratio statistics were examined for evidence of population stratification or uncontrolled type 1 error in the cohort. For any evidence of inflation, the intercept was used to adjust the SE of the summary statistics.

Table 1: Summary of cohorts and ancestries

Cohort	Attempt/Death	Ascertainment	Cases	Controls
EUR Ancestries				
Army STARRS	Attempt	Military	670	10,637
Australian Genetics of Depression Study	Attempt	Psychiatric	2,792	20,193
Columbia University	Attempt & Death	Psychiatric	577	1,233
Genetic Investigation of Suicide and SA (GISS)	Attempt	Psychiatric	660	660
German Borderline Genomics Consortium	Attempt	Psychiatric	481	1,653
iPSYCH	Attempt	Population	7,003	52,227
Janssen	Attempt	Psychiatric	255	1,684
Million Veteran Program	Attempt	Military	9,196	287,370
Psychiatric Genomics Consortium BIP	Attempt	Psychiatric	3,214	17,642
Psychiatric Genomics Consortium ED	Attempt	Psychiatric	170	5,070
Psychiatric Genomics Consortium MDD	Attempt	Psychiatric	1,528	16,626
Psychiatric Genomics Consortium SCZ	Attempt	Psychiatric	1,640	7,112
UK Biobank	Attempt	Population	2,433	334,766
University of Utah	Death	Population	4,692	20,702
Yale-Penn	Attempt	Psychiatric	475	1,817
Total			**35,786**	**779,392**
EAS Ancestries				
CONVERGE Consortium	Attempt	Psychiatric	1,148	6,515
Kobe University	Death	Population	746	14,049
Million Veteran Program	Attempt	Military	115	4,082
Total			**2,009**	**24,646**
AA Ancestries				
Grady Trauma Project	Attempt	General medical	669	4,473
Million Veteran Program	Attempt	Military	3,507	74,306
Yale-Penn	Attempt	Psychiatric	629	2,902
Total			**4,805**	**81,681**
LAT Ancestries				
Million Veteran Program	Attempt	Military	**1,271**	**29,306**
Multi-ancestry Total			**43,871**	**915,025**

Note: EUR = European, EAS = East Asian, AA = African/African American, LAT = Latin American, BIP = bipolar disorder, ED = eating disorders, MDD = major depressive, disorder, SCZ = schizophrenia

GWAS meta-analysis of suicide attempt

For both the ISGC and MVP cohorts, the initial GWAS analysis was conducted within genetic ancestral groups. For the ISGC meta-analysis, GWAS were conducted within study and genetic ancestral group, covarying for at least 10 principal components of genetic ancestry, genomic relatedness matrices or factors capturing site of recruitment or genotyping batch, as required[8].

For the MVP cohort, ancestry was defined for four mutually exclusive ancestral groups utilizing a previously defined approach harmonizing genetic ancestry and self-identified ancestry (HARE)[14]. Subsequent MVP GWAS analyses were performed within ancestral group using PLINK2[15], covarying for genetic ancestry principal components, age, and sex.

A multi-ancestry meta-analysis of SA GWAS summary statistics was conducted using an inverse variance-weighted fixed effects model (standard error) in METAL[16], assuming shared risk effects across ancestries. SNPs with a mean weighted minor allele frequency of <1%, mean weighted imputation INFO score <0.6 or SNPs present in <80% of the total effective sample size were removed to ensure adequate statistical power at every variant included. Ancestry-specific GWAS meta-analyses were conducted in European, African, and East Asian ancestry cohorts using the same procedures. Inflation of test statistics due to polygenicity or cryptic relatedness were assessed using the LD Score regression[17] (LDSC) attenuation ratio ((LDSC intercept - 1)/(mean of association chi-square statistics - 1)). Resulting genome-wide significant (GWS) loci were defined as those with $p<5x10^{-8}$ with LD r^2 >0.1, within a 3,000 kb window, based on the structure of the Haplotype Reference Consortium (HRC) multi-ancestry reference panel for the multi-ancestry meta-analysis, or the HRC ancestry-appropriate reference panel otherwise. GWS loci for SA were examined for heterogeneity across cohorts via the I^2 inconsistency metric and forest plots. In addition, meta-regressions using MR-MEGA[18] were examined to determine the extent to which ancestral or cohort differences confounded the genetic signal observed in fixed effects models, with consistent results across fixed effects and MR-MEGA analyses (data not shown).

Estimation of heritability and genetic association with other disorders

LD Score regression (LDSC)[17] was used to estimate the phenotypic variance in SA explained by common SNPs (SNP-based heritability, h^2_{SNP}) from the GWAS meta-analysis summary statistics. h^2_{SNP} was calculated on the liability scale assuming a lifetime prevalence of SA in the general population of 2% (middle of the range reported worldwide)[19]. The default script of LDSC was used to exclude SNPs with MAF ≤ 1% and INFO ≤ 0.9 and also to restrict variants to the list of approximately 1.2 million HAPMAP SNPs that are typically well-imputed across datasets. Additional LDSC h^2 estimates filtering variants to >2% and >5% MAF confirmed that estimates remained stable across thresholds (data not shown). The genetic correlation attributable to genome-wide SNPs (r_G) was estimated between the ISGC and MVP cohorts, between ancestral groupings, and with a range of psychiatric disorders using the largest available GWAS meta-analysis summary statistics. Genetic correlations with other phenotypes were limited to EUR-only summary statistics due to the EUR ancestry of other discovery GWAS, and tests were Bonferroni-corrected, adjusting for up to 18 phenotypes hypothesized to be associated with SA. Traits were selected based on previous epidemiological association and/or previous evidence of genetic association in LD Hub[20]. Previous LD Hub analyses in ISGC were pre-categorized manually into risk factor groups relevant to SA[6,21,22]: autoimmune disease, neurologic disease, heart disease, hypertension, diabetes, kidney disease, cancer, alcohol use, smoking, pain, psychiatric, sleep, life stressors, socioeconomic, and education/cognition. All r_G of SA in ISGC and MVP in this study were calculated using LDSC[20], and references for the discovery GWAS are listed in Table S2. Differences in r_G across other phenotypes using EUR GWAS meta-analyses were tested as a deviation from 0, using the block jackknife method implemented in LDSC[23].

Conditioning suicide attempt on major depressive disorder and PTSD

The EUR GWAS SA meta-analyses were conditioned on genetic risks for major depressive disorder (MDD) and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), because both are highly co-morbid with SA, and PTSD is particularly prevalent within military veteran populations (i.e., MVP). The results of the meta-analysis were conditioned on MDD and PTSD to examine genetic associations both shared with and unique to suicide risk. Conditioning was conducted using mtCOJO (multi-trait-based COnditional & JOint analysis using GWAS summary data)[24], implemented in GCTA software[25]. mtCOJO[24] estimates the effect size of a SNP on an outcome trait (e.g. SA) conditioned on exposure trait(s) (e.g., MDD). GWS SNPs for the exposure are used as instruments to estimate the effect of the exposure on the outcome, and this effect is used to perform genome-wide conditioning, yielding conditioned effect sizes and *p*-values for the outcome trait. The EUR-only SA GWAS summary statistics were used as the outcome trait, because mtCOJO requires GWAS summary statistics for the exposure trait, which were derived from EUR ancestry discovery GWAS. To select independent SNPs as instruments, we selected those more than 1 megabase (Mb) apart or with an LD $r^2<0.05$ based on the 1000 Genomes Project Phase 3 EUR reference panel[26]. mtCOJO is robust to sample overlap between the GWAS of the exposure and outcome. In this analysis, statistical power was reduced relative to the unconditioned analysis by the additional model parameters, but the genetic correlations using the conditioned summary statistics provide valuable insights into the relevant risk factors for SA over and above those related to MDD and PTSD.

Gene, gene pathway, and tissue enrichment analyses

Enrichment analyses of the GWAS results were performed to probe genes, biological pathways, and tissues implicated in SA. P values quantifying the degree of association of genes and gene sets with SA were calculated using MAGMA v1.08[27], implemented in FUMA v1.3.7[28,29]. Input SNPs were mapped to 18,627 protein-coding genes. Genome-wide significance (red dashed line in Figures S27 and S29, for multi-ancestry and EUR) was defined at $p = 0.05/18{,}627 = 2.68\times10^{-6}$. Curated gene sets including at least 10 genes from MSigDB V7.0 were tested for association with SA. Competitive gene-set tests were conducted to correct for gene size, variant density and LD within and between genes. Tissue-set enrichment analyses were also performed using MAGMA implemented in FUMA, to test for enrichment of association signal in genes expressed in 54 tissue types from GTEx V8 (Bonferroni-corrected *p*-value threshold = 9.26×10^{-4})[28,29].

Drug target enrichment analyses

Additional gene-set enrichment analyses, of both the multi-ancestry and EUR ancestry GWAS meta-analysis results, were performed restricted to genes targeted by drugs, in order to investigate putative relationships of suicide attempt with specific drug types. These analyses do not identify causal relationships, but may implicate genes relevant to pharmacotherapy. This approach has been described previously[30]. Gene-level and gene-set analyses were performed in MAGMA v1.08[27]. Gene boundaries were defined using build 37 reference data from the NCBI, available on the MAGMA website (https://ctg.cncr.nl/software/magma), extended 35kb upstream and 10kb downstream to increase the likelihood of including regulatory regions outside of the transcribed region. Gene-level association statistics were defined as the aggregate of the mean and the lowest variant-level P value within the gene boundary, converted to a Z-value. Gene sets were defined comprising the targets of each drug in the Drug-Gene Interaction database DGIdb v.2[31] and in the Psychoactive Drug Screening Database Ki DB[32],

both downloaded in June 2016[30]. Analyses were performed using competitive gene-set analyses in MAGMA.

Results from the drug-set analysis were then grouped according to the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical class of the drug[30]. Only drug classes containing at least 10 valid drug gene sets within them were analyzed. Drug-class analysis was performed using enrichment curves. All drug gene sets were ranked by their association in the drug-set analysis, and then for a given drug class an enrichment curve was drawn scoring a "hit" if the drug gene set was within the class, or a "miss" if it was outside of the class. The area under the curve was calculated, and a p-value for this calculated as the Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney test comparing drug gene sets within the class to drug gene sets outside of the class[30]. Multiple testing was controlled using a Bonferroni-corrected significance threshold of $p < 5.79 \times 10^{-5}$ for drug-set analysis and $p < 4.35 \times 10^{-4}$ for drug-class analysis, accounting for 863 drug-sets and 115 drug classes tested.

Summary data-based Mendelian randomization

Summary data-based Mendelian randomization (SMR) (v1.03)[33,34] was applied to investigate putative causal relationships between SNPs and SA via gene expression. SMR was performed using eQTL summary statistics from the MetaBrain consortium, which is the largest cortex-derived eQTL dataset, created in 2021, consisting of 2,970 EUR-cortex samples[35]. The analysis was conducted using the EUR-only GWAS meta-analysis results for consistency with the eQTL data. Brain eQTL data from comparable sample sizes in other ancestral groups is not currently available. SMR analysis was limited to transcripts with at least one significant *cis*-eQTL ($p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) in the dataset (8,753 in MetaBrain). The Bonferroni-corrected significance threshold for the SMR analysis was $p < 5.71 \times 10^{-6}$ and the significance threshold for the HEIDI test (HEterogeneity In Dependent Instruments)[37] was $p \geq 0.01$. A non-significant HEIDI test suggests a direct causal role, rather than a pleiotropic effect, of the SA-associated SNPs on gene expression.

Polygenic risk scoring

Polygenic risk scores (PRS) for SA were tested for association with SA versus controls in six target cohorts: PGC MDD, BIP and SCZ, CONVERGE (EAS ancestry), Yale-Penn (AA ancestry) and Grady Trauma Project (AA ancestry). The SA GWAS meta-analysis was repeated excluding each cohort in turn, to create independent discovery datasets. PRS were generated using PRS-CS[36], which uses a Bayesian regression framework to place continuous shrinkage priors on the effect sizes of SNPs in the PRS, adaptive to the strength of their association signal in the discovery GWAS and the LD structure from an external reference panel[36]. The 1000 Genomes EUR, EAS or African reference panels[26] were used to estimate LD between SNPs, as appropriate for each target cohort. PLINK 1.9[15] was used to weight SNPs by their effect sizes calculated using PRS-CS and sum all SNPs into PRS for each individual in the target cohorts. PRS were tested for association with case versus control status in the target cohort using a logistic regression model including covariates as per the GWAS. The amount of phenotypic variance explained by the PRS (R^2) was calculated on the liability scale, assuming a lifetime prevalence of SA in the general population of 2%[19]. The Bonferroni-corrected significance threshold $P<0.008$, adjusting for six tests.

Results

Sample characteristics

The multi-ancestry GWAS included 43,871 cases and 915,025 controls from 22 cohorts (Table 1). Cohort ancestry was defined by contributing site. Cases were predominantly of European ancestries (EUR, 81%), with 11% of admixed African ancestries (AA), 5% of East Asian ancestries (EAS), and 3% of Latino ancestries (LAT). Case definition was lifetime SA, with ~13% of all cases having died by suicide. Only one major ancestral group (LAT) was limited to a single cohort and thus not subject to ancestry-specific meta-analysis; all others were included in ancestry-specific meta-analyses. Study characteristics and ascertainment methods are presented in Supplementary Table S1.

Cohorts across ISGC and MVP differ with respect to both ascertainments (i.e., psychiatric, military, population as presented in Table 1). However, examination of the genetic correlation of GWAS meta-analyses for ISGC and MVP (r_G = .82, SE = .093, $p = 2.08 \times 10^{-18}$) indicated marked consistency of common-variant genetic architecture across meta-analyses. Results from both fixed and meta-regression models were comparable, indicating that ancestry and cohort ascertainment were unlikely to confound observed genetic effects.

GWAS meta-analysis of suicide attempt

The multi-ancestry GWAS meta-analysis identified eight genome-wide significant (GWS) loci ($P<5 \times 10^{-8}$) (Figure 1). The h^2_{SNP} of SA was significant at 5.7% (SE=0.003, $p = 5.70 \times 10^{-80}$) on the liability scale assuming an SA population prevalence of 2%. The LDSC intercept was 1.04 (SE=0.01, $p = 1.59 \times 10^{-5}$) and the attenuation ratio was 0.13 (SE=0.03), indicating that the majority of inflation of GWAS test statistics is likely due to polygenicity (Supplementary Figure S1).

The locus most strongly associated with SA was in an intergenic region on chromosome 7 (index SNP rs62474683, OR A allele = 1.05 [1.04-1.07], $p = 8.72 \times 10^{-12}$, frequency in cases = 0.57, frequency in controls = 0.56, Forest plot Figure S2). At other GWS loci, index SNPs were intronic in the *SLC6A9, DRD2, HS6ST3* and *FURIN* genes (Table 2). On chromosome 3, GWS SNPs localized around the 5' untranslated region of the *NLGN1* gene. There was no evidence of heterogeneity of effects across cohorts for any GWS locus according to I^2 heterogeneity indices. Forest plots for GWS loci are included in Figures S2-9. Mapped genes based on top loci in multi-ancestry and ancestry-specific meta-analyses are presented in Supplementary Tables S3-S6.



Figure 1: Manhattan plot of multi-ancestry GWAS meta-analysis of suicide attempt. The *x*-axis shows genomic position and the *y*-axis shows statistical significance as $-\log_{10}$(P value). The horizontal line shows the genome-wide significance threshold ($P<5.0\times10^{-8}$). Labels represent the nearest gene to the index SNP. Regional plots of the eight genome-wide significant loci across ancestries and the four genome-wide significant loci in Europeans are presented in Supplementary Figures S3-S14.

Ancestry-specific GWAS meta-analyses of suicide attempt

The EUR GWAS meta-analysis identified four additional GWS loci (Table 2, Figure S10, Forest plots Figures S11-14), composed of mostly intergenic index SNPs. These loci mapped to PDE4B, OTX2-AS1, CACNG2, with one residing in the major histocompatibility complex (MHC). GWAS meta-analyses in AA and EAS ancestries produced no GWS loci. Regional plots of the 12 GWS risk loci across all meta-analyses are presented in Supplementary Figures S15-S26. Manhattan plots and QQ-plots of GWAS gene-based tests with significant results are presented in Figures S27-S30.

Genetic correlations of SA across ancestry GWAS

The genetic correlations of SA across each of the ancestral groupings were attenuated, with estimated r_Gs between 0.18 (AA with LAT) and 0.79 (EUR with LAT) (Table S7). This is likely due to variation in the GWAS sample sizes across the ancestral groupings and individual cohorts. For example, LAT was limited to one cohort of 1,271 SA cases and was not subject to GWAS meta-analysis. Individual cohort GWAS were variably powered to estimate genetic correlation estimates with the other cohorts (Table S8).

Table 2: Results from meta-analyses of suicide attempt showing the index SNP from each genome-wide significant locus

CHR	Index SNP	BP	Locus Start..Stop	Nearest gene (distance to index SNP in kb)	P	OR	SE	A1	A2	Direction	$N_{Cohorts}$	N_{Total}	N_{Eff}
Multi-Ancestry													
1	rs3791129	44480093	44,462,155..44,497,134	*SLC6A9* (0.0)	1.22E-09	1.055	0.009	G	A	+-+++++--+-+?+++?+??++	18	933,136	158,078
3	rs7649709	173129819	173,113,742..174,012,162	*NLGN1* (0.0)	2.32E-08	1.054	0.010	A	C	++++++-+++-+?++-++++++	21	954,890	164,921
6	rs62404522	19307114	19,068,774..19,180,711	*LOC101928519* (-76.4)	1.68E-09	1.067	0.011	C	T	+--+++--++++-++-+-++++	22	956,659	166,924
7	rs62474683	115020725	114,763,653..114,871,409	*LINC01392* (-149.3)	8.72E-12	1.054	0.008	A	G	+-++++-++++++++-++-+++	22	958,896	167,455
11	rs7131627	113299829	113,280,327..113,346,120	*DRD2* (0.0)	6.2E-11	1.053	0.008	G	A	+++++--+++++++++?-++++	21	944,101	164,620
12	rs17485141	24213634	23,682,438..24,715,425	*SOX5* (0.0)	1.54E-08	1.049	0.009	C	T	+++-++++++++-+++++++++	22	958,896	167,455
13	rs9525171	96908223	96,742,361..97,491,816	*HS6ST3* (0.0)	8.07E-09	1.044	0.008	C	G	+-+++++--+-+-+++++-+++	22	958,896	167,455
15	rs17514846	91416550	91,411,818..91,426,687	*FURIN* (0.0)	1.81E-09	1.048	0.008	C	A	++++++++++-+-+++?+?+++	20	938,959	162,145
EUR Ancestry													
1	rs2503185	66461401	66,258,193..66,840,262	*PDE4B* (0.0)	3.42E-08	1.047	0.008	A	G	++++++---+++-++	15	815,178	136,860
6	rs35869525	26946687	29,640,168..30,152,231	--MHC--	2.18E-08	1.089	0.015	C	T	+?-+-+++-++++++	14	803,626	134,461
14	rs850261	57346423	57,278,724..57,398,026	*OTX2-AS1* (0.0)	1.37E-08	1.049	0.008	A	G	++-+-++++++++++	15	815,178	136,860
22	rs2284000	37053338	36,956,904..37,099,797	*CACNG2* (0.0)	1.98E-08	1.055	0.010	C	G	++++++-+-+-+?++	14	812,886	135,108

Note: CHR = chromosome, SNP = single nucleotide polymorphism, BP = GRCh37 base pair position, kb = kilobases, OR = odds ratio, SE = standard error, A1 = tested allele, A2 = other allele, EUR = European, $N_{Cohorts}$ = number of cohorts included, N_{Total} = Total cases and controls, N_{Eff} = total effective sample size, MHC = major histocompatibility complex.

Enrichment analyses and integration of GWAS with gene, pathway, and tissue databases

Summary statistics for all meta-analyses were examined in follow-up enrichment analyses using 1000 Genomes reference panels. The gene-set analyses identified 521 sets across the larger body of results from the multi-ancestry and EUR analyses, spanning multiple domains, including epigenetics, gene regulation and transcription, cellular response to stress, DNA repair, and immunologic signatures.

Significant gene expression was observed in pituitary gland and brain tissues in the multi-ancestry analysis. Significant gene expression in brain tissue was also observed in the EUR results. Tissue-set enrichment analyses and corresponding GTEx gene expression heatmaps are presented in Tables S9-S12 and Figures S31-S34.

EAS and AA p-value thresholds for inclusion of GWAS variants in follow-up analysis were relaxed to $p < 1x10^{-5}$ and $1x10^{-6}$, respectively, to explore gene-based tests of top GWAS variants. Top genes implicated in the EAS analysis included *C11orf87*, *MYO1C*, and *FAXC*. Top genes implicated in the AA analysis included *CNTNAP2*, *IGF2R*, *MAN1B1*, and *SLC22A1*. Neither set of genes was significantly associated with pathway or tissue enrichment. Associations of SA signal with genes and gene sets in the multi-ancestry, EUR, EAS, and AA meta-analyses are presented in Supplementary Tables S13-S14.

Overlap of GWAS results with population-based research and the GWAS Catalog

Significant proportions of overlapping genes in GWAS Catalog gene sets were observed for both multi-ancestry and EUR meta-analyses (Figures S35-S36). The 12 GWS loci from the multi-ancestry and EUR GWAS meta-analyses were tagged in several phenotypes from the GWAS Catalog. These included cognition, smoking, insomnia, and risky behavior. Six of the 12 risk loci had *p*-values < 0.005 for the "*Suicide or Other Intentional Self-Harm*" analysis in FinnGen. A comprehensive list of results of SNP associations from the GWAS Catalog is presented in Table S15. Examination of the pheWAS results ($p < 0.005$) across UKB, FinnGen and the GWAS catalog identified several psychiatric, weight/BMI- and immune-related traits (Table S16).

Drug target enrichment analyses

Drug target enrichment results suggested that SA risk is most associated with the targets of antipsychotic and antidepressant drug classes. In the multi-ancestry gene-set analysis of the targets of drug classes defined by their Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classes[30], there was significant enrichment in the targets of four drug classes: *Antipsychotics* and the broad class of *Psychoanaleptics*, including *Antidepressants* and its subclass *Other Antidepressants* (Table S17). The class of *Other Antidepressants* includes those not classified as selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, monoamine oxidase inhibitors or monoamine reuptake inhibitors. In the EUR analysis, there was significant enrichment in the targets of just three drug classes, including *Antipsychotics*, the broad class of *Psycholeptics* (drugs with a calming effect on behavior), and the class *Cytotoxic Antibiotics and Related Substances* (Table S18).

No drugs were significantly enriched when grouping genes targeted by individual drugs (from the Drug-Gene Interaction Database DGIdb v.2[31] and the Psychoactive Drug Screening Database Ki DB[32]) with the exception of significant enrichment of genes targeted by the insecticide cyfluthrin based on the European GWAS results (Tables S19 and S20 for multi-ancestry and EUR results).

SMR with MetaBrain data

Two of the 8,753 genes tested, *FES* and *TIAF1*, were significantly associated with SA in SMR analyses and passed the HEIDI (heterogeneity in dependent instruments) test[33,34]. Summary data-based Mendelian randomization (SMR)[33,34] results suggest that SA risk may be mediated by an increased expression of *FES* (previously implicated in cross-ancestry schizophrenia[37]) and decreased expression of *TIAF1* in cortex (Table S21).

Polygenic risk scoring analyses and estimation of genetic association with psychiatric and medical phenotypes

Polygenic risk analyses based on the new ISGC+MVP discovery GWAS meta-analysis statistics resulted in higher r^2 estimates than observed in ISGC1 (Table S22). Figure 2 presents a forest plot of the genetic correlations of the EUR GWAS meta-analyses of suicide attempt with several physical and mental health phenotypes, as well as one control phenotype (body mass index, BMI). Significant shared genetic covariation of EUR SA with smoking (r_G[SE] =.46[.03], p = 8.06×10^{-63}), ADHD (r_G = .55[.04], p = 2.98×10^{-41}), risk tolerance (r_G = .32[.02], p = 1.34×10^{-59}), and chronic pain (r_G = .45[.03], p = 9.50×10^{-50}) were observed both before and after conditioning on MDD and PTSD. Robust positive genetic correlations of neuroticism, schizophrenia, and bipolar disorder with SA (r_G = .45[.03], p = 1.0×10^{-52} ; r_G = .43[.03], p = 1.32×10^{-55}; r_G = .48[.04], p = 1.81×10^{-37}) did not remain significant after conditioning on both MDD and PTSD.

For ease of comparison across cohorts and phenotypic subgroups (SA vs. SD), genetic correlation estimates for phenotypes are presented in Table S23 using the European GWAS summary statistics from 1) ISGC + MVP, 2) ISGC only, 3) MVP only, 4) ISGC without suicide death, 5) ISGC suicide death only (the Utah Suicide Study, current N = 4,692 EUR suicide deaths and 20,702 controls), and 6) conditioning on MDD and PTSD for MVP, ISGC, and MVP + ISGC. LDSC jackknife tests of differences between these genetic correlation estimates are presented in Table S24, and more exhaustive comparison of phenome-wide r_G with the European ancestry GWAS meta-analysis is provided in Table S25.



Figure 2: Forest plot of genetic correlations of the multi-ancestry GWAS meta-analyses of suicide attempt with physical and mental health phenotypes. The *x*-axis presents genetic correlation values with 95% confidence intervals (CI), and the *y*-axis presents the discovery GWAS for multiple phenotypes. ISGC = International Suicide Genetics Consortium meta-analysis; ISGC + MVP = the primary meta-analysis including GWAS from both ISGC and Million Veterans Program sets of cohorts; ISGC + MVP | MDD & PTSD = the combined GWAS meta-analysis of both cohorts conditioning on major depressive disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder.

Discussion

This study presents the best-powered GWAS of SA to date, incorporating multiple ancestries and expanding the set of GWS loci to 12. Discovery of three of the novel GWS loci was only possible with the aggregation of all ancestral cohorts. For the first time, we also show that implicated genes are highly expressed in brain tissue, enriched in pathways related to gene regulation and transcription, cellular response to stress, DNA repair, and immunologic signatures, and are shared with relevant epidemiological risk factors. We also provide important

evidence that a significant proportion of the common variant genetic architecture of SA is shared across large civilian and veteran populations with disparate demographics.

One advantage of combining ISGC with MVP is the opportunity to examine genetic effects across heterogeneous cohorts. For example, the sample composition and ascertainment across the ISGC is predominantly civilian and international, with a large proportion of females[8]. A number of the ISGC samples (Psychiatric Genomics Consortium cohorts, Table 1) are collected from individuals with major psychiatric disorders, representing a more clinical population. In contrast, the MVP cohorts are predominantly male[9], and all are military veterans ascertained through the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) healthcare system. The consistency of SA common variant genetic architecture across cohorts indicates that power may be further maximized by combining future cohorts with differing demographic factors.

As expected, the increase in sample size, and resulting increase in power, led to the identification of several new GWS loci. The 12 loci identified in this study implicate genes expressed in brain and genes with links to increased risk of SA. Genes associated with SA in this study are highly enriched among psychiatric phenotypes and overall health and wellness risk factors for SA. Brain is the predominant tissue enriched for associated genes, and there is also significant enrichment in pituitary gland, consistent with previous association of SA with hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal system dysregulation[38]. In addition, the enrichment of pathways related to epigenetics and gene regulation and transcription suggest that epigenetic modifications, such as DNA methylation, may play an important role in modulating the effect of SA-associated genetic variants. Future studies of human postmortem brain would be important to validate this hypothesis and to evaluate the functional significance of the genes identified here.

Drug target enrichment results suggest that SA risk is associated with the targets of antipsychotic and antidepressant drug classes. One explanation may be that psychiatric symptoms associated with SA risk are also associated with these drug targets, though the direction of any association of drugs with risk cannot be assumed and is not directly tested here. The SMR analysis implicated *FES* and *TIAF1* in SA. *FES* was previously implicated in cross-ancestry schizophrenia[37]. At the same time, genetic correlations of SA with ADHD, smoking, pain, and risk tolerance remained significant after conditioning SA on MDD and PTSD, while schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and neuroticism did not. This suggests a potential role for health factors in SA risk that are both shared with and distinct from psychiatric disorders, as proposed in Mann & Rizk's stress diathesis model[42] of suicidal behavior based on clinical and biological studies. The suicide diathesis includes altered decision-making that is more pronounced in ADHD and smoking and aggravated by sleep problems. Pain is associated with the stress domain of suicidal behavior. Our study relates these elements from a genetics perspective.

Some limitations of this study should be considered. First, the meta-analysis of such a large number of diverse cohorts, with different assessments of SA, could reduce statistical power by increasing heterogeneity. Our analyses may have been made more conservative by the inclusion of age and sex covariates in some GWAS (three of the ISGC cohorts and MVP) and not others. However, GWAS of the primary datasets typically produced significant—and high—genetic correlation estimates, and GWS loci produced similar effect sizes across cohorts and across fixed and meta-regression models (all correlations of GWS effect sizes across models exceeded 0.99). Indeed, the apparent consistency of genetic architecture across European ISGC and MVP cohorts is surprising given marked demographic and ascertainment differences.

This study presents the largest GWAS specific to African and Asian ancestries to date. The lack of GWS loci specific to these SA meta-analyses underscores a strong need for greater ancestral admixture and representation in suicide research. With high variability of sample sizes of individual ISGC and MVP ancestral cohorts (case *n*s ranged from 115 to 9,196), some yielded reasonable h^2 and r_G estimates while others did not. We observed low and even negative r_G estimates in some cases across ancestral groupings. Matrix visualization of these genetic correlations allowed for an efficient examination of the generalizability of polygenic risk metrics, and clearly indicates need for additional ancestral admixture in future GWAS of suicide. Finally, broader ancestral representation--particularly from areas in Central America, Western Asia, and the Global South--is critical for improving the rigor and generalizability of GWAS results in future research.

This study presents the largest GWAS of SA to date, identifying 12 GWS loci and implicating brain and pituitary tissues. Implicated genes and established genetic relationships with ADHD, smoking, and risk tolerance help to inform biological contributions of risk to SA. From a clinical perspective, impulsivity, smoking status, and risk-taking behaviors are intuitive co-morbid indicators of suicide risk. Further study that also compares SA with subjects with suicidal ideation will enable distinguishing those who think about suicide from those who act on suicidal thoughts. Importantly, genetic risk for SA and SD, calculated in new, independent cohorts using these GWAS summary data, will contribute to a deeper understanding of the clinical implications of genetic risk for suicide. The future addition of multiple ancestral cohorts is likely to yield continued discovery and increased opportunity for clinical translation.

References

1. Mullins, N. *et al.* Dissecting the Shared Genetic Architecture of Suicide Attempt, Psychiatric Disorders, and Known Risk Factors. *Biol. Psychiatry* (2021) doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2021.05.029.
2. Kimbrel, N. A. *et al.* A genome-wide association study of suicide attempts in the million veterans program identifies evidence of pan-ancestry and ancestry-specific risk loci. *Mol. Psychiatry* (2022) doi:10.1038/s41380-022-01472-3.
3. Suicide. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/suicide.
4. http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/131056/9789241564779_eng.pdf;jsessionid=8F9FA3FA7C2567908C5BEFF336A41A49?sequence=1.
5. CDC WONDER. https://wonder.cdc.gov/.

6. https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/reports/rpt29393/2019NSDUHFFRPDFWHTML/2019NSDUHFFR1PDFW090120.pdf.
7. http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/131056/9789241564779_eng.pdf;jsessionid=8F9FA3FA7C2567908C5BEFF336A41A49?sequence=1.
8. Franklin, J. C. *et al.* Risk factors for suicidal thoughts and behaviors: A meta-analysis of 50 years of research. *Psychol. Bull.* **143**, 187–232 (2017).
9. Voracek, M. & Loibl, L. M. Genetics of suicide: a systematic review of twin studies. *Wien. Klin. Wochenschr.* **119**, 463–475 (2007).
10. Sullivan, P. F. *et al.* Psychiatric Genomics: An Update and an Agenda. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **175**, 15–27 (2018).
11. Peterson, R. E. *et al.* Genome-wide Association Studies in Ancestrally Diverse Populations: Opportunities, Methods, Pitfalls, and Recommendations. *Cell* **179**, 589–603 (2019).
12. Hoffmire, C. *et al.* VA Suicide Prevention Applications Network: A National Health Care System-Based Suicide Event Tracking System. *Public Health Rep.* **131**, 816–821 (2016).
13. Gaziano, J. M. *et al.* Million Veteran Program: A mega-biobank to study genetic influences on health and disease. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* **70**, 214–223 (2016).
14. Fang, H. *et al.* Harmonizing Genetic Ancestry and Self-identified Race/Ethnicity in Genome-wide Association Studies. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **105**, 763–772 (2019).
15. Chang, C. C. *et al.* Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *Gigascience* **4**, 7 (2015).
16. Willer, C. J., Li, Y. & Abecasis, G. R. METAL: fast and efficient meta-analysis of genomewide association scans. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 2190–2191 (2010).
17. Bulik-Sullivan, B. K. *et al.* LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nat. Genet.* **47**, 291–295 (2015).
18. Consortium, T. H. R. & the Haplotype Reference Consortium. A reference panel of 64,976 haplotypes for genotype imputation. *Nature Genetics* vol. 48 1279–1283 (2016).

19. Mägi, R. *et al.* Trans-ethnic meta-regression of genome-wide association studies accounting for ancestry increases power for discovery and improves fine-mapping resolution. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* **26**, 3639–3650 (2017).
20. Nock, M. K. *et al.* Cross-national prevalence and risk factors for suicidal ideation, plans and attempts. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **192**, 98–105 (2008).
21. Zheng, J. *et al.* LD Hub: a centralized database and web interface to perform LD score regression that maximizes the potential of summary level GWAS data for SNP heritability and genetic correlation analysis. *Bioinformatics* vol. 33 272–279 (2017).
22. Ahmedani, B. K. *et al.* Major Physical Health Conditions and Risk of Suicide. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* **53**, 308–315 (2017).
23. Fazel, S. & Runeson, B. Suicide. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 266–274 (2020).
24. Hübel, C. *et al.* Genomics of body fat percentage may contribute to sex bias in anorexia nervosa. *Am. J. Med. Genet. B Neuropsychiatr. Genet.* **180**, 428–438 (2019).
25. Cuéllar-Partida, G. *et al.* Complex-Traits Genetics Virtual Lab: A community-driven web platform for post-GWAS analyses. *bioRxiv* 518027 (2019) doi:10.1101/518027.
26. Zhu, Z. *et al.* Causal associations between risk factors and common diseases inferred from GWAS summary data. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 224 (2018).
27. Yang, J., Lee, S. H., Goddard, M. E. & Visscher, P. M. GCTA: a tool for genome-wide complex trait analysis. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **88**, 76–82 (2011).
28. Consortium, T. 1000 G. P. & The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium. A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature* vol. 526 68–74 (2015).
29. de Leeuw, C. A., Mooij, J. M., Heskes, T. & Posthuma, D. MAGMA: generalized gene-set analysis of GWAS data. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **11**, e1004219 (2015).
30. Watanabe, K., Taskesen, E., van Bochoven, A. & Posthuma, D. Functional mapping and annotation of genetic associations with FUMA. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1826 (2017).

31. GTEx Consortium *et al.* Genetic effects on gene expression across human tissues. *Nature* **550**, 204–213 (2017).

32. Gaspar, H. A. & Breen, G. Drug enrichment and discovery from schizophrenia genome-wide association results: an analysis and visualisation approach. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 12460 (2017).

33. Wagner, A. H. *et al.* DGIdb 2.0: mining clinically relevant drug-gene interactions. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, D1036–44 (2016).

34. Roth, B. L., Lopez, E., Patel, S. & Kroeze, W. K. The Multiplicity of Serotonin Receptors: Uselessly Diverse Molecules or an Embarrassment of Riches? *Neuroscientist* **6**, 252–262 (2000).

35. Zhu, Z. *et al.* Integration of summary data from GWAS and eQTL studies predicts complex trait gene targets. *Nat. Genet.* **48**, 481–487 (2016).

36. Wu, Y. *et al.* Integrative analysis of omics summary data reveals putative mechanisms underlying complex traits. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 918 (2018).

37. de Klein, N. *et al.* Brain expression quantitative trait locus and network analysis reveals downstream effects and putative drivers for brain-related diseases. *bioRxiv* (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.03.01.433439.

38. Wu, Y. *et al.* Integrative analysis of omics summary data reveals putative mechanisms underlying complex traits. *Nature Communications* vol. 9 (2018).

39. Ge, T., Chen, C.-Y., Ni, Y., Feng, Y.-C. A. & Smoller, J. W. Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and continuous shrinkage priors. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1776 (2019).

40. Ikeda, M. *et al.* Genome-Wide Association Study Detected Novel Susceptibility Genes for Schizophrenia and Shared Trans-Populations/Diseases Genetic Effect. *Schizophr. Bull.* **45**, 824–834 (2018).

41. Pfennig, A. *et al.* Hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal system regulation and suicidal behavior in depression. *Biol. Psychiatry* **57**, 336–342 (2005).

42. Mann, J. J. & Rizk, M. M. A Brain-Centric Model of Suicidal Behavior. *The American journal of psychiatry* vol. 177 902–916 (2020).