

1 **Title Page**

2 **Central corneal thickness and the risk of primary open-angle glaucoma: a Mendelian**
3 **randomization mediation analysis**

4 **Authors:** Andreas Katsimpris ¹, Sebastian-Edgar Baumeister ², Hansjörg Baurecht ³, Andrew J
5 Tatham ^{1,4*}, Michael Nolde ²

6

7 * shared last author

8

9 **Affiliations**

10 1. Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH3 9HA, UK

11 2. Institute of Health Services Research in Dentistry, University of Münster, Münster,
12 Germany

13 3. Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, University of Regensburg,
14 Regensburg, Germany

15 4. Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH3 9HA, UK

16

17 **Corresponding authors:**

18 Andreas Katsimpris, Department of Ophthalmology, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, Scotland, AB25

19 2ZN, UK, email: a.katsimpris@gna-gennimatas.gr, telephone: +447311299859, ORCID ID:

20 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5805-105X>

21 Michael Nolde, Institute of Health Services Research in Dentistry, University of Münster,

22 Germany, email: nolde@uni-muenster.de, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6893-7367>

23 **Abstract**

24 The association of central corneal thickness (CCT) with primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG)
25 remains uncertain. Although, several observational studies assessing this relationship, have
26 reported an inverse association between CCT and POAG, this could be the result of collider
27 bias. In this study, we leveraged human genetic data to assess through Mendelian
28 randomization (MR) the effect of CCT on POAG risk, and whether this effect is mediated by
29 intraocular pressure (IOP) changes. We used 24 single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs)
30 associated with CCT (P -value $< 5 \times 10^{-8}$) from a genome-wide association study (GWAS) ($N =$
31 17,803) provided by the International Glaucoma Genetics Consortium and 53 SNPs associated
32 with IOP (P -value $< 5 \times 10^{-8}$) from a GWAS of UK Biobank (UKBB) ($N = 97,653$). We related
33 these instruments with POAG using a GWAS meta-analysis of 8,283 POAG cases and 753,827
34 controls from UKBB and FinnGen. MR analysis suggested a positive association between CCT
35 and POAG (odds ratio of POAG per $50\mu\text{m}$ increase in CCT: 1.38; 95% confidence interval: 1.18
36 to 1.61; p -value < 0.01). MR mediation analysis showed that 28.4% of the total effect of CCT on
37 POAG risk was mediated through changes in IOP. The primary results were consistent with
38 estimates of pleiotropy-robust MR methods. In conclusion, contrary to most observational
39 studies, our results support a positive effect of CCT on the risk of POAG.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 **Introduction**

47 Primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG) ranks as the primary cause of irreversible blindness
48 worldwide, with projections indicating a significant and growing impact in the future [1].

49 Identification of recognized risk factors for POAG, such as elevated intraocular pressure (IOP),
50 family history of POAG and non-White ethnicity in individuals can lead to early detection of
51 POAG through screening initiatives and mitigate vision impairment [2].

52 The role of central corneal thickness (CCT) as a potential risk factor for POAG remains
53 uncertain, with ongoing debate regarding its clinical significance in the diagnosis and
54 management of the condition [3]. Lower CCT has been postulated to be spuriously associated
55 with higher risk of POAG, since CCT can artificially influence IOP measurements [4]. Moreover,
56 the inverse association between CCT and POAG has been reported mainly by observational
57 studies, which either adjusted for IOP in their analyses, thereby treating IOP like a confounder
58 [5,6], or selected their participants based on measured IOP [7]. This can result in a spurious
59 inverse association of CCT with POAG, as a result of collider bias [8]. Collider bias in a study
60 can occur after controlling for a variable that is a common effect of the exposure and the
61 outcome. The variable that is caused by both the exposure and the outcome is termed a
62 “collider”, and controlling for this variable either by study design or statistical analysis can create
63 spurious associations between the exposure and the outcome of interest. In studies assessing
64 the association between CCT and POAG, collider bias can occur when measured IOP is
65 controlled, either in study design or statistical analysis, since measured IOP is causally affected
66 by both true IOP and CCT (Figure 1).

67 One method to assess the existence of a causal relationship between CCT and POAG, is
68 Mendelian randomization (MR), a type of instrumental variable analysis, where genetic variants
69 from genome-wide association studies (GWAS) are used as instruments [9]. It is noteworthy
70 that a recent MR study found a marginally nonsignificant positive association between CCT and

71 POAG [10]. This suggests that the causal relationship between CCT and POAG may follow an
72 opposite direction compared to what has been observed in most observational studies.
73 Considering that the lack of statistical significance of the association estimate from the recent
74 MR study may have been due to the relatively small sample size of the GWAS used, we
75 employed MR in our current study, utilizing larger GWAS datasets of POAG to assess the
76 existence of a causal association between CCT and POAG. Moreover, we conducted a two-step
77 MR for mediation analysis [11], to further investigate the proportion of the effect of CCT on
78 POAG mediated through IOP changes.

79

80 **Materials and Methods**

81 *Study design*

82 MR employs genetic variants, typically single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), as
83 instrumental variables to assess the effect of modifiable risk factors on disease risk [9]. These
84 genetic variants are randomly allocated at conception, akin to a natural randomized controlled
85 trial, reducing susceptibility to confounding and reverse causation biases [11]. In our study, we
86 conducted a two-sample MR using summary statistics from GWAS for CCT [12] and POAG
87 [13,14], in order to assess the effect of CCT on POAG risk. Additionally, we performed
88 mediation analysis with two-step MR [11] to further explore the proportion of the effect of CCT
89 on POAG mediated through IOP changes. We followed the STROBE-MR guidelines [15] and
90 "Guidelines for performing Mendelian randomization investigations" [16] and we have not pre-
91 registered the study protocol.

92 *Data sources*

93 We retrieved summary data from the largest GWAS to date for CCT [10] comprising 17,803
94 individuals of European descent, from the International Glaucoma Genetics consortium IGCC.

95 CCT in individual cohorts was assessed with ultrasound pachymetry or corneal topography and
96 was measured in μm . Genotyping and imputation methods of the GWAS have been described
97 elsewhere [10]. Summary statistics for POAG were retrieved from two GWAS: 1) the FinnGen
98 consortium database (R8 release), which included 6,785 POAG cases and 349,292 controls
99 [13], 2) the UK Biobank (UKBB) cohort, which included 1,498 POAG cases and 404,535
100 controls [14]. In both GWAS participants were of European descent and POAG cases met the
101 criteria for a diagnosis of POAG based on the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth
102 Revision (ICD-9) or International Statistical Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10)
103 code. Summary statistics for corneal-compensated IOP (IOPcc) were also retrieved from the
104 UKBB cohort [14]. More specifically, a sub-sample of 97,653 participants from the UKBB
105 underwent ophthalmic assessment including IOPcc assessment in millimeters of mercury
106 (mmHg) using an Ocular Response Analyzer non-contact tonometer. Our chosen IOP
107 phenotype was IOPcc since it was designed to account for corneal biomechanical properties
108 and has also been utilized in prior GWAS for IOP [17]. Genotyping, quality control and
109 imputation methods of the GWAS have been described elsewhere [13,18].

110 *Selection of genetic variants as instrumental variables*

111 We chose SNPs from the CCT GWAS that reached genome-wide significance ($P\text{-value} < 5 \times 10^{-8}$)
112 after clumping for linkage disequilibrium (LD) at $r^2 < 0.001$ over a 10mb window. Utilizing the
113 MR-Steiger directionality test, we determined the causality direction between CCT and POAG
114 [19]. SNPs more strongly correlated with the outcome than the exposure were excluded, along
115 with those showing significant influence in the funnel plots and scatter plots. Ultimately, 24
116 SNPs associated with CCT were selected as instrumental variables. Moreover, by summing the
117 coefficients of determination (R^2) obtained from the associations between the selected SNPs
118 and CCT, we calculated the percentage of variability in CCT that can be accounted for by the

119 selected 24 SNPs. In a similar way, we selected 53 genetic variants from the IOP GWAS for our
120 MR mediation analysis.

121 *Statistical analysis*

122 The SNP-POAG association estimates of the selected SNPs were extracted from a meta-
123 analysis of the FinnGen and UKBB GWAS, that we performed using the inverse-variance
124 weighted (IVW) fixed effect approach. Following data harmonization, which involved filtering
125 SNPs based on HapMap3 [20], excluding strand-ambiguous ones, and aligning effect sizes, we
126 computed Wald ratios. These ratios were obtained by dividing the per-allele logarithm of odds
127 ratio (logOR) for each SNP from the meta-analyzed POAG GWAS by its corresponding logOR
128 from the GWAS for CCT. The cumulative effect of CCT on POAG risk was then estimated
129 through a multiplicative random effects IVW meta-analysis of the Wald ratios [21].

130 We conducted a univariable two-sample MR using summary-level statistics from GWAS
131 available for CCT and POAG. The two-sample MR approach relies on three fundamental
132 assumptions: (1) the genetic instruments should be reliably associated with the risk factor under
133 investigation ("relevance" assumption), (2) the genetic instruments should not be associated to
134 factors that might confound the association between the exposure and outcome
135 ("exchangeability" assumption), and (3) the genetic instruments are not associated with the
136 outcome other than via the risk factor of interest ("exclusion restriction" assumption) [22,23]. To
137 fulfill the "relevance" assumption, we ensured that the selected SNPs as instrumental variables
138 reached genome-wide significance (P -value $< 5 \times 10^{-8}$). Additionally, we assessed instrument
139 strength by calculating the F-statistic of the selected genetic instruments as well as the
140 proportion of exposure variance they explain. [24]. While the "exchangeability" and "exclusion
141 restriction" assumptions cannot be definitively proven, we conducted sensitivity analyses to
142 detect potential violation of the assumptions underlying MR. Possible violations may arise from
143 horizontal pleiotropy, where genetic variants impact outcomes through pathways unrelated to

144 the investigated exposure. Thus, we employed PhenoScanner [25] to assess associations
145 between our selected genetic instruments and traits that could potentially confound our analysis.
146 If pleiotropic pathways were detected, we utilized multivariable MR to account for these effects
147 [26]. Furthermore, we examined each selected SNP and its proxies for associations with known
148 POAG risk factors, assessed heterogeneity among the chosen genetic variants through the
149 Cochran Q heterogeneity test and I_{GX}^2 [23] to detect pleiotropy, and conducted MR Egger
150 regression [23] and pleiotropy-robust methods [27] (penalized weighted median, IVW radial
151 regression, and MR-Pleiotropy Residual Sum and Outlier (MR-PRESSO)) to assess directional
152 pleiotropy. To determine if the IVW estimate was influenced by a single SNP, we conducted a
153 leave-one-out analysis.

154 For assessing the effect of CCT on POAG that is mediated through IOP (indirect effect), we
155 conducted a two-step MR for mediation analysis [11]. In this method 2 MR estimates are
156 calculated 1) the causal effect of CCT on the IOP using a univariable MR model and 2) the
157 causal effect of the IOP on POAG using a multivariable MR model adjusted for CCT. These 2
158 estimates are then multiplied together to estimate the indirect effect of CCT on POAG that is
159 mediated through IOP. The total effect of CCT on POAG was also calculated and in all these
160 mediation MR analyses we used only the POAG GWAS from the FinnGen cohort, in order to
161 avoid overlap with the UKBB GWAS for IOP. Additionally, we calculated the proportion of the
162 total effect of CCT on POAG explained by the mediator (IOP), by dividing the indirect effect of
163 CCT on POAG by the total effect. The delta method was used to estimate 95% confidence
164 intervals (95%CI) for the indirect effect and the proportion mediated [28]. MR for mediation
165 requires SNPs that have been selected as instruments for the exposure and mediator to be
166 independent [11], so we ensured our selected SNPs from the CCT and IOP GWAS to be non-
167 overlapping.

168 All MR estimates for the associations of CCT with IOP and POAG were multiplied by 50,
169 representing the change in log odds of POAG or units of IOP per 50 μ m increase in CCT. All
170 analyses were performed with R version 4.2.1 [29] using the MendelianRandomization,
171 TwoSampleMR, MVMR and MR-PRESSO packages.

172

173 **Results**

174 *Effect of central corneal thickness on primary open-angle glaucoma*

175 The selected 24 SNPs from the CCT GWAS explained 7.55% of the variance in CCT and the F-
176 statistics for all SNPs were ≥ 30.87 (Supplementary Table S2). We found a positive effect of the
177 genetically predicted CCT on POAG risk using the IVW method (OR=1.38 per 50 μ m increase in
178 CCT; 95%CI = 1.18 to 1.61; P-value < 0.01) (Figure 2 and Supplementary Figure S2). The
179 estimates from the pleiotropy-robust methods were consistent with the estimate from the IVW
180 analysis (Figure 2). None of our instrumental SNPs were associated with POAG risk factors
181 (Supplementary Table S3) and, thus, we did not perform multivariable MR to adjust for
182 correlated horizontal pleiotropy.

183 We found evidence of heterogeneity among Wald ratios for CCT with POAG (Supplementary
184 Table S4), with a Cochran's Q heterogeneity test value of 40.62 (p-value = 0.013). However, the
185 intercepts from the MR-Egger analyses did not deviate from zero, thus, no directional pleiotropy
186 was present (Supplementary Table S4). The leave-one-SNP-out analyses identified no SNPs
187 with high influence on the IVW estimates for our exposures (Supplementary Table S5).

188 *Mediation analysis*

189 An illustration of the MR mediation analysis can be seen in Figure 3. Because here we used
190 only one GWAS for POAG the estimate of the total effect of CCT on POAG was slightly different

191 (OR: 1.50 per 50 μ m increase in CCT; 95%CI = 1.27 to 1.77; P-value < 0.01, Figure 2B and
192 Supplementary Table S6). 28.4% (95%CI: 0 to 60%) of the total effect of CCT on POAG was
193 mediated through changes in IOP.

194

195 **Discussion**

196 In this two-sample MR, we utilized genetic data to assess the association between CCT and the
197 risk of POAG. Moreover, we conducted MR mediation analysis to assess the proportion of the
198 CCT effect on POAG that is mediated through IOP changes. Contrary to most of the
199 observational studies in the literature, we found evidence of a positive causal association
200 between CCT and POAG.

201 The first landmark glaucoma study to suggest that thinner corneas are associated with the
202 development of POAG was the Ocular Hypertension Treatment Study [7]. (OHTS). In this
203 prospective study they found an unadjusted and adjusted hazard ratio (HR) for POAG of 1.88
204 (95%CI = 1.55 to 2.29) and 1.71 (95%CI = 1.40 to 2.09), respectively, per 40 μ m decrease in
205 CCT. However, all the OHTS study participants were individuals with ocular hypertension (IOP >
206 21mmHg), and since higher CCT can result in higher IOP measurement readings [30], this led
207 to a selection of a cohort with high CCT values (93% of the total participants had CCT higher
208 than 526 μ m). As a result, individuals in the OHTS with high CCT might actually have lower true
209 IOP which may have caused this false inverse association between CCT and POAG conversion
210 in the OHTS due to selection bias.

211 Additionally, two other landmark glaucoma studies, the Los Angeles Latino Eye study (LALES) [5]
212 and Early Manifest Glaucoma Trial (EMGT) [6], have found an inverse association between
213 CCT and POAG, but only in their confounder-adjusted analyses. In the univariate analysis of
214 baseline factors predicting the development of POAG in the LALES the OR for POAG per 40 μ m

215 decrease in CCT was 1.16 (95%CI: 0.90 to 1.50, p-value = 0.25), while in the multivariable
216 analysis, that adjusted for IOP, this association estimate became marginally statistically
217 significant with an OR for POAG of 1.30 (95%CI: 1.00 to 1.70, p-value = 0.05). Similarly, in the
218 EMGT, the univariable analysis showed no association between CCT and POAG per 40 μ m
219 decrease in CCT (HR: 1.23, 95%CI: 0.90–1.68, p-value = 0.188). However, in an analysis
220 stratified on baseline IOP, a statistically significant 42% increase in POAG risk was found per
221 40 μ m decrease in CCT (HR: 1.42, 95%CI: 1.00 to 1.92, p-value = 0.02), only in patients with
222 higher baseline IOP.

223 The fact that in these three landmark glaucoma studies a significant inverse association
224 occurred only after either adjusting for IOP in their analyses or stratifying their analysis based on
225 IOP or selecting their participants based on IOP, suggests the presence of collider bias [31].
226 (Figure 1). Selection bias can be considered a form of collider bias, where controlling of the
227 collider happens during sampling of the study participants [32]. This could be the case for the
228 presence of an inverse association between CCT and POAG in the OHTS, since participants
229 were selected based on measured IOP (collider), and both true IOP (outcome) and CCT
230 (exposure) are causally associated with it. In LALES [5] and EMGT [6], the significant
231 association between CCT and POAG seems to occur due to collider bias after adjusting for
232 measured IOP in their statistical analyses. The presence of collider bias on the CCT-POAG
233 association has also extensively been investigated by Khawaja et al. [8], where in their
234 simulated studies CCT was significantly associated with POAG only when adjusted for
235 measured IOP or when participants were selected on measured IOP.

236 In contrast to the observational studies mentioned above, a recent two-sample MR study [10]
237 found that genetic predisposition to higher CCT is associated with higher risk of POAG, similarly
238 to our results, but this association was marginally not significant (OR for POAG: 1.20 per 50 μ m
239 increase in CCT, 95%CI: 0.97 to 1.47, p-value = 0.09). The POAG GWAS that they used

240 included 63,412 participants (4,986 POAG cases and 58,426 controls). We were able to detect
241 a statistically significant association between CCT and POAG, because the combined GWAS
242 data for POAG were much larger and consisted of 762,210 participants (8,283 POAG cases and
243 753,827 controls). Despite the significant heterogeneity among the Wald ratios for our selected
244 SNPs, no directional pleiotropy, that could lead to biased estimates, was evident [23].

245 The key strength of this study was the large sample size of the combined GWAS for POAG,
246 which increased the power of our study. Moreover, the association estimates from the
247 pleiotropy-robust methods were consistent with the IVW estimate and did not indicate any
248 model violations. Additionally, our mediation analysis with MR allowed for assessment of the
249 causal pathway between CCT and POAG. However, some limitations need to be taken into
250 account. First, our outcome of interest was POAG so the effect of CCT on other types of
251 glaucoma (e.g., primary angle-closure glaucoma) were not assessed. Second, our MR models
252 assumed a linear relationship between CCT and POAG and no interaction between these two
253 factors.

254 In conclusion, contrary to most observational studies, our data provided evidence for a positive
255 association of CCT with POAG, with almost one third of the CCT effect being mediated through
256 IOP changes. Triangulation of evidence from different types of research studies, with different
257 key sources of bias, is warranted to confirm these results.

258

259

260

261

262

263 **References**

- 264 1 Tham, Y. C. *et al.* Global prevalence of glaucoma and projections of glaucoma burden
265 through 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ophthalmology* **121**, 2081-2090,
266 doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2014.05.013 (2014).
- 267 2 Weinreb, R. N. *et al.* Primary open-angle glaucoma. *Nat Rev Dis Primers* **2**, 16067,
268 doi:10.1038/nrdp.2016.67 (2016).
- 269 3 Sng, C. C., Ang, M. & Barton, K. Central corneal thickness in glaucoma. *Curr. Opin.*
270 *Ophthalmol.* **28**, 120-126, doi:10.1097/icu.0000000000000335 (2017).
- 271 4 Medeiros, F. A. & Weinreb, R. N. Is corneal thickness an independent risk factor for
272 glaucoma? *Ophthalmology* **119**, 435-436, doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2012.01.018 (2012).
- 273 5 Jiang, X. *et al.* Baseline risk factors that predict the development of open-angle
274 glaucoma in a population: the Los Angeles Latino Eye Study. *Ophthalmology* **119**, 2245-
275 2253, doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2012.05.030 (2012).
- 276 6 Leske, M. C. *et al.* Predictors of long-term progression in the early manifest glaucoma
277 trial. *Ophthalmology* **114**, 1965-1972, doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2007.03.016 (2007).
- 278 7 Gordon, M. O. *et al.* The Ocular Hypertension Treatment Study: Baseline Factors That
279 Predict the Onset of Primary Open-Angle Glaucoma. *Arch. Ophthalmol.* **120**, 714-720,
280 doi:10.1001/archophth.120.6.714 (2002).
- 281 8 Khawaja, A. P. & Jansonius, N. M. Potential for Collider Bias in Studies Examining the
282 Association of Central Corneal Thickness With Glaucoma. *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.*
283 **63**, 3-3, doi:10.1167/iovs.63.12.3 (2022).
- 284 9 Sanderson, E. *et al.* Mendelian randomization. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers* **2**, 6,
285 doi:10.1038/s43586-021-00092-5 (2022).

- 286 10 Choquet, H. *et al.* A multiethnic genome-wide analysis of 44,039 individuals identifies 41
287 new loci associated with central corneal thickness. *Commun Biol* **3**, 301,
288 doi:10.1038/s42003-020-1037-7 (2020).
- 289 11 Carter, A. R. *et al.* Mendelian randomisation for mediation analysis: current methods and
290 challenges for implementation. *Eur. J. Epidemiol.* **36**, 465-478, doi:10.1007/s10654-021-
291 00757-1 (2021).
- 292 12 Iglesias, A. I. *et al.* Cross-ancestry genome-wide association analysis of corneal
293 thickness strengthens link between complex and Mendelian eye diseases. *Nat Commun*
294 **9**, 1864, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-03646-6 (2018).
- 295 13 Kurki, M. I. *et al.* FinnGen provides genetic insights from a well-phenotyped isolated
296 population. *Nature* **613**, 508-518, doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05473-8 (2023).
- 297 14 Pan-UKB team. <https://pan.ukbb.broadinstitute.org>. 2020.
- 298 15 Skrivankova, V. W. *et al.* Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in
299 epidemiology using mendelian randomisation (STROBE-MR): explanation and
300 elaboration. *BMJ* **375**, n2233, doi:10.1136/bmj.n2233 (2021).
- 301 16 Burgess, S. *et al.* Guidelines for performing Mendelian randomization investigations:
302 update for summer 2023 [version 3; peer review: 2 approved]. *Wellcome Open*
303 *Research* **4**, doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15555.3 (2023).
- 304 17 Simcoe, M. J., Khawaja, A. P., Hysi, P. G. & Hammond, C. J. Genome-wide association
305 study of corneal biomechanical properties identifies over 200 loci providing insight into
306 the genetic etiology of ocular diseases. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* **29**, 3154-3164,
307 doi:10.1093/hmg/ddaa155 (2020).
- 308 18 Bycroft, C. *et al.* The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data.
309 *Nature* **562**, 203-209, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0579-z (2018).

- 310 19 Hemani, G., Tilling, K. & Davey Smith, G. Orienting the causal relationship between
311 imprecisely measured traits using GWAS summary data. *PLoS Genet.* **13**, e1007081,
312 doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1007081 (2017).
- 313 20 Frazer, K. A. *et al.* A second generation human haplotype map of over 3.1 million SNPs.
314 *Nature* **449**, 851-861, doi:10.1038/nature06258 (2007).
- 315 21 Burgess, S., Dudbridge, F. & Thompson, S. G. Combining information on multiple
316 instrumental variables in Mendelian randomization: comparison of allele score and
317 summarized data methods. *Stat. Med.* **35**, 1880 - 1906 (2015).
- 318 22 Burgess, S., Foley, C. N. & Zuber, V. Inferring Causal Relationships Between Risk
319 Factors and Outcomes from Genome-Wide Association Study Data. *Annu Rev*
320 *Genomics Hum Genet* **19**, 303-327, doi:10.1146/annurev-genom-083117-021731
321 (2018).
- 322 23 Hemani, G., Bowden, J. & Davey Smith, G. Evaluating the potential role of pleiotropy in
323 Mendelian randomization studies. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* **27**, R195-R208,
324 doi:10.1093/hmg/ddy163 (2018).
- 325 24 Lawlor, D. A., Harbord, R. M., Sterne, J. A., Timpson, N. & Davey Smith, G. Mendelian
326 randomization: using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in
327 epidemiology. *Stat. Med.* **27**, 1133-1163, doi:10.1002/sim.3034 (2008).
- 328 25 Kamat, M. A. *et al.* PhenoScanner V2: an expanded tool for searching human genotype-
329 phenotype associations. *Bioinformatics* **35**, 4851-4853,
330 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btz469 (2019).
- 331 26 Sanderson, E. Multivariable Mendelian Randomization and Mediation. *Cold Spring Harb.*
332 *Perspect. Med.* **11**, doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a038984 (2021).
- 333 27 Slob, E. A. W. & Burgess, S. A comparison of robust Mendelian randomization methods
334 using summary data. *Genet. Epidemiol.* **44**, 313-329, doi:10.1002/gepi.22295 (2020).

- 335 28 Ogasawara, H. Asymptotic standard errors of estimated standard errors in structural
336 equation modelling. *Br. J. Math. Stat. Psychol.* **55**, 213-229,
337 doi:10.1348/000711002760554552 (2002).
- 338 29 R Core Team (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
339 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 340 30 Doughty, M. J. & Zaman, M. L. Human corneal thickness and its impact on intraocular
341 pressure measures: a review and meta-analysis approach. *Surv. Ophthalmol.* **44**, 367-
342 408, doi:10.1016/s0039-6257(00)00110-7 (2000).
- 343 31 Holmberg, M. J. & Andersen, L. W. Collider Bias. *JAMA* **327**, 1282-1283,
344 doi:10.1001/jama.2022.1820 (2022).
- 345 32 Hernán, M. A. & Monge, S. Selection bias due to conditioning on a collider. *BMJ* **381**,
346 1135, doi:10.1136/bmj.p1135 (2023).

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357 **Author contributions**

358 KA, BSE and NM contributed to the study conception and design, drafted the manuscript and
359 analyzed the data. All authors critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content,
360 provided administrative, technical, or material support and approved the final version.

361 **Data availability**

362 The summary statistics for the central corneal thickness GWAS are available at
363 <https://datashare.ed.ac.uk/handle/10283/2976> (access date: 2023/08/17). The primary open-
364 angle glaucoma summary statistics for the FinnGen GWAS are available at
365 https://www.finnngen.fi/en/access_results (access date: 2023/08/17). The primary open-angle
366 glaucoma and intraocular pressure summary statistics for the UKBB GWAS are available at
367 <https://pan.ukbb.broadinstitute.org> (access date: 2023/08/17)

368 **Additional information**

369 Competing Interests: None declared

370 Acknowledgments: We want to acknowledge the participants and investigators of the FinnGen
371 and UK Biobank studies.

372

373

374

375


376

377

378

379 **Legends**


380 **Figure 1.** Directed acyclic graph showing the existence of collider bias when assessing the
381 association of central corneal thickness (CCT) with primary open angle glaucoma (POAG).
382 Measured IOP is a collider, since both CCT and true IOP are causally associated with it (black
383 arrows), In cases of adjustment for measured IOP in the analysis or stratification of the analysis
384 based on measured IOP or selection of the study participants based on measured IOP, a
385 spurious relationship (dashed red line) will occur between CCT and POAG via true IOP, even if
386 no true causal association between CCT and POAG exists (there is no arrow connecting CCT
387 with POAG).



388

389

390 **Figure 2.** Mendelian randomization estimates for the effect of central corneal thickness on
391 primary open-angle glaucoma. Estimates are reported as changes in odds of primary open-
392 angle glaucoma per 50 μm increase in central corneal thickness ^a.



393

394 ^a SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism; CI, confidence interval; MR-PRESSO, Mendelian
395 randomization pleiotropy residual sum and outlier.

396

397

398

399

400


401

402

403

404

405 **Figure 3.** Directed acyclic graphs of the mediation analysis with Mendelian randomization ^a.



406

407 ^a The indirect effect of central corneal thickness (CCT) on primary open-angle glaucoma
408 (POAG) can be calculated by multiplying α times β , where α is the effect of CCT on intraocular
409 pressure (IOP), and β the effect of IOP on POAG. The proportion mediated can be estimated by
410 dividing the indirect effect by the total effect of CCT on POAG. Estimates of the CCT effect on

411 IOP and POAG are shown per 50 μ m increase in CCT. logOR: logarithm of odds ratio; mmHg:
412 millimeters of mercury.

413