ADHD and intelligence polygenic scores associations with developmental dimensions in children with attention, learning and memory difficulties

Andrea M. Santangelo[1,2], Olena Ohlei[3], Silvana Mareva[1,4], Diandra Brkic[1,5], CALM team[1], Lars Bertram[3], Joni Holmes[1,6], Duncan Astle[1,7] and Kate Baker[1,8,9 *]

[1] Medical Research Council Cognitive and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge, UK

[2] Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, UK

[3]Lubeck Interdisciplinary Platform for Genome Analysis (LIGA), University of Luebeck, Germany

[4] Psychology Department, University of Exeter, UK

[5]Brain Health Department, Nestlé Institute of Health Sciences, Switzerland

[6] School of Psychology, University of East Anglia, UK

[7] Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, UK

[8] Department of Genomic Medicine, University of Cambridge, UK

[9] Department of Pathology, University of Cambridge, UK

*** corresponding author:** kb488@cam.ac.uk

Total word count: 6,345

Key words

Polygenic scores, ADHD, Intelligence, transdiagnostic, behavioural dimensions, psychopathology

Acknowledgments

Genotyping was carried out within the "Healthy minds 0-100 years: Optimising the use of European brain imaging cohorts (Lifebrain)" project, funded by EU Horizon2020 (Grant agreement number: 732592). We are grateful to Professor Sadaf Farooqi and her laboratory for DNA extractions and storage, and to NIHR BRC-MRC BioRepository for sample archiving.

The Centre for Attention Learning and Memory (CALM) research clinic was based at the MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge, funded by the MRC through UKRI (https://calm.mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk/). The authors wish to thank the many professionals working in children's services in the South-East and East of England for their support, and the children and their families for contributing to the project. The lead investigators are Duncan Astle, Kate Baker, Susan Gathercole, Joni Holmes, Rogier Kievit and Tom Manly. Data collection is assisted by a team of researchers and PhD students that includes Danyal Akarca, Joe Bathelt, Marc Bennett, Madalena Bettencourt, Giacomo Bignardi, Sarah Bishop, Erica Bottacin, Lara Bridge, Diandra Brkic, Annie Bryant, Sally Butterfield, Elizabeth Byrne, Gemma Crickmore, Edwin Dalmaijer, Fánchea Daly, Tina Emery, Laura Forde, Grace Franckel, Delia Furhmann, Andrew Gadie, Sara Gharooni, Jacalyn Guy, Erin Hawkins, Rebeca Ianov-Vitanov, Christian Iordanov, Agnieszka Jaroslawska, Sara Joeghan, Amy Johnson, Jonathan Jones, Silvana Mareva, Jessica Martin, Elise Ng-Cordell, Sinead O'Brien, Cliodhna O'Leary, Joseph Rennie, Andrea M. Santangelo, Ivan Simpson-Kent, Roma Siugzdaite, Tess Smith, Stepheni Uh, Maria Vedechkina, Francesca Woolgar, Natalia Zdorovtsova, Mengya Zhang.

Abstract

Common genetic variants make a significant contribution to neurodevelopmental characteristics such as cognitive abilities and ADHD symptoms. The relevance and structure of these associations amongst children with transdiagnostic difficulties in cognition, attention and learning has not been demonstrated. Polygenic scores (PGS) derived from genome-wide association study (GWAS) data on ADHD and Intelligence were calculated for 524 children and young people referred to the Centre for Attention, Learning and Memory (CALM). PGS-trait associations were tested via linear regression analyses, for a range of cognitive and behavioural measures, and factor scores from a hierarchical model of psychopathology. PGS associations were explored with and without co-varying for socio-economic status (SES). Within this sample, we found the expected positive associations between ADHD-PGS and ADHD primary symptoms, and between Intelligence-PGS and IQ. Whilst ADHD-PGS were also associated with broader externalising behaviours and intelligence scores, intelligence-PGS showed associations only with verbal and non-verbal cognitive skills, and not with ADHD traits. These associations remained significant after removing ADHD-diagnosed participants, or after covarying with SES. For the hierarchical model of psychopathology, ADHD-PGS, but not intelligence-PGS, showed associations with the general mental health factor, externalising factor, and social maladjustment factor, only when SES was not included as a covariate. In summary, PGS for neurodevelopmental traits contribute to both general and specific cognitive and behavioural dimensions in a paediatric transdiagnostic sample. Future studies investigating PGS associations with neural correlates, as well as gene-by-environment interactions, will contribute to our understanding of developmental pathways and risk-resilience mechanisms in child mental health.

Introduction

Polygenic scores (PGS) are estimates of individual common genetic variation associated with a trait or disorder and can provide insights into the genetic architecture and underlying mechanisms contributing to complex phenotypes [1, 2]. PGS have been extensively used to study the common polygenic contributions to a variety of neurodevelopmental traits in the general population, and to neurodevelopmental or mental health diagnoses in case-control studies [3, 4]. Although traits and diagnoses are often investigated in isolation from each other, shared genetic contributions across disorders are well-recognised [5–7], indicating that PGS influence aspects of neurobiological and cognitive development relevant to a diverse set of educational, behavioural and psychiatric vulnerabilities.

Neurodevelopmental difficulties often affect multiple domains impacting on learning, behaviour, emotion regulation and social function, with complex within-sample profiles of strength and difficulty. Moreover, children with neurodevelopmental difficulties often do not meet criteria for a specific diagnosis or meet criteria for multiple diagnoses. Recognising these complexities, investigations of neurodevelopment and mental health have increasingly adopted a transdiagnostic framework [8]. Within this framework, it is not necessary to meet formal diagnostic criteria to be included in a study, neither is the presence of co-occurring difficulties an exclusion criterion i.e. better mimicking the lived experience of multi-dimensional neurodevelopmental difficulties.

Previous studies of the associations between common genetic variation and individual neurodevelopmental traits or diagnoses (i.e. monodiagnostic studies) are of unclear relevance to the large population of children with transdiagnostic difficulties. PGS-phenotype relationships within this population are of high interest because these may point toward shared sources of variation underlying multiple symptom domains, and may be a starting point for elucidating mechanisms which exert transdiagnostic impacts. Determining the associations between multiple PGS and a range of traits within samples of children who have heterogeneous and co-occurring difficulties

provides an inclusive starting point for investigating links between genomic variation, neurobiological mechanisms and cognitive / mental health vulnerabilities.

With these goals in mind, the Centre for Attention Learning and Memory in Cambridge (CALM, http://calm.mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk/) recruited a cohort of approximately 800 children recognised by educational or clinical professionals as having difficulties in attention, learning and/or memory [9]. This unique transdiagnostic paediatric sample provides an opportunity to study the factors (genetics and environmental) and mechanisms that drive diversity in neurodevelopment, independent of categorical diagnoses and their co-occurrence. The CALM cohort is a well-characterised sample from the point of view of behavioural features [10–13], dimensions of cognitive and executive functions [14–16], dimensions of mental health [10, 17], and neuroimaging [18, 19]. The current paper addresses the question of whether and how Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and Intelligence PGS are associated with relevant neurodevelopmental characteristics within the transdiagnostic CALM sample. We have focused on ADHD and Intelligence PGS because these traits reflect important aspects of behavioural and cognitive heterogeneity within the CALM cohort, and there are robust large-scale GWAS studies to draw on for planned analyses.

ADHD is a common neurodevelopmental disorder characterised by symptoms in either the inattentive or hyperactive/impulsive domains, or both (Posner et al., 2020). ADHD affects approximately 5% of children and 2.5% of adults, with a high heritability of approximately 70-80% estimated from twin-based studies [21], and high comorbidity with other psychiatric conditions [22]. The latest genome-wide association meta-analysis (meta-GWAS) of ADHD case-control studies has identified 27 genome-wide significant risk loci, including genes enriched for expression in early brain development, with 14 % of SNP heritability accounting for ADHD [23]. Higher ADHD-PGS have been associated with ADHD diagnosis in independent case-control samples [24], as well as with ADHD symptoms in population-based studies [23, 25, 26], suggesting that an ADHD diagnosis represents the extreme expression of one or more heritable quantitative traits. In addition, 84–98% of ADHD-

risk variants are shared with other psychiatric disorders [23, 24] indicating the transdiagnostic potential of this genomic index.

In keeping with these pleiotropic associations, ADHD-PGS have recently been explored within a hierarchical, dimensional model of childhood psychopathology known as HiToP [27–29]. The HiToP model proposes a p-factor of general psychopathology at the apex, under which more specific factors are described [10, 30]. The p factor is highly heritable (50-60% from twin studies) and the model aligns well with current understanding of the higher order genetic structure of psychopathology. ADHD-PGS have consistently been shown to contribute to the p factor, as well as to sub-factors of externalizing behaviours and neurodevelopmental difficulties [25, 31–33], providing further evidence against diagnosis-specific association, and prompting questions about potential neurobiological, cognitive and developmental correlates.

A proportion of children with symptoms of ADHD or other behavioural difficulties also have cognitive and learning-related difficulties. The ability to think abstractly and problem solve independently of any previously acquired knowledge is known as fluid intelligence [34]. Fluid intelligence is highly heritable, with a general factor of intelligence (*g*) accounting for about 58% of the genetic variance in cognitive traits [4]. A large-scale, meta-GWAS for the *g* factor of general intelligence has identified 205 genomic loci implicating brain-expressed genes involved in nervous system development, neuron differentiation, and synapse structure and activity [35]. In addition, genomic variation contributing to intelligence also impacts on behavioural and psychiatric traits. Genetic correlation and Mendelian randomization analysis showed a negative correlation between intelligence-associated variants and ADHD and depression symptoms [34, 35]. In reverse, genomic variation quantified in association with behavioural traits (ADHD-PGS) has also been negatively correlated with cognitive abilities including general intelligence, attention, verbal and non-verbal reasoning, and working memory [23].

In summary, despite the existing evidence of convergent genetic contributions to cognitive (intelligence) and behavioural (ADHD) traits during childhood, it is not currently known whether

these contributions are observable within a transdiagnostic sample of children with neurodevelopmental difficulties. Within such a sample, polygenic contributions may be specific to a trait (e.g. ADHD-PGS associated with ADHD symptoms only; Intelligence-PGS associated with IQ only), or shared across traits (e.g. ADHD-PGS associated with additional behavioural dimensions, and aspects of cognitive function; Intelligence-PGS contributing to ADHD and mental health related dimensions). The extent to which PGS show specific or shared associations within the CALM sample could provide insight into the inter-relationships between dimensions of neurodevelopmental difficulty, at a behavioural or mechanistic level.

Thus, our first objective was to establish whether ADHD and Intelligence PGS showed associations with their respective primary traits, i.e. ADHD symptoms and cognitive test scores, within the CALM sample. Our second objective was to examine whether PGS associations were specific to these traits, or extended to additional behavioural traits (externalising and internalising problems) demonstrating cross-over between behavioural and cognitive dimensions. Thirdly, we explored whether PGS could contribute to our understanding of a hierarchical model of psychopathology (HiToP) within this population.

Methods

Participants

A cohort of children aged 5 to 18 years was recruited by the Centre for Attention, Learning and Memory (CALM, http://calm.mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk/) between February 2014 and December 2021 [9]. The cohort consisted of 800 children referred by a health or educational professional because of difficulties related to attention, learning and/or memory. In addition, 200 children were recruited from the same schools as controls. This paper reports analysis on the referred children only. Comprehensive phenotyping was carried out for all children (for details see Holmes et al., 2019) (**Table 1**), and an optional DNA sample (saliva) was provided. A total of 615 samples were submitted from the referred children for genotyping. After QC filtering (see below), a final N=524 participants remained, with 361 males and 163 females, and average age of 9.5±2.4 years (**Table 2**). Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD; [36] was used to approximate the socioeconomic status of the sample. Scores for postcode areas in the United Kingdom range from 1st to 32844th (most to least deprived). The range of IMD for the sample indicated participants came from areas with varying degrees of deprivation, with an average ranking above the national median (**Table 2**). The decile distribution for IMD in this cohort is shown in **Fig. S1**. Within this group of participants, 38% had received a diagnosis of any developmental or psychiatric disorder from community services, 22.5% had received a diagnosis of ADHD, 11.8% had been diagnosed with dyslexia or were receiving speech and language therapy, and 7% had received a diagnosis of autism.

Phenotypic measures

The measures used in the current analysis are listed in **Table 1**, together with descriptive data for each measure within the CALM PGS-analysed sample. HiToP factor scores were obtained according to previously published method [10]. Briefly, higher-order dimensions of psychopathology within the CALM cohort were determined using Goldberg's bass-ackward factor analytic method [37]. This method is based on multivariate hierarchical models of 1 factor, 2 factors, 3 factors and so

on, which enables the sequential, top-down extraction of dimensions whilst retaining the shared variance among the measures (the model ceases at the maximal number of factors that can be extracted). Three measures were included in this analysis: CPSF, SDQ and RCADS-P (**Table 1**). Because the RCADS questionnaire was introduced later into the CALM study protocol, HiToP factor analysis was conducted for the subgroup of participants with all measures available, for whom genetic data was available (N=218 individuals after QC filtering).

DNA extraction, genotyping, QC filtering, imputations, and PGS calculation

For detailed methods, see Supporting Material. In brief, DNA samples were collected from saliva using the Oragene® DNA self-collection kits (DNA Genotek Inc). DNA extraction was performed using prepIT·L2P Kit (DNA Genotek Inc) following manufacturer instructions. Genome-wide SNP genotyping was carried out using the Global Screening Array with shared custom-content (GSA, Illumina, Inc., USA) on an iScan instrument. The raw intensity data was subjected to genotype calling, extensive pre-imputation quality control and SNP imputation using an automated computational workflow described previously (Hong et al., 2020, 2021). A total of 18 samples were excluded (see Supporting Material for details). The LD pruned dataset was used for principal component analysis in PLINK [40] along with the reference dataset of the 1000 Genome Project Consortium Phase 3 (The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium, 2015) to ancestry groups. Only European-descent samples were used in the subsequent analyses, removing 40 non-European samples. Genotype imputation was performed with MiniMac3 [41] software using the "Haplotype Reference Consortium" v1.1 reference panel (McCarthy et al., 2016). Overall, this procedure resulted in 39,131,578 imputed SNPs.

We computed PGS as described previously (Choi et al., 2020). Allele status and effect-size estimates were taken from the summary statistics of the largest ADHD [23] and Intelligence [35] meta-GWAS published to date. Variant QC filtering was performed on both GWAS databases: duplicate and ambiguous SNPs were removed, and only SNPs with MAF >0.05 and imputation quality r^2 >0.8 were included. The target CALM sample did not overlap with the GWAS datasets. GWAS and CALM genotyping data were annotated on the GRCh37/hg19 genome build. Further 9 samples were

removed due to extreme heterozygosity (more than 3 SD from the mean), and 24 closely related individuals were also removed, giving a final sample size of N=524. Variant matching and recoding between the ADHD/Intelligence GWAS base and CALM target datasets was performed using R (version 3.5.3), resulting in 5,583,323 and 3,994,342 overlapping SNPs for ADHD and Intelligence, respectively. After SNP-clumping, PGS were computed for a variety of P-value thresholds (P_t) in the primary GWAS data (0.001, 0.05, 0.10, 0.20, 0.30, 0.40, 0.50) using PLINK.

Statistical analysis

PGS-trait association analyses were conducted on standardized values using R (v4.5.0) for each P_t. ADHD and Intelligence PGS were treated as independent variables in linear regression models adjusting for sex, age, and the first 6 components of a PCA performed on the pruned SNP pool dataset to account for population stratification. Sensitivity analyses including IMD as covariate, or removing participants with an ADHD diagnosis were performed. The variance explained (r^2) was derived by comparing results from the full model (outcome phenotype with PGS and covariates) vs the null model (outcome phenotype with covariates only). P_t values that explained the highest phenotypic variance (max r^2) were selected. Significant PGS-trait associations were determined after Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment to control for false discovery rate [43], (Tables S1-S5).

Results

ADHD-PGS and Intelligence-PGS are associated with their respective primary phenotypes within the CALM cohort

We first assessed the associations between ADHD and Intelligence PGS with their respective behavioural and cognitive primary phenotypes within the transdiagnostic CALM cohort. We found that ADHD-PGS were positively associated with Hyperactivity/Impulsivity scores (r^2= 0.03; Beta=0.17 SE=0.04; p=3.52e-05) and Inattention (r^2= 0.02; Beta=0.14 SE=0.04; p=1.57e-03) (**Fig. 1, Table S1**). These associations remained significant after covariation with Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD, **Table S2**). Sensitivity analysis removing ADHD-diagnosed participants confirmed these positive

associations (**Table S3**), i.e. the associations between ADHD-PGS and ADHD traits were not solely observed within or biased by the presence of participants with this diagnosis.

Intelligence-PGS were positively associated with verbal (r^2= 0.05; Beta=0.22 SE=0.04; p=4.00e-08) and non-verbal (r^2= 0.05; Beta=0.22 SE=0.04; p=7.41e-07) intelligence test scores (**Fig. 1, Table S1**), and these associations remained significant after covariation with IMD (**Table S2**).



Fig. 1 Forest plots showing standardized effect size (Beta) and 95% CI (error bars) from the linear regressions between ADHD and Intelligence-PGS and behavioural and cognitive measures within the CALM cohort. Vignette size corresponds to the linear regression P values (Table S1)

ADHD-PGS are associated with behavioural and cognitive dimensions beyond ADHD-related characteristics

We then analysed whether the impact of ADHD-PGS on behavioural traits can be observed beyond the narrowly defined dimensions of inattention and hyperactivity. We found that ADHD-PGS were positively associated with externalising behaviours encompassing SDQ Conduct and Hyperactivity/Inattention scales (r^2= 0.04; Beta=0.21 SE 0.04; p=1.06e-06), but not with internalising behaviours encompassing Emotional and Peer problems scales (r^2= 0.01; Beta=0.09 SE=0.04;

p=5.19e-02) (**Fig. 1, Table S1**). With respect to cognitive dimensions, ADHD-PGS were negatively associated with verbal (r^2= 0.02; Beta=-0.14 SE=0.04; p=1.02e-03), and non-verbal (r^2= 0.01; Beta=-0.11 SE=0.04; p=1.57e-02) intelligence (**Fig 1, Table S1**). All these associations remained significant after covariation with IMD (**Table S2**) or removing participants diagnosed for ADHD (**Table S3**).

Intelligence-PGS is not associated with behavioural dimensions beyond IQ

Intelligence-PGS were not significantly associated with ADHD inattention or hyperactivity scores, neither with externalising or internalising behavioural scores (**Fig. 1** and **Tables S1**; see **Table S2** for values covarying with IMD).

ADHD-PGS contributes to hierarchical factors of mental health within the CALM cohort

To assess whether ADHD and Intelligence PGS were associated with mental health, considered as a hierarchical tiered set of inter-related factors, we conducted regression analysis using the HiTOP factor scores calculated for CALM participants with data availability (see Materials and Methods for details). ADHD-PGS were positively associated with the level 1 general factor of psychopathology (r^2= 0.03; Beta=0.17 SE=0.07; p=1.37e-02), the level 2 broad externalizing factor (r^2= 0.03; Beta=0.17 SE=0.07; p=1.06e-02) and the level 3 social maladjustment factor (r^2= 0.03; Beta=0.19 SE=0.07; p=6.42e-03). Level 2 broad internalizing factor and level 3 specific internalizing and neurodevelopmental factors were not associated with ADHD-PGS (**Fig. 2**, **Table S4**). These associations were no longer significant when covarying with IMD (**Table S5**).

Intelligence-PGS showed no significant association with any of the HiTOP psychopathology factors, with or without IMD as a covariate (**Fig. 2, Table S4 and S5**).



Fig. 2 Forest plots showing standardized effect size (Beta) and 95% CI (error bars) from the linear regressions between ADHD and Intelligence-PGS and psychopathology factors (HiTOP) within the CALM cohort. Vignette size corresponds to the linear regression P values (Table S4)

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study of the polygenic contributions to neurodevelopmental characteristics within a paediatric transdiagnostic sample. Using the summary statistics of the largest meta-GWAS so far, we have derived PGS for ADHD and Intelligence for the transdiagnostic CALM cohort. We have examined the specificity and overlap of PGS associations with respective primary phenotypes (ADHD symptoms, IQ test scores), additional behavioural characteristics (SDQ externalising and internalising scores), and factor scores derived from a hierarchical model of psychopathology (HiTOP).

First, we found that ADHD-PGS were associated with hyperactivity-impulsivity and inattention questionnaire scores, and Intelligence-PGS with verbal and non-verbal intelligence test scores. This confirms that GWAS-derived metrics of common genomic variation are relevant to their expected dimensions of neurodevelopmental variation despite the inclusive ascertainment criteria,

high levels of co-occurring diagnoses, and sub-diagnostic difficulties of the CALM cohort. Enrichment for multi-dimensional behavioural and cognitive difficulties within the cohort means that PGS-trait relationships can be observed despite a relatively small sample size. Although a high proportion of the cohort had received a diagnosis of ADHD from community services prior to recruitment to CALM, removing these participants from analyses did not alter results. These results provide a starting point for future explorations of the associations between PGS, cognitive functions and neuroimaging correlates, and longitudinal associations within the CALM cohort.

Second, we found that PGS derived from ADHD meta-GWAS statistics were associated with neurodevelopmental dimensions beyond the core ADHD diagnostic symptoms, extending into externalising difficulties and verbal intelligence. This is consistent with previous studies that have found that higher ADHD-PGS are also associated with elevated neurodevelopmental, externalizing, and depressive and anxiety symptoms in diagnostic [44] and population studies [25, 45]. There are possible explanations for these results. The SDQ externalising score incorporates a hyperactivity subscale, so the association between ADHD-PGS and externalising scores may be driven by this subscale. The relationship between ADHD and language/verbal difficulties is well-documented both in CALM and in the broader literature [46, 47]. A single dimension of behavioural difficulties that includes both hyperactivity and inattention, was strongly and negatively associated with pragmatic communication skills within the CALM cohort [47]. The case groups contributing to ADHD-GWAS studies from which the ADHD-PGS is drawn likely included many individuals with ADHD plus additional behavioural symptoms plus reduced verbal intelligence, meaning that the ADHD-PGS may summate genomic variation contributing to each of these separate dimensions [23]. The symptoms assessed by ADHD questionnaires (particularly for the inattention subscale) are diverse and incorporate cognitive and behavioural features likely to be influenced by cognitive abilities for at least some children, meaning cross-over associations of the ADHD-PGS with diverse neurodevelopmental dimensions. Alternatively, genomic variation contributing to risk of ADHD symptoms may also contribute to risk of these additional phenotypes (a truly transdiagnostic genetic

effect), evidenced by the significant genetic correlations between ADHD risk variants and IQ and educational attainment [24]. Future studies could test these alternative explanations.

In contrast, Intelligence-PGS showed a strong and specific relationship with only verbal and non-verbal IQ test scores and did not cross-associate with any behavioural measures. This highlights the relative independence of general cognitive abilities and behavioural dimensions within this sample and suggests separable aspects of genomic variation contribute to these broad domains. Previous analyses of cognition within the CALM cohort have identified three dimensions: phonological processing, processing speed and executive function (Holmes et al 2021) which can be explored with regard to PGS contributions in future analyses, accounting for developmental effects. PGS quantifies the load of polygenic variation but does not evaluate each individual's unique combination of variants. Mapping these variants to genes [48], exploring functional meaning via gene set enrichment analysis using MAGMA [49] or FUMA [50], and comparing across traits, may uncover important aspects of genomic diversity relevant to different neurobiological mechanisms and cognitive-behavioural trajectories.

Whilst examining specific PGS-behavioural relationships has value and builds on previous literature, individual children within CALM (and children with co-occurring developmental difficulties in general) experience a combination of cognitive, behavioural, social and emotional challenges that may be better understood in an integrated fashion. The HiTOP model provides one such integrated framework for mental health, hence we have explored associations between HiTOP factors and PGS scores. Here again, we found that Intelligence-PGS had no predictive value in explaining psychopathological variation within the sample. ADHD-PGS analyses suggest that there are polygenic contributions to an overarching p factor within CALM, indexing general susceptibility to emotional-behavioural symptoms as has been shown previously [25, 31]. Interestingly, we did not detect any association between ADHD-PGS and the lower-level "neurodevelopmental" factor which encompasses inattention, hyperactivity/impulsivity and executive function. Instead, ADHD-PGS were associated with "social maladjustment", encompassing conduct-related and peer-related problems

assessed by the SDQ. We speculate that this observed association may be explained by the high comorbidity between ADHD and conduct disorders [20]. A within-case analysis of individuals with comorbid ADHD and conduct disorders showed a positive linear relationship between ADHD-PGS and conduct problems, especially aggression [51]. Alternatively, the relationship between ADHD-PGS and verbal abilities, rather than a direct effect on behavioural characteristics, may have also contributed to these observations. The importance of communication abilities (pragmatic skills in particular) and their relationship with behavioural symptomatology has been emphasised in previous CALM analyses [47], and future hypothesis-driven studies could investigate the links between ADHD-PGS and language development. However, it is important to note that the sample available for PGS-HiTop analysis was likely under-powered, and the specificity of associations should thus be treated with caution.

Within the CALM sample, socio-economic status (approximated via the Index of Multiple Deprivation) is an important demographic factor which is known to contribute to behavioural symptom likelihood and to correlate with polygenic variation [52]. Hence it is possible that observed PGS-behavioural associations are confounded by the influence of SES. To explore this, we conducted association analyses with and without IMD co-variation. We found that the PGS associations with cognitive and behavioural measures were insensitive to IMD, suggesting that there is relatively little environmental influence within this sample [53], perhaps reflecting limited SES range. Associations between ADHD-PGS and HiTop psychopathology factors were weakened (or rendered non-significant) when co-varying for IMD. This may indicate that the observed associations are artefacts of co-variation, or that the sample is under-powered to detect significant associations once co-variates are accounted for, or alternatively that there are important gene x environment interactions at play. Future studies could explore gene x environment interactions within this sample by assessing the impact of environmental factors, such as parental education and perinatal health [54].

In summary, we have investigated a unique transdiagnostic sample and found that PGS contribute significantly and specifically to behavioural characteristics and cognitive abilities. This is a

first step toward investigating links between genomic variation, brain development and cognitive processes contributing to learning and behavioural problems within transdiagnostic populations.

Statements and Declarations

Competing Interests

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Funding

D. Astle and K. Baker are supported by the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00030/2; MC_UU_00030/3). A.M. Santangelo was supported by the Isaac Newton Trust / Wellcome Trust ISSF / University of Cambridge Joint Research Grants scheme, and by the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00030/3 and MC_UU_00032/3). All research at the Department of Psychiatry in the University of Cambridge is supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203312) and the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration East of England.

Data Availability

Behavioural and cognitive data is available online through the CALM Managed Open Access repository: https://portal.ide-cam.org.uk/overview/1158. Genetic data is available via collaboration with CALM.

Ethics

All procedures complied with the ethical standards of the national and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008. All procedures involving human participants were approved by the National Health Service, Health Research Authority NRES Committee East of England (REC: 13/EE/0157, IRAS 127675).

Consent to participate

Informed consent was obtained from legal guardians.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization (KB, DA, DB, AS); Formal analysis (AS); Funding acquisition (KB); Investigation (JH, DA, SM, CALM team); Resources (OO, LB); Writing – original draft (AS, KB); Writing – review & editing (all authors).

References

1. Andlauer TFM, Nöthen MM (2020) Polygenic scores for psychiatric disease: From research tool to clinical application. Medizinische Genetik 32:39–45. https://doi.org/10.1515/MEDGEN-2020-2006/ASSET/GRAPHIC/J_MEDGEN-2020-2006_FIG_002.JPG

2. Choi SW, Mak TSH, O'Reilly PF (2020) Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic risk score analyses. Nat Protoc 15:2759–2772. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41596-020-0353-1

3. Ronald A, de Bode N, Polderman TJC (2021) Systematic Review: How the Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder Polygenic Risk Score Adds to Our Understanding of ADHD and Associated Traits. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 60:1234–1277. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JAAC.2021.01.019

4. de la Fuente J, Davies G, Grotzinger AD, et al (2020) A general dimension of genetic sharing across diverse cognitive traits inferred from molecular data. Nature Human Behaviour 2020 5:1 5:49–58. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-00936-2

5. Lee PH, Anttila V, Won H, et al (2019) Genomic Relationships, Novel Loci, and Pleiotropic Mechanisms across Eight Psychiatric Disorders. Cell 179:1469-1482.e11. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CELL.2019.11.020

6. Gidziela A, Ahmadzadeh YI, Michelini G, et al (2023) A meta-analysis of genetic effects associated with neurodevelopmental disorders and co-occurring conditions. Nature Human Behaviour 2023 7:4 7:642–656. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01530-y

7. Romero C, Werme J, Jansen PR, et al (2022) Exploring the genetic overlap between twelve psychiatric disorders. Nature Genetics 2022 54:12 54:1795–1802. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01245-2

8. Astle DE, Holmes J, Kievit R, Gathercole SE (2022) Annual Research Review: The transdiagnostic revolution in neurodevelopmental disorders. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 63:397–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/JCPP.13481

9. Holmes J, Bryant A, Gathercole SE (2019) Protocol for a transdiagnostic study of children with problems of attention, learning and memory (CALM). BMC Pediatr 19:. https://doi.org/10.1186/S12887-018-1385-3

10. Holmes J, Mareva S, Bennett MP, et al (2021) Higher-Order Dimensions of Psychopathology in a Neurodevelopmental Transdiagnostic Sample. J Abnorm Psychol 130:909–922. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000710

11. Mareva S, Akarca D, Astle D, et al (2023) Transdiagnostic profiles of behaviour and communication relate to academic and socioemotional functioning and neural white matter organisation. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 64:. https://doi.org/10.1111/JCPP.13685

12. Williams KL, Holmes J, Farina F, et al (2022) Inconsistencies between Subjective Reports of Cognitive Difficulties and Performance on Cognitive Tests are Associated with Elevated Internalising and Externalising Symptoms in Children with Learning-related Problems. Res Child Adolesc Psychopathol 50:1557–1572. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10802-022-00930-4

13. Bryant A, Guy J, Holmes J (2020) The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire Predicts Concurrent Mental Health Difficulties in a Transdiagnostic Sample of Struggling Learners. Front Psychol 11:. https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2020.587821

14. Bathelt J, Holmes J, Astle DE, et al (2018) Data-Driven Subtyping of Executive Function-Related Behavioral Problems in Children. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 57:252-262.e4. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JAAC.2018.01.014

15. Holmes J, Guy J, Kievit RA, et al (2021) Cognitive Dimensions of Learning in Children With Problems in Attention, Learning, and Memory. J Educ Psychol 113:1454–1480. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000644

16. Mareva S, Holmes J (2019) Transdiagnostic associations across communication, cognitive, and behavioural problems in a developmentally at-risk population: A network approach. BMC Pediatr 19:. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-019-1818-7

17. Guy J, Mareva S, Franckel G, Holmes J (2022) Dimensions of cognition, behaviour, and mental health in struggling learners: A spotlight on girls. JCPP advances 2:. https://doi.org/10.1002/JCV2.12082

18. Akarca D, Vértes PE, Bullmore ET, et al (2021) A generative network model of neurodevelopmental diversity in structural brain organization. Nat Commun 12:. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-24430-z

19. Siugzdaite R, Bathelt J, Holmes J, Astle DE (2020) Transdiagnostic Brain Mapping in Developmental Disorders. Current Biology 30:1245-1257.e4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.01.078

20. Posner J, Polanczyk G V., Sonuga-Barke E (2020) Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. Lancet 395:450–462. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)33004-1

21. Faraone S V., Perlis RH, Doyle AE, et al (2005) Molecular genetics of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Biol Psychiatry 57:1313–1323. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOPSYCH.2004.11.024

22. Jensen CM, Steinhausen HC (2015) Comorbid mental disorders in children and adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in a large nationwide study. Atten Defic Hyperact Disord 7:27–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/S12402-014-0142-1

23. Demontis D, Walters GB, Athanasiadis G, et al (2023) Genome-wide analyses of ADHD identify 27 risk loci, refine the genetic architecture and implicate several cognitive domains. Nature Genetics 2023 55:2 55:198–208. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01285-8

24. Demontis D, Walters RK, Martin J, et al (2019) Discovery of the first genome-wide significant risk loci for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Nat Genet 51:63–75. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41588-018-0269-7

25. Brikell I, Larsson H, Lu Y, et al (2020) The contribution of common genetic risk variants for ADHD to a general factor of childhood psychopathology. Mol Psychiatry 25:1809–1821. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41380-018-0109-2

26. Martin J, Hamshere ML, Stergiakouli E, et al (2014) Genetic Risk for Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder Contributes to Neurodevelopmental Traits in the General Population. Biol Psychiatry 76:664. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOPSYCH.2014.02.013

27. Waszczuk MA, Eaton NR, Krueger RF, et al (2020) Redefining phenotypes to advance psychiatric genetics: Implications from hierarchical taxonomy of psychopathology. J Abnorm Psychol 129:. https://doi.org/10.1037/ABN0000486

28. Allegrini AG, Cheesman R, Rimfeld K, et al (2020) The p factor: genetic analyses support a general dimension of psychopathology in childhood and adolescence. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 61:30–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/JCPP.13113

29. Kotov R, Waszczuk MA, Krueger RF, et al (2017) The Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): A dimensional alternative to traditional nosologies. J Abnorm Psychol 126:454–477. https://doi.org/10.1037/ABN0000258

30. Michelini G, Barch DM, Tian Y, et al (2019) Delineating and validating higher-order dimensions of psychopathology in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study. Transl Psychiatry 9:. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41398-019-0593-4

31. Waszczuk MA, Miao J, Docherty AR, et al (2023) General v. specific vulnerabilities: polygenic risk scores and higher-order psychopathology dimensions in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study. Psychol Med 53:1937–1946. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291721003639

32. Riglin L, Thapar AK, Leppert B, et al (2020) Using Genetics to Examine a General Liability to Childhood Psychopathology. Behav Genet 50:213–220. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10519-019-09985-4

33. Pat N, Riglin L, Anney R, et al (2022) Motivation and Cognitive Abilities as Mediators Between Polygenic Scores and Psychopathology in Children. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 61:782-795.e3. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JAAC.2021.08.019

34. Deary IJ, Cox SR, Hill WD (2021) Genetic variation, brain, and intelligence differences. Molecular Psychiatry 2021 27:1 27:335–353. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-021-01027-y

35. Savage JE, Jansen PR, Stringer S, et al (2018) Genome-wide association meta-analysis in 269,867 individuals identifies new genetic and functional links to intelligence. Nat Genet 50:912–919. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41588-018-0152-6

36. (2019) The English Indices of Deprivation 2019

37. Goldberg LR (2006) Doing it all Bass-Ackwards: The development of hierarchical factor structures from the top down. J Res Pers 40:347–358. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JRP.2006.01.001

38. Hong S, Dobricic V, Ohlei O, et al (2021) TMEM106B and CPOX are genetic determinants of cerebrospinal fluid Alzheimer's disease biomarker levels. Alzheimers Dement 17:1628–1640. https://doi.org/10.1002/ALZ.12330

39. Hong S, Prokopenko D, Dobricic V, et al (2020) Genome-wide association study of Alzheimer's disease CSF biomarkers in the EMIF-AD Multimodal Biomarker Discovery dataset. Transl Psychiatry 10:. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41398-020-01074-Z

40. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, et al (2007) PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses. Am J Hum Genet 81:559–575. https://doi.org/10.1086/519795

41. Das S, Forer L, Schönherr S, et al (2016) Next-generation genotype imputation service and methods. Nat Genet 48:1284–1287. https://doi.org/10.1038/NG.3656

42. McCarthy S, Das S, Kretzschmar W, et al (2016) A reference panel of 64,976 haplotypes for genotype imputation. Nat Genet 48:1279–1283. https://doi.org/10.1038/NG.3643

43. Lee S, Lee DK (2018) What is the proper way to apply the multiple comparison test? Korean J Anesthesiol 71:353–360. https://doi.org/10.4097/KJA.D.18.00242

44. Stergiakouli E, Martin J, Hamshere ML, et al (2015) Shared genetic influences between attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) traits in children and clinical ADHD. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 54:322–327. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JAAC.2015.01.010

45. Du Rietz E, Coleman J, Glanville K, et al (2018) Association of Polygenic Risk for Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder With Co-occurring Traits and Disorders. Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging 3:635–643. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2017.11.013

46. Korrel H, Mueller KL, Silk T, et al (2017) Research Review: Language problems in children with Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder - a systematic meta-analytic review. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 58:640–654. https://doi.org/10.1111/JCPP.12688

47. Hawkins E, Gathercole S, Astle D, Holmes J (2016) Language Problems and ADHD Symptoms: How Specific Are the Links? Brain Sci 6:. https://doi.org/10.3390/BRAINSCI6040050

48. McLaren W, Gil L, Hunt SE, et al (2016) The Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor. Genome Biol 17:1–14. https://doi.org/10.1186/S13059-016-0974-4/TABLES/8

49. de Leeuw CA, Mooij JM, Heskes T, Posthuma D (2015) MAGMA: Generalized Gene-Set Analysis of GWAS Data. PLoS Comput Biol 11:e1004219. https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PCBI.1004219

50. Watanabe K, Taskesen E, Van Bochoven A, Posthuma D (2017) Functional mapping and annotation of genetic associations with FUMA. Nat Commun 8:. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41467-017-01261-5

51. Hamshere ML, Langley K, Martin J, et al (2013) High loading of polygenic risk for ADHD in children with comorbid aggression. American Journal of Psychiatry 170:909–916. https://doi.org/10.1176/APPI.AJP.2013.12081129/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/909F1.JPEG

52. Abdellaoui A, Verweij KJH (2021) Dissecting polygenic signals from genome-wide association studies on human behaviour. Nature Human Behaviour 2021 5:6 5:686–694. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01110-y

53. Rask-Andersen M, Karlsson T, Ek WE, Johansson Å (2021) Modification of Heritability for Educational Attainment and Fluid Intelligence by Socioeconomic Deprivation in the UK Biobank. Am J Psychiatry 178:625–634. https://doi.org/10.1176/APPI.AJP.2020.20040462

54. Leffa DT, Caye A, Belangero SI, et al (2023) The synergistic effect of genetic and environmental factors in the development of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder symptoms in children and adolescents. Dev Psychopathol 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579423000366

55. Conners CK (2008) Conners parent rating scale short form, 3rd ed. Pearson, London, UK

56. Goodman R (1997) The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: A research note. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 38:581–586. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1469-7610.1997.TB01545.X

57. (2005) Wechsler Individual Achievement Test Second UK Edition (WIAT-II UK). Wechsler Individual Achievement Test Second UK Edition (WIAT-II UK). https://doi.org/10.53841/BPSTEST.2005.WIAT2

58. Dunn LM, Dunn DM (2007) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Pearson Education, Minneapolis, USA.

59. Chorpita BF, Yim L, Moffitt C, et al (2000) Assessment of symptoms of DSM-IV anxiety and depression in children: a revised child anxiety and depression scale. Behaviour research and therapy 38:835–855. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(99)00130-8

Table 1: Cognitive and behavioural measures, and HiTOP factor scores, for the CALM sample included in the PGS analyses (after QC filtering)

Measures	Instrument	Variable	Mean	SD	Range
Behavioural (N=524)					
Hyperactivity/Impulsivity	Conners 3 - Parent Rating Scale Short Form[1]	Raw scores	10.98	5,59	0-18
Inattention			11.77	3.44	0-16
Externalising behaviours	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire[2]	Sum of Conduct and Hyperactivity/Inattention scales	11.11	4.12	1-20
Internalising behaviours		Sum of Emotional and Peer problems scales	7.85	4.62	0-19
Cognitive (N=524)					
Non-verbal intelligence	Wechsler Abbreviated Scales of Intelligence II[3]	Matrix Reasoning subtest-T scores	43.72	9.66	20-80
Verbal intelligence	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test[4]	Number of correct items- percentile	48.93	29.36	0.09-99.9
HiTOP (N=218)					
Level 1:					
P factor	Conners 3 - Parent Rating Scale Short Form[1], Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire[2], and Revised Children's Anxiety and Depression Scale Parent Version[6]	Factor scores[5]	0.01	1.02	-2.22-3.31
Level 2:					
Broad internalizing			-0.01	1.01	-1.88-3.82
Broad externalizing			0.03	1.01	-2.59-2.23
Level 3:					
Specific internalizing			-0.01	1.01	-1.74-3.79
Social maladjustment			-0.01	1.03	-1.70-2.57
Neurodevelopmental			0.08	1.00	-3.74-1.56

[1] [55]; [2] [56]; [3] [57];[4] [58]; [5] [10]; [6] [59]

Table 2: Description of the CALM sample after QC filtering

Sample size	**Tota**	**Males/Females**
N	524	361/163
Diagnosis	**Percentage of total**	**N**
Any developmental or psychiatric disorder	38%	199
ADHD	22.5%	118
Dyslexia/speech therapy	11.8%	34/28
Autism	7%	37
	Mean±SD	**Range**
Age (years)	9.5±2.4	5.2-18.6
Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)	20328±8254	155-32803


ADHD-PGS
IQ-PGS
Hyperactivity/Impulsivity (Conners)
Inattention (Conners)
Externalizing behaviours (SDQ)
Internalizing behaviours (SDQ)
Verbal Intelligence scores
Non-verbal Intelligence scores
-0.2
-0.1
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
Effect Size (Beta)
-0.2
-0.1
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
Effect Size (Beta)


ADHD-PGS
IQ-PGS
General factor (level 1)
Broad externalizing factor (level 2)
Broad internalizing factor (level 2)
Social maladjustment (level 3)
Specific internalizing (level 3)
Neurodevelopmental (level 3)
-0.2
-0.1
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
Effect Size (Beta)
-0.2
-0.1
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
Effect Size (Beta)