Recurrent stroke prediction by applying a stroke polygenic risk score in the Japanese population.
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Abstract

Recently, various polygenic risk score (PRS)-based methods were developed to improve stroke prediction. However, current PRSs (including cross-ancestry PRS) poorly predict recurrent stroke. Here, we aimed to determine whether the best PRS for Japanese individuals can also predict stroke recurrence in this population by extensively comparing the methods and maximizing the predictive performance for stroke onset.

Methods

We used data from the BioBank Japan (BBJ) 1st cohort (n=179,938) to derive and optimize the PRSs using a 10-fold cross-validation. We integrated the optimized PRSs for multiple traits, such as vascular risk factors and stroke subtypes to generate a single PRS using the meta-scoring approach (metaGRS). We used an independent BBJ 2nd cohort (n=41,929) as a test sample to evaluate the association of the metaGRS with stroke and recurrent stroke.

Results

We analyzed recurrent stroke cases (n=174) and non-recurrent stroke controls (n=1,153) among subjects within the BBJ 2nd cohort. After adjusting for known risk factors, metaGRS was associated with stroke recurrence (adjusted OR per SD 1.18 [95% CI: 1.00–1.39, p=0.044]), although no significant correlation was observed with the published PRSs. We administered three distinct tests to consider the potential index event bias; however, the outcomes derived from these examinations did not provide any significant indication of the influence of index event bias. The high metaGRS group without a history of hypertension had a higher risk of stroke recurrence than that of the low metaGRS group (adjusted OR 2.24 [95% CI: 1.07–4.66, p=0.032]). However, this association was weak in the hypertension
group (adjusted OR 1.21 [95% CI: 0.69–2.13, p=0.50]).

Conclusions

The metaGRS developed in a Japanese cohort predicted stroke recurrence in an independent cohort of patients. In particular, it predicted an increased risk of recurrence among stroke patients without hypertension. These findings provide clues for additional genetic risk stratification and help in developing personalized strategies for stroke recurrence prevention.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-standard abbreviations and acronyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>PRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>P+T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>BBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>BBJ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>BBJ2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>ToMMo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>AIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>IPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>GWAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>IPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>LAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>SVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>CES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>TIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>HWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>WGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>SAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>DM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
87 SM  smoking
88 BMI  body mass index
89 HE  height
90 SBP  systolic blood pressure
91 DBP  diastolic blood pressure
92 TC  total cholesterol
93 TG  triglyceride
94 HDL  high-density lipoprotein
95 LDL  low-density lipoprotein
Introduction

Stroke is a major cause of mortality in Japan, with 56,000 deaths reported in 2020.\(^1\) The conventional risk factors for stroke include hypertension, high waist-to-hip ratio, smoking, cardiac causes, dyslipidemia, and diabetes mellitus.\(^2\) In Japan, the stroke recurrence rate is up to 30–50\% during 5-10 years of follow-up after the first stroke.\(^3,4\) Accordingly, it will be medically beneficial to stratify high-risk groups for recurrent stroke among those who have experienced a stroke to potentially generate more intensive secondary prevention strategies than current recommendations.

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have identified many disease-susceptibility variants associated with complex traits.\(^5\) A polygenic risk score (PRS) is the weighted summation of the individual genetic effects of these variants. Its weighting strategy varies depending on the construction method; traditionally, only significant variants are used in developing this score. The recently developed PRS methods involve non-significant variants and updated effect weights and consider the linkage disequilibrium (LD) structure. The development of PRS methods has helped stratify high-risk groups for complex traits,\(^6-11\) including stroke.\(^12\)

Polygenic risk scores developed using the 32 genome-wide significant (p< 5.0×10^{-8}) variants or 90 marginally associated (p<1.0×10^{-5}) variants (PRS\(_{90}\)) from the MEGASTROKE study\(^12\) are associated with stroke onset in subjects of European ancestry.\(^12,13\) The meta-scoring PRS approach (metaGRS) includes 3.2 million variants by combining PRSs for stroke subtypes, risk factors, and comorbidities by adjusting the effect weight via elastic-net logistic regression; this approach has an improved predictive performance for stroke compared to that of PRS\(_{90}\).\(^14\) MetaGRS can predict stroke incidence independent of environmental factors and could help motivate individuals with high genetic risk to make lifestyle changes for...
stroke prevention (although not yet implemented in clinical practice outside a research setting). The PRS shows reduced transferability between populations. Additionally, a PRS developed using various variants derived from Japanese GWAS successfully predicted stroke onset in the Japanese population. Most recently, the GIGASTROKE study proposed an integrated PRS approach among PRSs derived from populations of multiple ancestries using the metaGRS framework (iPGS), which showed a better predictive ability than the MEGASTROKE European or East Asian PRS. However, the PRS did not successfully predict stroke recurrence; for example, PRS and iPGS did not significantly predict stroke recurrence after adjusting for clinical comorbidities, with notably smaller effect sizes than for non-recurrent stroke. Furthermore, the potential effect of index event (also known as “collider”) bias that may distort the association of PRS was suspected.

The optimal method to improve the predictive accuracy of PRS depends on the population-and trait-specific genetic architecture. Therefore, we compared different PRS methods and determined whether the best PRS can predict the onset of recurrent stroke in a Japanese population.
Methods

The workflow of this study is shown in Figure 1. This article follows the TRIPOD (Transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis) reporting guidelines.

Study subjects and quality control

BioBank Japan (BBJ) involves physicians diagnosing all ischemic stroke (AIS) cases at the collaborating hospitals. BBJ was established in 2003 and recruited 267,000 patients from 12 medical institutions (66 hospitals) in two phases.11–13 The recruited patients had at least one of the 51 primarily multifactorial (common) diseases, which accounted for 440,000 cases. We used BBJ 1st cohort (BBJ1) data to derive PRSs and available independent BBJ 2nd cohort (BBJ2) data to evaluate the performance of PRSs in predicting AIS and recurrent AIS. Recurrent AIS information was unavailable for the BBJ1 data. In BBJ2, any AIS cases (n=1,470), AIS-free controls (n=40,459), recurrent AIS cases (n=174), and non-recurrent AIS controls (n=1,153) were available. The mean duration from the first episode of AIS onset to recurrent AIS onset was 4.88 years. Detailed sample characteristics are listed in Supplementary Methods and Table 1.

This study was approved by the ethics committee of the Institute of Medical Science, the University of Tokyo, Japan. Quality control, pre-phasing, and genotype imputation were conducted using PLINK(v2.0),34–36 Eagle (v2.4.1), and Minimac4 (v1.0.2), respectively. The detailed processes are presented in the Supplementary Methods.

Constructing PRSs for AIS

Unbiased PRSs were obtained by applying a 10-fold cross-validation to select the model and optimize the parameters.26,38 Briefly, BBJ1 samples were randomly split into ten equal-sized
subsamples. We retained one subsample for validation and the others for training. We repeated this process 10 times, with each of the ten subsamples used exactly once for validation. A GWAS was conducted on the training set in each iteration, adjusted for age, sex, and the first 10 principal components (PCs) via Firth logistic regression using PLINK (v.2.0).³⁴ We obtained the weights of variants for PRS from the GWAS summary statistics of the training set using five PRS methods—P+T (PLINK (v.1.9) for clumping), LDpred²,³⁹ Lassosum²,⁴⁰ (LDpred2 and Lassosum2 by bigsnpr package (v.1.7.2) in R (v.3.5.0)), PRS-CS (v.1.0.0),⁴¹ and PRS-CSx (v.1.0.0).⁴² The PRS-CSx integrated BBJ1 with the European stroke GWAS summary statistics (MEGASTROKE; the largest study available at this study design)⁴³ by learning an optimal linear combination. We used combinations of parameters for P+T (1,224 parameters), LDpred2 (126 parameters), Lassosum2 (200 parameters), PRS-CS (9 parameters), and PRS-CSx (9 parameters), as described in the Supplementary Methods. Subsequently, the PRSs for the validation sample were calculated using the weights obtained from the training samples. The accuracy for predicting AIS cases was evaluated from Nagelkerke’s R² (simply “R²” from this point onwards)²⁹,⁴⁴ after adjusting for age, sex, and the first 10 PCs. We calculated the mean R² over 10 cross-validation results for each method with each parameter after a 10-fold cross-validation. We chose the method and parameters that maximized incremental R² (PRS_AIS) among these PRSs. We further integrated the PRS_AIS with PRSs of vascular risk factors, such as stroke subtypes and comorbid diseases presence, using the elastic net framework to construct a metaGRS using the glmnet package (v.4.1.3) in R (v.4.1.0). Nine binary traits and eight quantitative traits of vascular risk factors reported in a previous study¹⁴ are described in the Supplementary Methods. Binary traits were determined by conducting GWAS and attempting to obtain unbiased weights using cross-validations. The effect weights from the derivation
sample every 17 traits were calculated using PRS-CS-auto since it did not require an independent validation sample set for parameter optimization and performed well for various traits. Subsequently, we used a validation sample to calculate the weight of AIS and the 17-trait PRSs to predict AIS using elastic-net logistic regression. We conducted a 10-fold cross-validation and used the mean weight for testing.

We used PLINK (v2.0) to calculate the individual PRS by aggregating the effect estimates multiplied by each imputed dosage into a single score per person.

**Risk factors**

The following seven risk factors that were previously utilized as covariates were used as covariates for testing: hypertension (systolic blood pressure > 140 mmHg, diastolic blood pressure > 90 mmHg, or hypertension history), hyperlipidemia, diabetes (all types), smoking (current smoker), vascular disease (myocardial infarction, peripheral artery disease, stable angina pectoris, and unstable angina pectoris), congestive heart failure, and atrial fibrillation (including atrial flutter). A sample was considered to have a risk factor status if it had that status at enrollment or from historical records (Tables 1 and S1).

**Assessment of the association of PRS with AIS and AIS recurrence**

We used a single selected method with optimized parameters and calculated the metaGRS in independent testing sample sets. We used a logistic regression model to assess the association of the PRS using the two case-control settings for AIS (any-AIS versus AIS-free controls) and AIS recurrence (recurrent AIS versus non-recurrent AIS). We also applied two other combinations of case-controls: recurrent AIS versus AIS-free controls and non-recurrent AIS versus AIS-free controls (Figure 1). Furthermore, we examined additional PRS contributions of the seven risk factors to predictive accuracy and discriminative performance using the
values of $R^2$ and area under the curve (AUC), according to our previous studies.\textsuperscript{14,46} Additionally, we evaluated the performance of the following PRSs derived from other milestone studies for stroke prediction: 32 genome-wide significant variants (for any stroke, ischemic stroke, or ischemic stroke subtypes) from the MEGASTROKE cross-ancestry study of 524,354 individuals (PRS\textsubscript{32}),\textsuperscript{43} 89 genome-wide significant variants of 1,614,080 multi-population individuals (PRS\textsubscript{89}), and 6,010,730 variants of the East Asian PRS developed from 9,809 individuals (iPGS\textsubscript{EAS}),\textsuperscript{18} both from the GIGASTROKE study. The PRS calculation process is described in the Supplementary Methods.

**Considering potential index event bias**

An index event bias may be induced when the samples are only selected from cases.\textsuperscript{47} We evaluated the extent to which the index event bias affected our results since we used case-only samples in this study. The association of PRSs with recurrent AIS was evaluated after adjusting for seven risk factors, in addition to age, sex, and the first 10 PCs. Adjusting for such confounding bias will not be enough to eliminate bias for a recurrence association study.\textsuperscript{48} Therefore, we sought to mitigate a potential index event bias by applying three distinct methodologies.\textsuperscript{48,49} First, we utilized linear and logistic regression models to assess the relationships between metaGRS and covariates within the any-AIS case (n=1,327) and AIS-free control groups (n=40,459). Initially, we did not adjust for age, sex, the seven risk factors, or the first 10 PCs. Subsequently, we observed the distributions of covariate values across the metaGRS quintiles. We performed statistical tests to detect heterogeneity in the estimates between the prevalent case and control groups, following the methodology of a prior study.\textsuperscript{19,50} Second, we refined our analysis by adjusting for associations between metaGRS and AIS recurrence while considering the differential effects of covariates, according to a previous method.\textsuperscript{19} Finally, we applied the inverse probability weighted (IPW)
approach[^47] to comprehensively account for index event bias. Collectively, these analytical approaches were adopted to enhance the validity of our findings.

### Association of metaGRS and AIS recurrence in patients with/without hypertension

Logistic regression was conducted in subgroups with and without hypertension and metaGRS tertiles among recurrent AIS cases (with hypertension n=107, without hypertension n=67) and non-recurrent AIS controls (with hypertension n=731, without hypertension n=422) to assess the relationship between the PRS and the risk of AIS recurrence. The low metaGRS tertile was set as the reference group and adjusted for age, sex, and the first 10 PCs.

### Statistical analysis

The mean with standard deviation (SD) or proportion of factors was reported for the baseline characteristics of testing samples. The incremental value (R^2 or AUC) was estimated from the differences between patients with and without PRSs of the fitted values of age, sex, first 10 PCs, and seven risk factors[^48] and calculated as the 95% confidence interval. The pROC package (v.1.18.0) in R was used to determine the discriminative ability of the AUC. The IPW package (v.1.2) in R was used for the IPW approach. R (v. 3.5.0) was used to perform logistic regression to calculate R^2, Pearson’s correlation coefficient, and linear regression. All statistical tests were two-sided. The significance level was set at p = 0.05.
Results

Derivation of effect weight

The imputed genotype data of 17,621 AIS cases and 162,317 controls without an AIS diagnosis were used for 9,622,629 autosomal variants after implementing quality control of the BBJ1 dataset (Tables S2-S4).

We conducted a 10-fold cross-validation to adjust the parameters and select the best PRS associated with AIS. We performed GWAS 10 times on 90% of the randomly selected BBJ1 dataset (training data). We successfully detected previously reported signals in each dataset ($p<5 \times 10^{-8}$), including SH3PXD2A, CCDC63 (eight times), CUX2, and LINC02356 (every time) (Figure S1, Table S5).

We confirmed some expected characteristics of each PRS method (such as low accuracy) using only genome-wide significant variants (Tables S6–10 and Supplementary Notes). The mean incremental $R^2$ values of each scoring method with the best-performed parameters were 0.0038 (95% CI: 0.0030–0.0046), 0.00443 (95% CI: 0.0035–0.0054), 0.0039 (95% CI: 0.0030–0.0048), 0.00441 (95% CI: 0.0036–0.0053), and 0.0037 (95% CI: 0.0031–0.0042) for P+T, LDpred2, Lassosum2, PRS-CS, and PRS-CSx, respectively (Table 2). We chose LDpred2 with the parameter set of $\rho$-value = 0.0056, a heritability-value = $1.0 \times h^2_{LDSC}$, where $h^2_{LDSC}$ is the heritability estimate from the constrained LD score regression, and a no-sparse model for subsequent analyses, since it showed the best mean incremental $R^2$ value among the five methods.

We observed an average number of nonzero weights for 8.4 traits after computing the metaGRS via elastic net regularization 10 times (10-fold). The metaGRS weight of AIS was highest (mean=0.123, SD=0.026), followed by diastolic blood pressure (mean=0.039, SD=0.039), atrial fibrillation (mean=0.023, SD=0.024), and myocardial infarction.
Figure S2 and Table S11). Only the triglyceride weights were zero at all 10 measurements among the 18 traits included in the metaGRS calculation. The number of variants used for metaGRS was 1,014,026; a total of 1,011,847 variants (99.8%) remained after matching with the BBJ2 dataset.

**Association of metaGRS with AIS cases and recurrent AIS**

We used the imputed genotype data of 1,470 AIS cases and 40,459 controls without a diagnosis of AIS for 59,387,070 variants from the BBJ2 dataset to test the association of metaGRS with AIS and AIS recurrence. The AIS case-only sample of the BBJ2 was used to analyze AIS recurrence. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the test samples.

MetaGRS was associated with AIS diagnosis after adjusting for age, sex, first 10 PCs, and seven risk factors (adjusted OR, 1.21 [95% CI: 1.15–1.27, p=2.89×10^{-12}]), as previously reported.\(^{14,18}\) MetaGRS was also associated with AIS recurrence compared with recurrence-free AIS (adjusted OR 1.18 [95% CI: 1.00–1.39, p=0.044]; Table 3 and Figure S3). MetaGRS showed stronger association when comparing recurrent AIS with AIS-free controls (adjusted OR 1.37 [95% CI: 1.18–1.59, p=5.35×10^{-5}]; Table S12).

The contribution of the metaGRS and traditional risk factors showed an AIS prediction accuracy with an \(R^2\) value of 0.06 and an AUC of 0.689 after constructing the baseline model using age, sex, the first 10 PCs, and seven risk factors. The incremental AUCs were 0.0087 and 0.0123 for AIS and AIS recurrence, respectively when metaGRS was added to the baseline model (Table 3). In our dataset, clinical risk factors (including hypertension) were related to AIS diagnosis but were insignificantly associated with AIS recurrence (Table S1).

We assessed the prediction performance of previously developed PRSs for AIS and AIS recurrence in our dataset. After matching with the BBJ2 dataset (Supplementary Methods), 27, 84, and 5,756,652 variants remained in PRS\(_{32}\), PRS\(_{89}\), and iPGS, respectively. We
confirmed their association with AIS diagnosis; adjusted ORs were 1.11 [95% CI: 1.06–1.17, p=4.23×10^{-5}], 1.08 [95% CI: 1.03–1.14, p=2.96×10^{-3}], and 1.26 [95% CI: 1.20–1.33, p=1.24×10^{-17}] for PRS_{32}, PRS_{89}, and iPGS, respectively (Table 3, Figure S3); however, a significant association was not observed between PRSs and AIS recurrence (p-values of 0.41, 0.054, and 0.37, respectively; Table 3 and Figure S3). Our Japanese optimized metaGRS was the only PRS significantly associated with AIS recurrence in this study.

Analyzing for potential index event bias

We observed the values of covariates at the AIS-free control group and any-AIS case group in each quintile. We did not find any significant heterogeneous relationships between the covariates and the metaGRS in terms of regression estimates in the prevalent case and control samples (p>0.05, Table S13).

We used three different variable models—i) age and sex; ii) age, sex, and seven risk factors; and iii) age, sex, the first 10 PCs, and seven risk factors—to determine the association between metaGRS and recurrent AIS; none of these confounders significantly influenced our results (Figure S4).

We compared the association results of IPW adjusted (accounting for index event bias) with those of non-adjusted IPW (accounting for confounding bias). The results remained almost unchanged, but the 95% confidence intervals overlapped (Figure S5). A comparison of the three distinct models did not indicate an effect of index event bias.

Association of metaGRS and AIS recurrence in patients with/without hypertension

We divided the test sample into subgroups according to the presence or absence of a history of hypertension and evaluated the risk effect of the metaGRS tertile. The high metaGRS group without a history of hypertension showed a higher risk effect for AIS recurrence.
compared to the low metaGRS group (OR of the high metaGRS group compared to that of the low metaGRS group was 2.24 [95% CI: 1.07–4.66, p=0.032], Figure 2 and Table S14).

However, no significant association was observed between the metaGRS and AIS recurrence in the group with a history of hypertension (the OR of the high metaGRS group compared to that of the low metaGRS group was 1.21 [95% CI: 0.69–2.13, p=0.50] (Figure 2 and Table S14).
Discussion

We successfully examined the association between recurrent AIS and our best model PRS (metaGRS using LDpred2); the adjusted OR was 1.18 for each unit of SD increase in PRS.

Our metaGRS showed stronger (adjusted OR per SD=1.37) association when comparing recurrent AIS with AIS-free controls. Furthermore, a high PRS was associated with AIS recurrence particularly in groups without a history of hypertension (OR of the top vs. bottom metaGRS tertile=2.24). These results are consistent with the result of a previous study wherein the stroke prediction accuracy of the PRS was high in the group with low CHA2DS2-VASc scores. These results indicate the utility of the PRS in developing more precise strategies to prevent AIS recurrence in individuals with a high PRS who do not have high profiles based on clinical risk factors.

We attempted to mitigate potential index event bias since our purpose was to specifically determine the efficacy of PRS among AIS patients. It is difficult to predict and provide an accurate assessment of recurrent AIS based on genetic predisposition owing to the possible effect of index event bias leading to a distorted association in studies on recurrent stroke. This study found no evidence of heterogeneous associations between covariates and the metaGRS; we did not find any evidence of a solid collider bias of known variables.

By applying IPW, we confirmed that our results support the association between metaGRS and recurrent AIS.

There are three putative reasons our metaGRS could predict AIS recurrence. First, the metaGRS algorithm combines the genetic profiles of related traits and slightly improves the performance, reaching the level of significance. Second, the performances of PRS-CS (incremental $R^2=0.00441$) and LDpred2 (incremental $R^2=0.00443$) in our validation analysis were better than those of other traditional PRS methods, such as P+T (incremental $R^2=0.0038$). This demonstrated the importance of using shrinkage estimation methods that...
consider LD to predict AIS and AIS recurrence. Third, we restricted to use only single
matched ancestry throughout.

Nevertheless, our study had several limitations. First, the sample size for recurrent AIS needs
to be increased (n=174 at testing), even in the largest hospital-based biobank in Japan.
Compared to our metaGRS, iPGS constructed in GIGASTROKE showed a stronger
association for AIS and weaker association for AIS recurrence. Although potential
discrepancies exist, both PRSs (metaGRS and iPGS) exhibit the same direction of effects and
have overlapping confidence intervals (Table 3, Figure S3). Second, despite using as many
covariates (age, sex, the first 10 PCs, and seven risk factors (hypertension, hyperlipidemia,
diabetes mellitus, smoking, vascular disease, congestive heart failure, and atrial fibrillation))
as possible based on a previous study,\textsuperscript{12} other confounders might have affected our results.
Finally, there may have been an index event bias that was not fully detected by each method
that we implemented; however this risk was minimized using multiple approaches. Further
studies using different sample sets (including other ancestry groups) are warranted to confirm
the prediction of recurrent stroke using the PRS.

In conclusion, our study indicated that PRS can be applied to predict AIS recurrence in
addition to traditional clinical risk factors. This shows the potential utility of PRS in
population-based screening and in the clinical setting. Overall, our results indicate that
stratifying high-risk groups for recurrent stroke among those who have experienced a stroke
could be medically beneficial and help in developing personalized strategies for recurrence
prevention. Our results suggest that it might be particularly useful in patients with AIS
without hypertension, although this requires confirmation in independent datasets.
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Table 1. Characteristic of the testing sample (BBJ2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Any-AIS versus AIS-free controls</th>
<th>Recurrent AIS versus non-recurrent AIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N sample (%) SD</td>
<td>OR 95% CI p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>41,929 (100%)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS / AIS recurrent</td>
<td>1,470 (3.5%)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0 (SD=12.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female sex</td>
<td>19,407 (46.3%)</td>
<td>0.48 [0.43–0.54] &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>17,710 (42.2%)</td>
<td>2.27 [2.04–2.53] &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlipidemia</td>
<td>11,604 (27.7%)</td>
<td>2.17 [1.95–2.41] &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>3,622 (8.6%)</td>
<td>1.16 [0.97–1.39] 0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking**</td>
<td>21,570 (51.9%)</td>
<td>1.43 [1.28–1.59] &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular disease</td>
<td>3,136 (7.5%)</td>
<td>1.31 [1.08–1.56] 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td>1,329 (3.2%)</td>
<td>1.27 [0.95–1.66] 0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrial fibrillation</td>
<td>1,004 (2.4%)</td>
<td>2.22 [1.71–2.84] &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All risk factor characteristics were derived from history and not at the time of registration. Odds ratio (OR), 95% CI (95% confidence intervals), and p-values were calculated using logistic regression for onset and AIS recurrence (unadjusted for other factors). *Age at AIS
case-control was that at recruitment, while age at recurrent AIS case-control was that at first incidence. The numbers indicate the median threshold age. ** The total number of missing values of smoking was 389 for all case-control and 12 for recurrent AIS case-control samples. Abbreviations: BBJ2, BioBank 2nd cohort; AIS, all ischemic stroke; SD = standard deviation
## Table 2. Polygenic risk score performance at validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Best parameters</th>
<th>Mean number of variants</th>
<th>Best mean incremental Nagelkerke $R^2$</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P+T</td>
<td>Clumping $R^2=0.95$, Clumping kb=526, Imputation $R^2=0.8$, p-value threshold=1</td>
<td>3,144,737</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.0030–0.0046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDpred2</td>
<td>$\rho$ value=0.0056, heritability value $\times$ 1.0, no_sparse</td>
<td>898,456</td>
<td>0.00443</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0035–0.0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassosum2</td>
<td>$S=0.9$, lambda=0.00388</td>
<td>282,520</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0030–0.0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS-CS</td>
<td>Phi=1.00E-04</td>
<td>985,439</td>
<td>0.00441</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.0036–0.0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS-CSx</td>
<td>Phi=1.00E-05</td>
<td>1,016,745</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0031–0.0042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Polygenic risk score performance at testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRS Method</th>
<th>Association tests</th>
<th>OR per SD [95% CI]</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Incremental AUC</th>
<th>Incremental Nagelkerke $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MetaGRS</td>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>1.21[1.15–1.27]</td>
<td>2.89E-12</td>
<td>0.0087</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>1.18[1.00–1.39]</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGASTROKE</td>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>1.11[1.06–1.17]</td>
<td>4.23E-05</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 SNVs</td>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>1.07[0.91–1.25]</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIGASTROKE</td>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>1.08[1.03–1.14]</td>
<td>2.96E-03</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 SNVs</td>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>1.17[1.00–1.38]</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIGASTROKE</td>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>1.26[1.20–1.33]</td>
<td>1.24E-17</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPGS</td>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>1.08[0.91–1.27]</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Polygenic risk score performance was evaluated using an independent testing set for AIS and recurrent AIS. We showed two main association tests; AIS (any-AIS cases vs. AIS-free controls) and AIS recurrence (recurrent AIS vs. non-recurrent AIS). Incremental AUC and $R^2$ are the differences in the values when fitting with/without PRS, along with age, sex, the first 10 PCs, and seven risk factors. Abbreviations: AIS, all ischemic strokes; OR, odds ratio; AUC, area under the curve; PC, principal components; PRS, polygenic risk score; SD = standard deviation.
Figure Legends

Figure 1. Workflow

MEGASTROKE AIS summary statistics of European (EUR) studies were only used for PRS-CSx. 1000 Genomes Project super population samples (EAS or EUR) were used for the LD reference panel. Abbreviations: GWAS = genome-wide association study, PRS = polygenic risk score, P+T = pruning and thresholding, OR = odds ratio, AIS = all ischemic stroke, ToMMo = Tohoku Medical Megabank; LD, linkage disequilibrium.

We used a logistic regression model to assess the association of the PRS using the two case-control settings for AIS (A: any-AIS vs. AIS-free controls) and AIS recurrence (B: recurrent AIS vs. non-recurrent AIS). We also applied two other combinations of case-controls (C: recurrent versus AIS-free controls and D: non-recurrent versus AIS-free controls).
Figure 2. Odds ratio of metaGRS tertiles with/without a history of hypertension

Association of AIS recurrence and meta-GRS tertiles with or without a history of hypertension (HT) in the testing sample, with reference to the low metaGRS tertiles.
SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Recurrent stroke prediction by applying a stroke polygenic risk score
in the Japanese population
Supplementary Methods

Samples

BioBank Japan (BBJ) collected DNA, serum, and medical records (clinical information) with consent from patients. The BBJ 1st cohort (BBJ1) dataset contained all ischemic stroke (AIS, n=17,621) cases, including large artery stroke (LAS, n=981), small vessel stroke (SVS, n=3,108), and cardioembolic stroke (CES, n=608) cases. The patients without AIS were included as controls (n=162,317).

Testing involved the use of data from part of the BBJ 2nd cohort (BBJ2) dataset, which contains information about AIS cases (n=1,470), including LAS (n=268), SVS (n=508), CES (n=122), and transient ischemic attack (TIA, n=105). All patients without AIS were included as controls (n=40,459). Among these cases, recurrent ischemic stroke (n=187) was used as a case of recurrent AIS, which included LAS (n=40), SVS (n=57), CES (n=11), and transient ischemic attack (TIA, n=20). Samples with information on the first onset date and follow-up of under 30 days were excluded; AIS cases with recurrence (n=174) were set as the case group, and AIS cases without recurrence (n=1,153) remained in the control group in the testing sample.

Quality control and imputation process of BBJ1 data

We removed variants with call rates <0.99, samples with call rates <0.98, non-East Asian samples, and sex-discordant samples. We used 939 samples whose genotypes were analyzed using whole-genome sequencing (WGS); we added an additional quality control based on the concordance rate between the genotyping array and WGS. We excluded variants with concordance rates <99.5% or non-reference discordance rates ≥0.5% and Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) (p<1e-6). The 10 principal components (PCs) were calculated by...
applying additional quality control (QC) to the BBJ1 genotyped data. We removed samples from close relatives (King’s cutoff >0.0884), and 24 long LD regions,\(^5^4\) including the MHC region (chr6, position 25,000,000-35,000,000), and MAF<0.01. We pruned (PLINK2 parameters: --indep-pairwise 200 50 0.20) and finally used 92,231–92,303 variants to conduct projection and calculate the first 10 PCs depending on a 10-fold sample set of the 90% BBJ1 dataset.

Subsequently, the datasets were phased (Eagle v2.4.1) and imputed (Minimac4 v1.0.2) using the developed panel.\(^5^5\) We further conducted quality control to remove variants with minor allele counts <10, close relatives (King cutoff >0.0884), and imputation r-square <0.8.

**Quality control and imputation process for BBJ2 data**

We removed samples with no age/sex information, sex discrepancy, call rates <0.98, heterozygosity rates with SD >4 or <-4, from duplicate or twins (pi-hat >= 0.75), and from non-East Asian subjects. We then removed variants with a call rate <0.99, duplicate SNPs, heterozygous count <5, HWE (p<1e-6), and allele frequency discrepancies (gap from 1000 genomes EAS >0.16). A total of 41,929 samples and 525,239 variants were analyzed.

We applied additional quality control to the BBJ2 genotyped data to calculate the 10 PCs. We removed variants in 24 long LD regions,\(^5^4\) pruned them (PLINK2 parameters: --indep-pairwise 200 50 0.05), extracted close relatives (King cut-off >0.0884), and used 69,068 variants to calculate the first 10 PCs.

We removed variants of the imputation r-squared <0.3 after phasing (Eagle v2.4.1) and imputing (Minimac4 v1.0.2) the developed panel.\(^5^5\) We used a lower r-square threshold for BBJ2 to reduce the number of variants unmatched with BBJ1.

**Polygenic risk score parameters at the derivation**
Pruning and threshold used a total of 1,224 parameter combinations of three stricter imputation r-squared score thresholds \{0.8, 0.9, and 0.95\}, four base sizes of the clumping window \{50, 100, 200, and 500\}, six squared correlations of clumping \{0.01, 0.05, 0.2, 0.5, 0.8, and 0.95\}, and 17 p-value threshold \{1e-8, 3e-8, 1e-7, 3e-7, 1e-6, 3e-6, 1e-5, 3e-5, 1e-4, 3e-4, 1e-3, 3e-3, 0.01, 0.03, 0.1, 0.3, and 1\}. We used clumping windows and divided the base size by the squared correlation of clumping.\textsuperscript{56-59} The following default parameters were used for LDpred2: three heritability \{0.7, 1, and 1.4\}×h^2_{\text{LDSC}}, where h^2_{\text{LDSC}} is the heritability estimate from the constrained LD score regression,\textsuperscript{52} 21 \rho estimates \{equally spaced on a log scale between 1e-5 and 1\}, and sparse or not. The following default parameters were used for Lassosum2: 10 values of s \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, and 1.0\} and 20 values of \lambda \ {equally spaced on a log scale between 0.1 and 0.001}. Regarding PRS-CS and PRS-CSx, we used slightly more extended parameters: phi \{1e-7, 1e-6, 1e-5, 1e-4, 1e-3, 0.01, 0.1, 1, and auto\}, than the default parameters \{1e-4, 1e-3, 0.01, 0.1, 1, and auto\}, because the optimized parameter in the initial trials using our dataset was the smallest (phi=1e-4) in the default range. Other parameters were set to default values (a=1, b=0.5).\textsuperscript{41,42}

**Linkage disequilibrium (LD) reference**

We used the EAS superpopulation of the 1000 Genomes panel (n=504) as a LD reference for P+T clumping. For LDpred2, Lassosum2, PRS-CS, and PRS-CSx models, we restricted our use of external LD reference panels to the HapMap 3 variants, which were also constructed from 1000 Genomes EAS. HapMap 3 variant restriction resulted in 898,456, 898,456, 985,440, and 1,076,835 variants of LDpred2, Lassosum2, PRS-CS, and PRS-CSx, respectively. To use PRS-CSx for the EUR, we used the EUR superpopulation of the 1000 Genomes panel and its HapMap3 variants (1,016,745 variants).
MetaGRS was developed following a previous study\textsuperscript{14} and included nine binary and eight quantitative traits. The nine binary traits were SVS, LAS, CES, myocardial infarction (MI), stable angina pectoris (SAP), unstable angina pectoris (AP), atrial fibrillation (AF), diabetes (DM), and ever smoking (SM) from the BBJ1 dataset. Subsequently, we conducted GWAS. The number of cases and controls is listed in Table S15. Summary statistics were obtained from the jMorp website (https://jmorp.megabank.tohoku.ac.jp) and were used for eight quantitative traits—body mass index (BMI), height (HE), systolic blood pressure (SBP), diastolic blood pressure (DBP), total cholesterol (TC), triglyceride (TG), high-density lipoprotein (HDL), and low-density lipoprotein (LDL) from the Tohoku Medical Megabank Project (ToMMo; 22,033 to 47,056 samples).\textsuperscript{60}

Polygenic risk score calculation from other milestone studies

We obtained effect weights from the PGS catalog (PGS000665 and PGS002725 of https://www.pgscatalog.org for PRS\textsubscript{32} and iPGS\textsubscript{EAS}, respectively) and for PRS\textsubscript{89} from the supplementary tables.\textsuperscript{18} We used variants that matched with the BBJ2 dataset (imputation r-squared > 0.3). The unmatched variants in PRS\textsubscript{32} and PRS\textsubscript{89} included proxy variants that showed the highest r-squared values with the index variants only from an r-squared value greater than 0.3. The r-squared values were calculated using the plink --r2 command\textsuperscript{15} with the 1000 Genome EAS as a reference.
Supplementary Notes

Characteristics of the PRS methods during validation

The following characteristics of each method were observed while testing several parameters: the best mean incremental $R^2$ of 0.0038 was observed for the P + T method when we liberalized the p-value threshold to 1 and clumped $r^2 > 0.8$, whereas it was below 0.001 when we used a low p-value threshold ($< 10^{-8}$, Table S5). For LDpred2, $\rho$ values higher than 0.001 showed good performance (mean incremental $R^2$ was 0.0038 for $\rho$ values $\geq 0.001$ compared to 0.0016 for $\rho$ values $< 0.001$), while heritability estimates and sparse parameters made less difference (Table S6). For Lassosum2, the closer the value of parameter “s” is to 1, the higher the prediction accuracy, but it wasn’t the case at exactly 1. Larger lambda parameters correlate with greater accuracy (mean incremental $R^2$ was between 0.0025 to 0.0039). However, the accuracy sharply decreases (mean incremental $R^2 < 0.001$) if the value is too small ($< 0.01$). The prediction performance was maximized when the parameters were $s=0.9$ and lambda=0.0038 (Table S7). High and low phi values resulted in low performance for PRS-CS (mean incremental $R^2$ was 0.0041 for phi=$10^{-3}$, $10^{-4}$, and $10^{-5}$ compared to 0.0029 for other phi parameters; Table S8). Meanwhile, PRS-CSx was relatively consistent regardless of the phi values (mean incremental $R^2$ was 0.0032 for phi=$10^{-3}$, $10^{-4}$, and $10^{-5}$ compared to 0.0028 for other phi parameters; Table S9).

The performance of the PRS-CS ($R^2=0.00441$) was comparable to that of LDpred2 ($R^2=0.00443$) in the validation analysis. Low validation predictability (incremental $R^2 < 0.001$) was observed when we restricted the p-value threshold in the P+T method to genome-wide significance ($p<5 \times 10^{-8}$). PRS-CSx improves cross-population polygenic prediction by integrating GWAS summary statistics from other populations;\textsuperscript{61-65} however, we could not reproduce this result in our current study using PRS-CSx. Our results demonstrate the
importance of using Bayesian methods of high-dimensional techniques in variable selection and shrinkage estimation considering LD (such as LDpred2 and PRS-CS) to predict AIS and recurrent AIS.
Supplementary Figures

Figure S1. Genome-wide association study (GWAS) in derivation samples

We conducted stroke GWAS using 90% of BBJ cohort data as the derivation sample, using Firth logistic regression and PLINK (v.2.0) for each 10-fold cross-validation identification. a. Quantile-Quantile plot, b. Manhattan plot, and c. genome-wide significant (p<5e-8) loci of each fold. Abbreviations: Chr = chromosome.
Figure S2. Elastic net weight

The mean weight of 10-fold elastic net regression as determined by “glmnet” in the validation sample. The X-axis shows the AS and the 17 binary and quantitative traits. Error bars represent standard deviations.

Abbreviations: AIS, all ischemic stroke; SVS, small vessel stroke; LAS, large artery stroke; CES, cardioembolic stroke; MI, myocardial infarction; SAP, stable angina pectoris; UAP, unstable angina pectoris; AF, atrial fibrillation; DM, diabetes; SM, smoking; BMI, body mass index; HE, height; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; HCL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; SD, standard deviation.
Figure S3. Odds ratio per SD to predict AIS and AIS recurrence

Odds ratio per standard deviation by metaGRS and three publicly available PRS in the independent test set of AIS (case=1, 470, control=40,459) and AIS recurrence case-control set (case=174, control=1,153). Age, sex, the first 10 PCs, and seven risk factors were adjusted. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The dotted line represents the point at which the ORs per SD of AIS and AIS recurrence were equal. Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; AIS, all ischemic stroke; PRS, polygenic risk score; PC, principal component; SD, standard deviation.
Figure S4. Association between seven comorbidities and AIS/AIS recurrence

The Y-axis shows the odds ratio per standard deviation (SD) and 95% confidence interval (CI) of the seven risk factors (six clinical comorbidities and smoking) in the BBJ 2nd cohort.

In our dataset, we used HT defined as SBP>140 mmHg, DBP>90 mmHg, or hypertension history, DM inclusive of type 1 diabetes and other diabetes, SM as a current smoker at the time of registration, VD representing myocardial infarction, arteriosclerosis obliterans, stable angina pectoris, unstable angina pectoris, and AF inclusive of atrial flutter. We used the status at the time of registration and history of these comorbidities.

Abbreviations: HT, hypertension; HL, hyperlipidemia; DM, diabetes; SM, smoking; VD, vascular disease; HF, congestive heart failure; AF, atrial fibrillation.
Figure S5. Association between metaGRS and AIS recurrence in patients with or without IPW adjustment

The y-axis shows the odds ratio per SD and the 95% confidence interval for predicting recurrent AIS. Model 1: age and sex; model 2: age, sex, and seven risk factors; model 3: age, sex, the first 10 principal components (PCs), and seven risk factors. The color represents whether the inverse probability weight (IPW) is adjusted. We applied logistic regression using variables as covariates when the IPW was not adjusted. We replaced 14 missing data on the smoking status to mean values.
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