Mendelian randomization infers the effect of 14 parental illnesses on 44 congenital anomalies

Tian Tian[1], MD; Lei Tan[2], MD; Wenjing Shao[3], MD

[1] Prenatal Diagnosis Center ,Reproductive Medicine Center,The First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, 130021, China

[2] Department of Orthopedics Trauma, Orthopaedic Center, the First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, 130021, China

[3] Obstetrics and Gynecology Center, the First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, 130021, China

Running title: Causal Effects of parental illnesses on congenital anomalies Risk

Address for correspondence:

Wenjing Shao

Obstetrics and Gynecology Center, the First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, 130021, China; shaoshao@jlu.edu.cn

E-mail addresses:

Tian Tian: tiantian0113@jlu.edu.cn

Lei Tan: tanlei@jlu.edu.cn

Wenjing Shao: shaoshao@jlu.edu.cn

Abstract:

Background: Congenital anomalies (CA), including congenital malformations (CM) and congenital deformities (CD), are significant health concerns influenced by genetic and environmental factors. Parental illnesses, especially those with genetic components, may affect the risk of congenital anomalies in offspring. Although clinical studies have suggested associations between certain parental illnesses and increased CM and CD risk, causal relationships remain unclear. This study employs a Mendelian randomization (MR) approach to investigate these potential causal links.

Methods: Fourteen parental illnesses were selected for this study: breast cancer, chronic bronchitis/emphysema, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, and Alzheimer's disease in mothers; and Alzheimer's disease, bowel cancer, chronic bronchitis/emphysema, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, lung cancer, and prostate cancer in fathers. Genetic variants associated with these illnesses were identified from genome-wide association studies (GWAS) in the UK Biobank. Genetic data for 44 congenital anomalies were sourced from the FinnGen database. Two-sample MR was conducted to estimate causal effects, with sensitivity analyses and multivariable MR (MVMR) to control for potential confounders.

Results: MR analysis revealed causal relationships between 13 parental illnesses and 13 specific congenital anomalies. Notably, mother's hypertension significantly increased the risk of congenital hypothyroidism (IVW: OR = 7.969, 95% CI = 3.0826-20.6011, p = 4.20E-04), and father's diabetes increased the risk of congenital heart defects in offspring (IVW: OR = 3.8E+09, 95% CI = 2.2E+04-6.6E+14, p = 3E-04). The associations' strength varied with the type of parental illness and the specific congenital disease.

Conclusion: This study underscores the utility of MR in elucidating genetic influences of parental health conditions on congenital anomalies. The findings highlight the importance of managing parental health to reduce congenital anomalies risk in offspring. Further research is needed to explore underlying biological mechanisms and validate these findings in diverse populations.

Keywords: Parental illnesses; Congenital anomalies; Mendelian randomization;

Causal relationship; Genome-wide association study

Introduction

Congenital anomalies(CA), encompassing a wide range of structural and

functional anomalies present at birth, contribute significantly to infant morbidity and

mortality worldwide[1]. Understanding the etiology of these conditions is crucial for

developing preventative strategies and improving health outcomes. While

environmental and genetic factors have been extensively studied, the influence of

parental health conditions on the risk of congenital anomalies in offspring remains an

area of ongoing research[2].

Parental illnesses, particularly chronic conditions, can have profound effects on

the health and development of their children. These conditions may lead to adverse

intrauterine environments, epigenetic modifications, or genetic predispositions that

increase the risk of congenital anomalies. Observational studies have suggested

associations between various parental illnesses and congenital anomalies. Recent

studies have shown significant associations between parental chronic illnesses, such

as diabetes, obesity, and hypertension, and the occurrence of congenital anomalies

and other health issues in their offspring. For instance, maternal diabetes during

pregnancy has been linked to congenital heart defects, neural tube defects, and other

structural abnormalities in newborns[3–5]. Similarly, paternal health should not be

overlooked. Research indicates that paternal obesity and metabolic syndrome are

associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular diseases in children[6, 7].

Mendelian randomisation (MR) offers a robust approach to infer causality by

using genetic variants as instrumental variables[8]. This method leverages the random

assortment of genes from parents to offspring during meiosis, mimicking the

randomised control trial design and thus reducing confounding[9]. By identifying

genetic variants associated with specific parental illnesses, MR can provide insights

into the causal relationships between these conditions and congenital anomalies.

In this study, we aim to investigate the causal effects of 14 parental illnesses on

the incidence of 44 congenital anomalies in offspring using MR. By integrating

genetic data from large-scale GWAS and relevant cohorts, we seek to elucidate the

genetic underpinnings of congenital anomalies influenced by parental health

conditions. Through rigorous MR analysis, we aspire to deliver reliable evidence that

can guide future research and clinical practice in the prevention and management of

congenital anomalies.

Research Design and Methods

1. Study Design and Data Sources

We employed both univariable Mendelian randomisation (UVMR) and

multivariable Mendelian randomisation (MVMR) to investigate the causal effects of

14 parental illnesses on the incidence of 44 congenital anomalies in offspring. MR

uses genetic variants as instrumental variables to infer causality, minimizing

confounding factors and biases typically associated with observational studies.

Throughout the study, we rigorously adhered to three core assumptions to ensure the

validity of our results: 1. Establishing a reliable association between genetic variants

and the risk factor. 2. Confirming no association between genetic variants and

confounders. 3. Ensuring genetic variants solely influence the outcome through the

risk factors[10]. A comprehensive study design flowchart is provided in Figure 1.

Our study utilized the largest and most recent publicly available summary

statistics from multiple GWAS sources, including the FinnGen database and the UK

Biobank (UKBB) database. To prevent overlap, we carefully selected data from the

UKBB as exposure factors, and data from FinnGen were designated as the outcomes.

Adherence to the STROBE-MR (Strengthening the Reporting of Mendelian

Randomization Studies) guidelines was maintained throughout the study[11]. Detailed

information on the GWAS data used in this study is provided in Supplementary

Tables 1.

2. Genetic Association Datasets

Parental Illnesses and Genetic Instruments

We sourced comprehensive GWAS data for parental illnesses from the largest

study to date, selecting 14 parental illnesses from the UKBB. Each illness involved

300-400 thousand samples of European ancestry, encompassing approximately 10

million SNPs. The mother's conditions included breast cancer, chronic

bronchitis/emphysema, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, and Alzheimer's disease.

The father's conditions included Alzheimer's disease, bowel cancer, chronic

bronchitis/emphysema, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, lung cancer, and

prostate cancer. Detailed information on the GWAS data used in this study is

provided in Supplementary Table 1.

Congenital anomalies

The study focused on 44 congenital anomalies, encompassing a wide range of

structural and functional anomalies. Genetic data for these congenital anomalies were

obtained from the FinnGen database, known for its comprehensive coverage of

congenital anomalies[12]. Each disease involved 300 thousand samples of European

ancestry and approximately 16 million SNPs. The diseases were classified into

categories such as cardiovascular anomalies, musculoskeletal anomalies, nervous

system anomalies, urinary system anomalies, genital organs anomalies, respiratory

system anomalies, and others. Detailed information on the GWAS data used in this

study is provided in Supplementary Table 1.

3. Genetic Instrument Selection

For genetic instrument selection, we established a genome-wide significance

threshold. SNPs with a P-value less than 5×10^{-8} were considered significant. To

ensure robust analyses, we required a minimum of three instrumental variables for

each illness to perform the inverse-variance weighted (IVW) method and conduct

sensitivity tests. Variants meeting these criteria were then clumped for linkage

disequilibrium (LD) using a distance window of 10,000 kB and an $r^2 < 0.001$. To

avoid the risk of weak instrumental bias, the F statistic was performed to evaluate the

strength of the IV. When $F > 10$, the association between the IV and exposures was

deemed to be sufficiently robust, thereby safeguarding the results of the MR analysis

against potential weak instrumental bias. After several rounds of rigorous filtering, a

set of eligible instrumental variables for the subsequent MR analysis were obtained.

The instrument variables used in this study is presented in Supplementary Tables S5.

4. Software

142   We employed the "TwoSampleMR"[13], "MendelianRandomization"[14] , and

143   "MR-PRESSO"[15]   packages for UVMR and MVMR analyses, including

144   sensitivity tests. Statistical analyses were conducted using R software version 4.3.2

145   (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing).

5. Mendelian Randomization

Univariable MR Analysis

Causal effects were estimated using the random-effects inverse variance

weighted (IVW) method. Causal estimates were expressed as odds ratios (ORs) with

95% confidence intervals (CIs). To ensure unbiased estimates, MR analyses were also

conducted using four alternative methods: MR Egger, Simple mode, Weighted

median, and Weighted mode. A causal effect was considered suggested if the IVW

p-value was less than 0.05. Moreover, a causal effect was deemed significant if the

IVW p-value fell below the Bonferroni-corrected threshold ($p < 0.05/14 = 0.0035$),

coupled with consistent directionality in the weighted median and MR-Egger results.

Multivariable MR Analysis

157   For results from the UVMR analysis where multiple exposures were causally

158   related to the same congenital disease, we performed MVMR to mitigate the

159   confounding influence of the exposure factors. The MVMR-IVW method was used

160   for this purpose[16].

Sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to validate the findings and to account for

potential biases. MR-Egger Regression: Assesses directional pleiotropy and provides

a pleiotropy-adjusted causal estimate. Weighted Median: Provides a robust causal

estimate even if up to 50% of the information comes from invalid instruments[17].

MR-PRESSO: Detects and corrects for horizontal pleiotropy by identifying outlier

SNPs[18]. Credible causal inference requires consistent directionality across the three

methods and the absence of horizontal pleiotropic effects.

6.Data and Resource Availability

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this article and

its supplementary information files.

Results

Overview

The MR analysis investigated the causal effects of 14 parental illnesses on the

incidence of 44 congenital anomalies in offspring. Among these, father's bower

cancer showed no causal effect on any of the 44 congenital anomalies. Thirteen other

illnesses demonstrated causal relationships with 13 congenital anomalies ($p < 0.05$),

with only two MR analysis results passing multiple testing. The remaining 31

congenital anomalies were not influenced by these 14 parental illnesses. The results

highlighted significant associations between certain parental health conditions and

specific congenital anomalies (Figure 2, Supplemental Table S2 and S3). Detailed

results for notable associations are presented below.

Effect of 6 Illnesses of mother on 44 Congenital anomalies

Using both UVMR(Figure 3) and MVMR(Figure 4), the analysis identified

several positive associations (IVW: $p < 0.05$): breast cancer with congenital

malformations (CM) of the ovaries, fallopian tubes, and broad ligaments; Alzheimer's

disease with other CM of the peripheral vascular system; diabetes with CM of the

urinary system; hypertension with congenital hypothyroidism; chronic

bronchitis/emphysema with CM of the breast; chronic bronchitis/emphysema with

CM of the gallbladder, bile ducts, and liver; and heart disease with CD of the hip.

Notably, hypertension showed a significant causal effect on congenital

hypothyroidism after Bonferroni correction (IVW: OR = 7.969, 95%

CI=3.0826-20.6011, $p = 4.20E-04$). (Figure 2, Supplemental Figure 2, Supplemental

Tables 2). Sensitivity analyses revealed consistent results with no evidence of

horizontal pleiotropy. One outlier was identified in the MR-PRESSO test for

hypertension on congenital hypothyroidism; consistent results were obtained after

removing the outlier (p=2.09E-06). Further MR analyses showed no causal links with

other congenital anomalies. Additional results are detailed in Supplementary Table S2

and S4, with leave-one-out and scatter plots provided in Supplementary Figures 1-7.

Effects of 8 Illnesses of father on 44 Congenital anomalies

Using instrumental variables for father's illnesses, the following positive

associations were found (IVW: $p < 0.05$) in UVMR (Figure 3) and MVMR (Figure 4):

heart disease with CD of the head, face, spine, and chest; lung cancer with CM of the

breast; hypertension with CM of the spine and bony thorax; diabetes with other CM of

male genital organs; and prostate cancer with both CD of the feet and CM and CD of

the musculoskeletal system. Most notably, after Bonferroni correction, the MR

analysis for diabetes showed a significant causal effect on other CM of male genital

organs (IVW: OR = 3.8 E+09, 95% CI=2.2 E+04-6.6 E+14, p = 3E-04). Sensitivity

analyses confirmed no evidence of heterogeneity or horizontal pleiotropy. No outliers

were detected by MR-PRESSO. Additional results are detailed in Supplementary

Table S3 and S4. Leave-one-out analysis showed consistent results. Leave-one-out are

provided in Supplementary Figures 8-13.

MVMR

For results from the UVMR analysis where multiple exposures were causally

related to the same congenital disease, we performed MVMR to mitigate the

confounding influence of the exposure factors. The results revealed the following

independent causal relationships: father's lung cancer and mother's

bronchitis/emphysema with CM of the breast; father's hypertension with CM of the

spine and bony thorax; mother's diabetes with CM of the urinary system; mother's

hypertension with congenital or acquired hypothyroidism; and father's diabetes with

other CM of male genital organs (Figure 4).

Discussion

Our study provides novel insights into the causal relationships between parental

illnesses and congenital anomalies in offspring through the application of Mendelian

randomization. The significant associations observed, particularly the increased risk

of congenital hypothyroidism associated with mother's hypertension and CM of male

genital organs associated with father's diabetes, underscore the potential for parental

health to influence fetal development. These findings enhance our understanding of

the differing roles of parental health conditions in the development of congenital

anomalies and provide avenues for further mechanistic investigation. However, our

MR approach strengthens these associations by reducing the likelihood of

confounding factors and reverse causation.

Our analysis reveals an unexpected causal relationship between mother's

hypertension and congenital hypothyroidism, suggesting a more intricate connection

between mother's health and offspring endocrine development than previously

recognized. This association prompts a reexamination of the factors influencing the

fetal thyroid gland's maturation and function, potentially implicating a range of

mechanisms from direct hormonal impacts to the influence of the in-utero

environment on gene expression and developmental programming. Mother's

hypertension could affect placental function, thereby impacting the nutrient and

hormone exchange critical for fetal development[19]. Hypertensive conditions might

lead to altered levels of placental hormones, such as human chorionic gonadotropin,

which is known to play a role in fetal thyroid function[20]. Additionally, the stress

and inflammation associated with hypertension could lead to epigenetic modifications

that affect gene expression related to thyroid development and function[21].

Moreover, maternal hypertension has been associated with oxidative stress and

vascular dysfunction, creating a suboptimal in-utero environment that disrupts the

endocrine axis and fetal thyroid gland maturation, contributing to congenital

hypothyroidism[22, 23]. Understanding these pathways opens new avenues for

research and highlights the need for careful monitoring and management of

hypertensive conditions during pregnancy to mitigate potential risks to offspring

health.

The finding that father's diabetes is significantly associated with an increased

risk of congenital malformations of male genital organs aligns with previous research.

Ding's study highlights how diabetes can impair male fertility by disrupting glucose

metabolism, leading to poor sperm quality and DNA integrity. Diabetes can cause

long-term damage and dysfunction in various organs, including the male reproductive

system, affecting sperm motility and fertilization capacity[24]. Additionally, T.

Fullston's research suggests that father's obesity can impair reproductive health

across generations through epigenetic inheritance[25], while Michelle Lane's review

emphasizes the significant influence of both mother's and father's obesity on

offspring health[26]. These findings underscore the importance of father's

preconception health, particularly concerning metabolic conditions, in influencing the

risk of congenital anomalies in offspring.

The distinct causal relationships identified in this study highlight the need for

targeted preconception and prenatal care strategies to manage parental health

conditions, thereby potentially reducing the risk of congenital anomalies in offspring.

Hypertension and diabetes, in particular, appear to play significant roles in the

development of certain congenital anomalies, suggesting that genetic and possibly

epigenetic mechanisms are involved. These findings call for further research to

explore the biological pathways and to develop targeted interventions.

Future research should focus on validating these findings in diverse populations

and investigating other potential parental health conditions. Additionally, studies

should aim to identify biomarkers that can help stratify the risk of congenital

anomalies based on parental health status. Clinical trials evaluating the efficacy and

safety of interventions designed to manage these health conditions before and during

pregnancy are essential.

This study has several strengths, including the use of robust MR techniques to

minimize confounding and ensure reliable causal inferences. The comprehensive

analysis using GWAS data from European ancestry populations minimized population

stratification bias, and various sensitivity analyses confirmed the robustness of our

findings. Furthermore, consistent results across different datasets underscored the

robustness of our findings[27].

Our study has limitations affecting generalizability and interpretation. Focusing

on a single ethnic group restricts broader applicability. Replication in diverse cohorts

is necessary. Reliance on summary statistics from GWAS may introduce

misclassification bias. Additionally, potential pleiotropy in Mendelian randomization

analysis and residual confounding remains concerns, despite sensitivity analyses.

Additionally, our MR analyses yielded extreme odds ratios (ORs), which could be

attributed to the small number of instrumental variables or variability in the effect

sizes of the genetic instruments used. These extreme values should be interpreted with

caution, and further analyses are needed to confirm these findings.

In conclusion, our study offers compelling evidence of significant causal

relationships between certain parental illnesses and heightened risk of congenital

anomalies. The insight holds promise for improving clinical outcomes among

offspring at risk of congenital anomalies.

Acknowledgments

We want to acknowledge the participants and investigators of the FinnGen study,

UK Biobank, and other GWASs included in this study. Without the dedication of

these organizations and their members, this article would have been difficult to

complete.

Clinical trial number

Not applicable

Funding

We thank the Jilin Province Science and Technology Development Grant (grant

Nos. 20210101452JC) for funding this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Ethics Statement

Not applicable

Author Contributions:

WJ.S. conceived the project, designed the study and revised the manuscript.;

T.T. wrote the manuscript; L.T. collected data from the public database, and all

authors reviewed the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Consent for Publication

Not applicable

Data Availability Statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the

article/Supplementary Material. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding

author.

Abbreviations

CA: Congenital anomalies; CM: congenital malformations; CD: congenital

deformities; IVW: Inverse variance weighted; IVs: Instrumental variables; SNPs:

Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms; MR: Mendelian randomization; UVMR,

Univariable MR; MVMR: Multivariable MR; OR: Odds ratio; CI, confidence interval;

GWAS: Genome-Wide Association Study; UKBB, United Kingdom Biobank

References

1. Corsello G, Giuffrè M. Congenital malformations. J Matern-Fetal Neonatal Med Off J Eur Assoc Perinat Med Fed Asia Ocean Perinat Soc Int Soc Perinat Obstet. 2012;25 Suppl 1:25–9.

2. Taruscio D, Mantovani A, Carbone P, Barisic I, Bianchi F, Garne E, et al. Primary prevention of congenital anomalies: recommendable, feasible and achievable. Public Health Genomics. 2015;18:184–91.

3. Eriksson UJ, Håkan Borg LA, Cederberg J, Nordstrand H, Simán CM, Wentzel C, et al. Pathogenesis of Diabetes-Induced Congenital Malformations. Ups J Med Sci. 2000;105:53–84.

4. Wu Y, Liu B, Sun Y, Du Y, Santillan MK, Santillan DA, et al. Association of Maternal Prepregnancy Diabetes and Gestational Diabetes Mellitus With Congenital Anomalies of the Newborn. Diabetes Care. 2020;43:2983–90.

5. Zhang T-N, Huang X-M, Zhao X-Y, Wang W, Wen R, Gao S-Y. Risks of specific congenital anomalies in offspring of women with diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of population-based studies including over 80 million births. PLoS Med. 2022;19:e1003900.

6. Soubry A, Schildkraut JM, Murtha A, Wang F, Huang Z, Bernal A, et al. Paternal obesity is associated with IGF2hypomethylation in newborns: results from a Newborn Epigenetics Study (NEST) cohort. BMC Med. 2013;11:29.

7. McPherson NO, Fullston T, Aitken RJ, Lane M. Paternal obesity, interventions, and mechanistic pathways to impaired health in offspring. Ann Nutr Metab. 2014;64:231–8.

8. Burgess S, Davey Smith G, Davies NM, Dudbridge F, Gill D, Glymour MM, et al. Guidelines for performing Mendelian randomization investigations: update for summer 2023. Wellcome Open Res. 2019;4:186.

9. Sekula P, Del Greco M F, Pattaro C, Köttgen A. Mendelian Randomization as an Approach to Assess Causality Using Observational Data. J Am Soc Nephrol JASN. 2016;27:3253–65.

10. Sanderson E, Glymour MM, Holmes MV, Kang H, Morrison J, Munafò MR, et al. Mendelian randomization. Nat Rev Methods Primer. 2022;2:6.

11. Skrivankova VW, Richmond RC, Woolf BAR, Davies NM, Swanson SA, VanderWeele TJ, et al. Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology using mendelian randomisation (STROBE-MR): explanation and elaboration. BMJ. 2021;375:n2233.

12. Kurki MI, Karjalainen J, Palta P, Sipilä TP, Kristiansson K, Donner KM, et al. FinnGen provides genetic insights from a well-phenotyped isolated population. Nature. 2023;613:508–18.

13. Woolf B, Di Cara N, Moreno-Stokoe C, Skrivankova V, Drax K, Higgins JPT, et al. Investigating the transparency of reporting in two-sample summary data Mendelian randomization studies using the MR-Base platform. Int J Epidemiol. 2022;51:1943–56.

14. Yavorska OO, Burgess S. MendelianRandomization: an R package for performing Mendelian
randomization analyses using summarized data. Int J Epidemiol. 2017;46:1734–9.

15. Ong J-S, MacGregor S. Implementing MR-PRESSO and GCTA-GSMR for pleiotropy
assessment in Mendelian randomization studies from a practitioner's perspective. Genet
Epidemiol. 2019;43:609–16.

16. Burgess S, Butterworth A, Thompson SG. Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple
genetic variants using summarized data. Genet Epidemiol. 2013;37:658–65.

17. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian
Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. Genet
Epidemiol. 2016;40:304–14.

18. Verbanck M, Chen C-Y, Neale B, Do R. Detection of widespread horizontal pleiotropy in
causal relationships inferred from Mendelian randomization between complex traits and diseases.
Nat Genet. 2018;50:693–8.

19. Fraser A, Catov JM. Placental syndromes and long-term risk of hypertension. J Hum
Hypertens. 2023;37:671–4.

20. Brennan MC, Wolfe MD, Murray-Krezan CM, Cole LA, Rayburn WF. First-trimester
hyperglycosylated human chorionic gonadotropin and development of hypertension. Prenat Diagn.
2013;33:1075–9.

21. Berta E, Lengyel I, Halmi S, Zrínyi M, Erdei A, Harangi M, et al. Hypertension in Thyroid
Disorders. Front Endocrinol. 2019;10.

22. Dinh QN, Drummond GR, Sobey CG, Chrissobolis S. Roles of Inflammation, Oxidative Stress,
and Vascular Dysfunction in Hypertension. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/406960.

23. Schulz E, Gori T, Münzel T. Oxidative stress and endothelial dysfunction in hypertension.
Hypertens Res. 2011;34:665–73.

24. Ding G-L, Liu Y, Liu M-E, Pan J-X, Guo M-X, Sheng J-Z, et al. The effects of diabetes on
male fertility and epigenetic regulation during spermatogenesis. Asian J Androl. 2015;17:948.

25. Fullston T, Palmer NO, Owens JA, Mitchell M, Bakos HW, Lane M. Diet-induced paternal
obesity in the absence of diabetes diminishes the reproductive health of two subsequent
generations of mice. Hum Reprod Oxf Engl. 2012;27:1391–400.

26. Lane M, Zander-Fox DL, Robker RL, McPherson NO. Peri-conception parental obesity,
reproductive health, and transgenerational impacts. Trends Endocrinol Metab TEM.
2015;26:84–90.

27. Burgess S, Davies NM, Thompson SG. Bias due to participant overlap in two-sample
Mendelian randomization. Genet Epidemiol. 2016;40:597–608.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Flowchart of the study design. GWAS, genome-wide association studies; UVMR, Univariable MR; MVMR, multivariable mendelian randomization; UKBB, United Kingdom Biobank; IVs, instrument variables.

Figure 2. Heatmap of Mendelian randomisation effect size estimates (Signed Log-transformed p-value) of genetically predicted parental illnesses on congenital anomalies. (A) Effect of 6 illnesses of the mother on 44 congenital anomalies; (B) Effects of 8 illnesses of the father on 44 congenital anomalies. The Signed Log-transformed value represents the negative logarithm (base 10) of each p-value, multiplied by the sign of the effect. The asterisk ("*") indicates suggestive significance ($p<0.05$), while double asterisks ("**") denote significance after Bonferroni correction ($p<0.0035$ (0.05/14)). CA: Congenital anomalies; CD: Congenital deformities; CM: Congenital malformations.

Figure 3: The UVMR of positive causal effects of parental illnesses on congenital anomalies. CA: Congenital anomalies; CD: Congenital deformities; CM: Congenital malformations; IVW: Inverse variance weighted; IVs: Instrumental variables; SNPs: Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms; MR: Mendelian randomization; UVMR: Univariable MR; OR: Odds ratio; CI: Confidence interval; GWAS: Genome-Wide Association Study; UKBB: United Kingdom Biobank. IVW p-values below the Bonferroni-corrected threshold ($p<0.0035$ (0.05/14)) are highlighted in boldface type.

Figure 4: MVMR of parental illnesses on congenital anomalies. The MVMR-IVW method was used. Shown are the number of IVs in each analysis and the conditional F statistic for each exposure in MVMR. CA: Congenital anomalies; CD: Congenital deformities; CM: Congenital malformations; IVW: Inverse variance weighted; IVs: Instrumental variables; SNPs: Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms; MR: Mendelian randomization; MVMR: Multiple variable MR; OR: Odds ratio; CI: Confidence interval; GWAS: Genome-Wide Association Study; UKBB: United Kingdom Biobank.

Exposure	Outcome	nsnp	method	OR(95% CI)	pval	H_pval	P_pval	PR_pval
Illnesses of mother:								
Alzheimer	Hypothyroidism	4	IVW	1.0691 (1.0136 to 1.13)	0.014	0.8511		0.836
		4	MR Egger	1.0589 (0.9774 to 1.15)	0.2966	0.707	0.7823	
		4	Weighted median	1.0682 (1.0112 to 1.13)	0.0184			
Alzheimer	CM of the urinary	4	IVW	0.8232 (0.6788 to 1.00)	0.0479	0.5299		0.522
	system	4	MR Egger	0.7218 (0.5403 to 0.96)	0.1583	0.6724	0.3561	
		4	Weighted median	0.7908 (0.6455 to 0.97)	0.0234			
Alzheimer	Other CM of	4	IVW	1.6080 (1.0329 to 2.50)	0.0354	0.3883		0.643
	peripheral vascular	4	MR Egger	1.4121 (0.6484 to 3.08)	0.4765	0.2519	0.7041	
	system	4	Weighted median	1.5188 (0.9634 to 2.39)	0.0719			
Breast cancer	CM of ovaries,	11	IVW	4.6e+02 (1.2794 to 1.6e+05)	0.0411	0.5782		0.597
	fallopian tubes	11	MR Egger	6.3e+07 (6.1890 to 6.4e+14)	0.057	0.726	0.1572	
	and broad ligaments	11	Weighted median	5.0e+04 (13.1902 to 1.9e+08)	0.0101			
Diabetes	CM of the urinary sy	13	IVW	1.2e+02 (1.0134 to 1.5e+04)	0.0494	0.5648		0.739
		13	MR Egger	2.4e+03 (0.0188 to 3.2e+08)	0.2207	0.5048	0.5964	
		13	Weighted median	8.6e+01 (0.1258 to 5.9e+04)	0.181			
Diabetes	Other CM of male	13	IVW	1.5e+07 (4.4570 to 5.2e+13)	0.0312	0.7057		0.562
	genital organs	13	MR Egger	8.9e+07 (7.9e−09 to 9.9e+23)	0.3526	0.6258	0.9204	
		13	Weighted median	3.7e+07 (0.0369 to 3.8e+16)	0.0994			
Chronic bronchitis/e	Congenital	4	IVW	2.2e+15 (22900.0000 to 2.0e+26)	0.0062	0.3708		0.55
	hypothyroidism	4	MR Egger	1.4e+22 (1.1e−61 to 1.9e+105)	0.6534	0.2126	0.8854	
		4	Weighted median	4.6e+11 (0.0179 to 1.2e+25)	0.0883			
Chronic bronchitis/e	CM of breast	4	IVW	4.6e+20 (1780000.0000 to 1.2e+35)	0.005	0.6911		0.672
		4	MR Egger	2.9e+32 (4.1e−58 to 2.0e+122)	0.5523	0.498	0.8188	
		4	Weighted median	1.6e+24 (3890000.0000 to 6.5e+41)	0.0071			
Chronic bronchitis/e	CM of gallbladder,	4	IVW	5.1e+30 (3.9914 to 6.5e+60)	0.0456	0.0646		0.189
	bile ducts and liver	4	MR Egger	9.1e+12 (1.9e−218 to 4.4e+243)	0.9224	0.0279	0.8926	
		4	Weighted median	5.8e+30 (2070000.0000 to 1.6e+55)	0.0137			
Heart disease	CD of hip	8	IVW	7.3e+05 (6.0013 to 9.0e+10)	0.0238	0.5077		0.526
		8	MR Egger	1.9e+07 (0.0222 to 1.6e+16)	0.1614	0.4088	0.7173	
		8	Weighted median	6.0e+06 (1.5843 to 2.3e+13)	0.0434			
High blood pressure	Hypothyroidism	29	IVW	8.0e+00 (3.0826 to 20.60)	**1.84e−05**	0.052		**0.04**
		29	MR Egger	1.7910 (0.0370 to 86.69)	0.7707	0.0299	0.4432	
		29	Weighted median	7.7e+00 (2.5455 to 23.26)	3e−04			
Illnesses of father:								
Heart disease	CD of head, face,	19	IVW	4.7e+02 (1.3862 to 1.6e+05)	0.0385	0.3085		0.362
	spine and chest	19	MR Egger	1.8e+05 (0.2047 to 1.5e+11)	0.1013	0.3042	0.361	
		19	Weighted median	1.0e+02 (0.0374 to 2.8e+05)	0.2515			
Lung cancer	Congenital	4	IVW	1.6e+09 (151.2500 to 1.6e+16)	0.0102	0.8441		0.866
	hypothyroidism	4	MR Egger	8.1e+14 (2.3e−05 to 2.8e+34)	0.2734	0.8004	0.6017	
		4	Weighted median	3.0e+08 (1.7399 to 5.3e+16)	0.0437			
Lung cancer	CM of breast	4	IVW	1.2e+13 (4818.9800 to 3.2e+22)	0.0064	0.4826		0.471
		4	MR Egger	1.1e+24 (0.0114 to 1.0e+50)	0.2115	0.4325	0.4695	
		4	Weighted median	3.7e+16 (82600.0000 to 1.6e+28)	0.0053			
High blood pressure	CM of spine and	6	IVW	1.0e+08 (2.6290 to 4.0e+15)	0.0386	0.6531		0.691
	bony thorax	6	MR Egger	8.1e+20 (5.6e−56 to 1.2e+97)	0.6191	0.526	0.7555	
		6	Weighted median	1.2e+08 (0.0334 to 4.6e+17)	0.0974			
Diabetes	CM of spine and	26	IVW	2.0e+05 (1.6793 to 2.3e+10)	0.0407	0.6168		0.611
	bony thorax	26	MR Egger	2.0e+09 (0.0011 to 3.4e+21)	0.1496	0.5893	0.4884	
		26	Weighted median	3.3e+10 (2470.0000 to 4.4e+17)	0.0038			
Diabetes	Other CM of male	26	IVW	3.8e+09 (22400.0000 to 6.6e+14)	**3e−04**	0.7949		0.853
	genital organs	26	MR Egger	1.2e+11 (0.0304 to 4.6e+23)	0.0976	0.753	0.8007	
		26	Weighted median	3.1e+09 (22.4923 to 4.2e+17)	0.0223			
Alzheimer	Hypothyroidism	4	IVW	5.0e+00 (1.3144 to 18.99)	0.0182	0.7338		0.64
		4	MR Egger	3.6e+00 (0.6202 to 20.76)	0.2898	0.6199	0.6267	
		4	Weighted median	4.8e+00 (1.3050 to 17.84)	0.0183			
Prostate cancer	CD of feet	11	IVW	2.5e+05 (4.0634 to 1.6e+10)	0.0272	0.3176		0.228
		11	MR Egger	7.4e+04 (2.2e−08 to 2.5e+17)	0.4659	0.2417	0.9294	
		11	Weighted median	4.6e+05 (0.0933 to 2.2e+12)	0.0973			
Prostate cancer	CM and CD of the	11	IVW	2.7e+02 (1.0906 to 6.5e+04)	0.0465	0.3888		0.441
	musculoskeletal syst	11	MR Egger	6.8e+06 (12.7855 to 3.6e+12)	0.0441	0.5456	0.1334	
		11	Weighted median	1.5e+02 (0.1163 to 2.0e+05)	0.1699			

0 0.5 1 1.5 2

Exposure	Outcome	nsnp	F		OR(95% CI)	pval	Qpval
Father's Lung cancer	Congenital	3	15.37		2.6e+06 (1.9e−03 to 3.5e+15)	0.1692	0.2592
Mother's bronchitis/emphysema	Hypothyroidism	4	14.20		4.8e+10 (7.7e−03 to 2.9e+23)	0.1018	
Father's Lung cancer	CM of breast	3	15.37		2.3e+07 (1.0e+01 to 5.5e+13)	**0.0234**	0.7849
Mother's bronchitis/emphysema		4	14.20		1.1e+15 (1.5e+06 to 9.1e+23)	**0.0009**	
Father's hypertension	CM of spine and	6	9.58		3.9e+08 (3.0e+02 to 5.0e+14)	**0.0059**	0.7477
Father's Diabetes	bony thorax	26	31.17		3.2e+04 (8.8e−01 to 1.2e+09)	0.0529	
Mother's Alzheimer	CM of the urinary	4	1.69		1.7086 (0.6601 to 4.4227)	0.2696	0.796
Mother's Diabetes	system	12	7.49		8.3e+01 (1.4e+00 to 4.7e+03)	**0.0324**	
Mother's Alzheimer	Hypothyroidism	4	1.69		0.9807 (0.7621 to 1.2621)	0.8797	0.2921
Mother's hypertension	(congenital or acquired)	26	23.42		11.3600 (4.5299 to 28.4778)	**2.2e−07**	
Father's Alzheimer		4	1.64		2.4e+01 (3.9e−02 to 1.4e+04)	0.3331	
Mother's Diabetes	Other CM of male	10	2.83		7.1e−11 (4.0e−23 to 1.2e+02)	0.1043	0.9114
Father's Diabetes	genital organs	26	2.86		2.2e+17 (4.4e+06 to 1.2e+28)	**0.0015**	

0 0.5 1 1.5 2