**Age at Menarche and Coronary Artery Disease Risk: Divergent Associations with Different Sources of Variation**

Ambreen Sonawalla, MD,[a,b] Daniel I. Chasman, PhD,[b,c] Yee-Ming Chan, MD, PhD[a,b].

[a]Division of Endocrinology, Department of Pediatrics, Boston Children's Hospital, [b]Departments of Pediatrics (A.S., Y.M.C.) and Medicine (D.I.C.), Harvard Medical School, [c]Division of Preventive Medicine, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital

**Short title:** Age at Menarche and Coronary Artery Disease

**Address for correspondence:** Ambreen Sonawalla, MD; ambreen.sonawalla@childrens.harvard.edu; 300 Longwood Avenue, Boston, MA 02115. Phone: 617-355-0796, fax: 617-730-0194. ORCID: 0000-0003-4342-5343

**Email addresses:**

Yee-Ming Chan: yee-ming.chan@childrens.harvard.edu; Daniel I. Chasman: dchasman@bwh.harvard.edu

DISCLOSURE SUMMARY

**Abstract**

**Background:** In women, both earlier and later age at menarche (AAM) are associated with increased risk of coronary artery disease (CAD). This study sought to determine if the relationship of AAM with CAD and CAD risk factors differs for different underlying sources of variation in AAM – specifically, variation attributable to common genetic variants as represented by a polygenic score (PGS) vs. variation in AAM adjusted for the PGS.

**Methods:** Primary analyses were conducted on data from 201,037 women in the UK Biobank and validation studies on data from 23,268 women in the Women's Genome Health Study (WGHS). For each individual, a PGS for AAM was calculated, then two variables were estimated from linear regression models: the genetically predicted AAM (the estimated AAM for each woman solely due to the effects of common genetic variants) and the PGS-adjusted AAM (estimated AAM for each woman solely due to factors other than the PGS). Logistic regression and linear splines were then used to study the relationships of these variables with CAD and CAD risk factors.

**Results:** Genetically predicted AAM demonstrated a linear relationship with CAD and linear or roughly linear relationships with CAD risk factors. In contrast, PGS-adjusted AAM demonstrated a U-shaped relationship with CAD and with hemoglobin A1c, triglycerides, HDL-C, and waist-hip ratio. Validation studies using WGHS data produced similar results.

**Conclusions:** These results suggest that later AAM itself does not cause increased risk of CAD; rather, upstream sources of variation other than common genetic variants can cause both later AAM and increased risk of CAD. Dysglycemia, dyslipidemia, and central adiposity are candidate mediators of the association of later AAM with increased risk of CAD.

Key words: pubertal timing, polygenic score, women, UK Biobank.

Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms:

AAM: age at menarche

BMI: body-mass index

CAD: coronary artery disease

DBP: diastolic blood pressure

HbA1c: hemoglobin A1c

HDL-C: high-density lipoprotein cholesterol

LDL-C: low-density lipoprotein cholesterol

PGS: polygenic score

SBP: systolic blood pressure

WGHS: Women's Genome Health Study

## INTRODUCTION

Many pathologies manifesting in adulthood have antecedents in childhood. There is growing evidence that coronary artery disease (CAD) in women, a leading cause of morbidity and mortality in the world, is associated with both earlier and later age at menarche (AAM), a hallmark of pubertal timing (1–4). *Earlier* puberty is associated with increased risk of CAD in both men and women; however, the association between *later* puberty and increased risk of CAD appears to be unique to women; in men, later puberty is associated with a decreased risk of CAD (3). A deeper exploration of these childhood antecedents would allow a better understanding of the pathogenesis of CAD in adulthood, specifically identify factors that uniquely affect women and facilitate the development of targeted preventive interventions, potentially as early as childhood.

Multiple studies have associated earlier AAM with a higher risk of developing components of the metabolic syndrome, namely obesity, type 2 diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and dyslipidemia (3,5–9). Studies have further suggested that the association between earlier AAM and risk of CAD is mediated by adiposity (10,11). In contrast, the associations of later AAM reported to date do not fit neatly into the paradigm of metabolic syndrome. Later AAM is associated with lower rather than higher body-mass index (BMI) (3,12,13), and studies on other components of the metabolic syndrome have produced conflicting results, with some studies showing association of later AAM with higher risk of hypertension (1,14), others showing a lower risk of hypertension (3) or type 2 diabetes (15), and yet others showing no association with hypertension, type 2 diabetes, or hypercholesterolemia (3,16). Hence, while earlier AAM has

been associated with several CAD risk factors, there may be distinct mechanisms underlying the

association of later AAM with increased risk of CAD.

Variation in AAM can stem from several upstream sources, including genetics (both common

genetic variants and rare genetic variants), acquired factors such as chronic illness, chronic

stress, underweight, and undernutrition, and environmental factors such as family composition

(e.g., presence or absence of father) (17). It is possible that some of these sources of variation

may influence risk of CAD only through their influence on AAM, while others may directly

influence CAD risk and features of the metabolic syndrome (Figure 1). Thus, dissecting variation

in AAM based on underlying sources of variation could provide a clearer understanding of the

relationship of AAM with CAD.

Genetics is a major source of variation in AAM, with half to three-quarters of variation

attributable to genetics (18,19). A 2017 genome-wide association study (GWAS) on AAM

identified 389 independent single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with AAM at

genome-wide significance (20). The results from this GWAS allow the calculation of a polygenic

score (PGS) for a given individual to reflect the cumulative contribution of common genetic

variants to AAM.

Previous studies have used PGSs to dissect the influence of genetics vs. environmental factors

(or other factors not captured by the PGS) that contribute to traits such as BMI and LDL-C

(21,22). These studies have found that associations of these traits with health outcomes differ

between genetically and environmentally influenced traits. For example, obesity driven by

environmental factors was associated with more harmful cardiovascular outcomes than

genetically predicted obesity (21), suggesting that dissecting effects based on underlying source

of variation can allow deeper insights into pathogenic mechanisms.

The aims of this study were two-fold: first, to determine if the association between later AAM

and increased risk of CAD depends on the underlying source of variation in AAM – specifically,

common genetic variation vs. other sources of variation; second, to study the relationships of

these different sources of variation in AAM with CAD risk factors.

**METHODS**

To study how different sources of variation in the timing of menarche are associated with risk of

CAD, two variables were calculated: genetically predicted AAM (the estimated AAM

determined solely by the effects of common genetic influences, as estimated by a PGS for AAM)

and PGS-adjusted AAM (the estimated AAM determined solely by factors other than common

genetic variants, the PGS).

*Study cohorts*

This study used data from two cohorts: the UK Biobank for primary analyses and the Women's

Genome Health Study (WGHS) for validation analyses. The UK Biobank is a population-based

cohort of over 500,000 men and women in the UK 40 years and older at the time of recruitment,

with extensive health-related phenotypic and laboratory data as well as individual-level genetic

data (23). This study analyzed data from 201,037 unrelated women in the UK Biobank of non-

Finnish European ancestry (as determined through principal component analysis) (24) who had

genetic and self-reported AAM data. During data collection in the UK Biobank, any value of

AAM <5 years or >25 years was rejected, and any AAM entered as <6 years or >20 years

required confirmation from participants (25). Women with missing AAM data were excluded

from analysis. The UK Biobank obtained the multiple ethical and regulatory approvals required

for recruitment and research procedures, and participants provided written consent (23). The

WGHS is a cohort of initially healthy American women aged 45 years and older at enrollment

with genetic and phenotypic data, followed over 26-28 years for cardiovascular and other

outcomes (26). This analysis studied data from 23,268 women in the WGHS who had genetic

and self-reported AAM data. Self-reported AAM ≤9 years or ≥ 17 years were entered as 9 years

or 17 years, respectively. The WGHS was approved by the institutional review board of Brigham

and Women's Hospital, and participants consented to ongoing analyses (26).

*Polygenic score calculation*

A PGS was calculated for each woman in the above cohorts in two steps. The first step used the

PRS-CS algorithm, which allows the inclusion of all available SNPs from the GWAS on AAM

(20), not just those that meet a given *p*-value threshold, and weights the SNP effect sizes based

on their significance and adjusts for linkage disequilibrium (27). The use of this algorithm has

the potential to explain more variability in AAM than algorithms that use only the SNPs that

meet a given significance threshold. The second step calculated the PGS using PRSice-2

(without clumping or thresholding) to sum the weighted effect sizes for all SNPs in each

individual with the ability to incorporate the probabilistic genotype dosages generated by

imputation (28).

*Subdividing variation in age at menarche*

Using each full cohort, regression of self-reported AAM was performed against the PGS for

AAM, with the first 10 genetic principal components, assessment center and technical variables

such as array number as covariates. The following two variables were then calculated for each

individual:

1.  Genetically predicted AAM: This represents the estimated AAM that each woman would

have had if her AAM were determined solely by her common genetic variants, as

estimated by the PGS. Statistically, it is the AAM predicted by the regression of AAM

against the PGS (Supplemental Figure 1, (29)).

2.  PGS-adjusted AAM: This represents the estimated AAM that each woman would have

had if there were no effect of her common genetic variants (as represented by the PGS),

i.e., her AAM were determined solely by sources of variation other than common genetic

variants. Statistically, this was the residual of the regression of AAM against the PGS for

each individual, added to the AAM corresponding to the mean PGS (to simulate a

scenario in which the contribution of the PGS is the same for all women) (Supplemental

Figure 1, (29)).

*Outcomes and analytical methods*

The study's primary outcome variable was CAD risk. In the UK Biobank, prevalent CAD at

baseline was determined as previously described using a combination of self-report, ICD-9/10

codes, and procedure codes (24). The WGHS recruited middle-aged female healthcare

professionals with no history of CAD at baseline and identified validated incident CAD during

26-28 years of follow-up as described previously (26). Secondary outcome variables were CAD

risk factors at baseline for both cohorts: hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), triglycerides, high-density

lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), systolic blood

pressure (SBP), diastolic blood pressure (DBP), and BMI; data on waist-hip ratio was available

at baseline in the UK Biobank and 6 years after recruitment in the WGHS.

The relationship of genetically predicted AAM and PGS-adjusted AAM was studied with logistic

regression for prevalent CAD, with Cox proportional hazards models for incident CAD, and with

linear splines for each continuous variable (HbA1c, triglycerides, HDL-C, LDL-C, SBP, DBP,

BMI, waist-hip ratio), with a knot at 12.94 years, which is the AAM corresponding to the mean

PGS. Because we observed nonlinear relationships, we also used linear splines to separately

analyze values of genetically predicted and PGS-adjusted AAM earlier and later than the mean.

For analyses with LDL-C, results were corrected for self-reported use of cholesterol-lowering

medications – these were specific LDL-lowering medications in the UK Biobank, (statins,

ezetimibe, and bile-acid sequestrants) and collective cholesterol-lowering medications in the

WGHS; additional analyses included only women not taking these medications.

Covariates of age and age$^2$ were used for all analyses. Analyses were conducted using R v.4.3.1.

A significance threshold of 0.05 was used.

To determine if results in the UK Biobank were biased by overfitting as a result of the UK

Biobank having contributed to the GWAS for AAM, analyses of CAD were repeated using a

PGS calculated using an earlier GWAS that did not include the UK Biobank (30). Furthermore,

to determine if outlier values of AAM were disproportionately affecting results, analyses were

repeated after excluding women with extreme values of AAM such that up to 0.1% of women

were excluded at each extreme.

**RESULTS**

To understand potential different effects of different sources of variation in AAM, we

constructed two hypothetical scenarios. In the first scenario, a woman's AAM is determined

solely by the effects of common genetic variants. We refer to the estimated AAM in this scenario

as "genetically predicted AAM." In the second scenario, a woman's AAM is determined solely

by the effects of factors other than common genetic variants (or more precisely, by factors other

than the PGS). We refer to the estimated AAM in this scenario as "PGS-adjusted AAM."

To examine the differential associations of these two sources of variation with CAD risk, we

analyzed data from 201,037 unrelated, non-Finnish European women in the UK Biobank. We

first calculated a PGS for AAM for each woman, then regressed self-reported AAM against the

PGS for AAM to calculate genetically predicted AAM and to derive PGS-adjusted AAM

(Supplemental Figure 1, (29)). For instance, for an individual with a self-reported AAM of 16

years and a PGS of 0.357, the regression provided a genetically predicted AAM of 13.42 years

and a residual of 2.58 years. In the regression, the AAM corresponding to the mean PGS was

12.95 years, and hence the PGS-adjusted AAM was 2.58 + 12.95 = 15.53 years.

For women in the UK Biobank, the regression of self-reported AAM against the PGS for AAM

demonstrated that the PGS accounted for 15.8% of the variation in AAM. Genetically predicted

AAM had a mean ± standard deviation of 12.95 ± 0.64 years, and PGS-adjusted AAM had a

mean ± standard deviation of 12.94 ± 1.47 years with a standard deviation of 1.47 years

(Supplemental Figure 2, (29)). We then studied the associations of genetically predicted AAM

and PGS-adjusted AAM with risk of CAD and with CAD risk factors.

*Risk of coronary artery disease*

Risk of CAD demonstrated a linear relationship with genetically predicted AAM but a non-

linear, U-shaped relationship with PGS-adjusted AAM (Figure 2). In the linear relationship of

genetically predicted AAM with risk of CAD; each 1-year increase in genetically predicted

AAM was associated with an odds ratio (OR) for CAD of 0.91. In other words, for every 1 year

that AAM was later due solely to the effects of common genetic variants (as estimated by the

PGS), the odds of CAD were lower by 9% (Table 1). To assess for non-linear relationships,

linear spline analyses were done which showed no difference in slopes when genetically

predicted AAM was earlier vs. later than the mean (Table 1). This lack of difference in slopes

indicates that the linear relationship of genetically predicted AAM and risk of CAD extends

across all values of genetically predicted AAM.

In contrast, the association between PGS-adjusted AAM and risk of CAD was U-shaped, with

both earlier and later values associated with increased CAD risk (Figure 2). For PGS-adjusted

AAM that was earlier than the mean, each 1-year increase (causing AAM to be less early) was

associated with an OR for CAD of 0.91 (Table 1). In other words, in women whose PGS-

adjusted AAM was earlier than the mean, for every 1 year that AAM was less early due to

factors other than the PGS, the odds of CAD were lower by 9%. In contrast, for PGS-adjusted

AAM later than the mean, each 1-year increase (causing AAM to be even later) was associated

with an OR for CAD of 1.11, i.e., the odds of CAD were higher by 11% (Table 1).

Because the 2017 AAM GWAS meta-analysis included data from the UK Biobank, which could

introduce bias in the above analyses, we conducted sensitivity analyses using the results from an

AAM GWAS meta-analysis published in 2014 that did not include the UK Biobank. These

analyses showed similar results for CAD (Supplemental Figure 3, Supplemental Table 1, (29)).

We also conducted sensitivity analyses excluding women with extreme values of AAM (at the

upper and lower 0.1%) and obtained similar results.

*Hemoglobin A1c*

We then examined the associations of genetically predicted AAM and PGS-adjusted AAM with

CAD risk factors. Just as the relationship between genetically predicted AAM and CAD was

linear, we observed linear (or roughly linear) relationships between genetically predicted AAM

and most CAD risk factors. In contrast, for PGS-adjusted AAM we observed mostly non-linear

relationships with CAD risk factors.

For hemoglobin A1c, an indicator of average blood glucose over the preceding 3 months,

genetically predicted AAM demonstrated a roughly negative linear relationship, with later

genetically predicted AAM associated with lower HbA1c (Figure 3). Linear spline analyses

indicated that while both slopes were negative, for values of genetically predicted AAM earlier

than the mean, the slope of the association with HbA1c was slightly steeper than for values of

genetically predicted AAM later than the mean (-0.034 and -0.022 %/year, respectively; $p$ for

difference between slopes: $7 \times 10^{-5}$; Table 1). In contrast, PGS-adjusted AAM demonstrated a U-

shaped relationship with HbA1c: both earlier and later PGS-adjusted AAM were associated with

an increase in HbA1c (for values earlier than the mean: slope = -0.022 %/year, for values later

than the mean: slope = 0.007%/year; $p$ for difference between slopes $< 2 \times 10^{-16}$; Figure 3, Table

1). This was similar to the U-shaped relationship of PGS-adjusted AAM with CAD risk.

Comparing genetically predicted AAM and PGS-adjusted AAM, for values earlier than the

mean, the slopes for the associations with HbA1c were comparable (Table 1). However, for

values of AAM later than the mean, different slopes were seen for genetically predicted vs. PGS-

adjusted AAM; as noted above, for every 1 year that AAM was delayed, HbA1c *decreased* by

0.01% for genetically predicted AAM but *increased* by 0.007% for PGS-adjusted AAM.

*Lipids*

Genetically predicted AAM demonstrated linear relationships with triglycerides and HDL-C

(Figure 3), with later genetically predicted AAM associated with lower triglycerides and higher

HDL-C (Figure 3) and no significant difference in slopes between earlier and later genetically

predicted AAM (*p* for difference in slopes for triglycerides = 0.83 mg/dL/year, for HDL-C =

0.38 mg/dL/year; Table 1). In contrast, PGS-adjusted AAM demonstrated non-linear

relationships with HDL-C and triglycerides – U-shaped for triglycerides and inverted-U-shaped

for HDL-C (Figure 3) - with both increasingly earlier and later PGS-adjusted AAM associated

with higher triglycerides and lower HDL-C (Figure 3, Table 1).

For LDL-C, associations showed a less clear pattern. Earlier genetically predicted AAM showed

no association with LDL-C, and later genetically predicted AAM showed a negative linear

relationship (Table 1). In contrast, for PGS-adjusted AAM, earlier values showed a negative

linear relationship, but later PGS-adjusted AAM showed no significant association (Figure 3,

Table 1). Similar results were seen when analyses excluded those taking LDL-lowering

medications (Table 1).

*Blood pressure*

Later genetically predicted AAM was associated with both lower SBP and lower DBP (Figure

3), with no significant difference between the slopes for values of genetically predicted AAM

earlier vs. later than the mean (Table 1). Later PGS-adjusted AAM was also associated with

lower SBP and DBP (Figure 3), but the slopes of the associations were steeper for values of

PGS-adjusted AAM that were earlier vs. later than the mean (Table 1).

*Adiposity*

We studied two estimates of adiposity: BMI and waist-hip ratio. For BMI, we found a roughly

negative linear relationship between genetically predicted AAM and BMI, with later genetically

predicted AAM associated with lower BMI (Figure 3, Table 1). The slope of the association with

BMI was slightly steeper for values of genetically predicted AAM earlier vs. later than the mean

(Table 1). This pattern was similar to the relationship seen between genetically predicted AAM

and HbA1c.

For PGS-adjusted AAM, a different relationship was seen with BMI (Figure 3). While later PGS-

adjusted AAM was consistently associated with lower BMI, the slope of the association was ten-

fold steeper for values earlier vs. later than the mean (-0.80 kg/m2/year vs. -0.079 kg/m2/year

respectively; $p$ for difference between slopes 2 x $10^{-16}$; Table 1). This resembled the patterns seen

with SBP and DBP.

For waist-hip ratio, genetically predicted AAM showed a negative linear association, with no

significant difference in slopes for the association when genetically predicted AAM was earlier

vs. later than the mean (Figure 3, Table 1). In contrast, the relationship of PGS-adjusted AAM

with waist-hip ratio was U-shaped, with values both earlier and later than the mean associated

with higher waist-hip ratio (Figure 3, Table 1), similar to the associations seen with CAD,

HbA1c, triglycerides, and HDL-C.

*Validation in the Women's Genome Health Study*

Validation studies using data from the WGHS produced results similar to the above results for

the UK Biobank. In the WGHS, genetically predicted AAM showed linear relationships with

HbA1c, triglycerides, HDL-C, SBP, DBP, BMI and waist-hip ratio and no clear relationship with

LDL-C (Figure 4). Just as in the UK Biobank, PGS-adjusted AAM showed U-shaped

relationships with triglycerides and HbA1c, an inverted-U-shaped relationship with HDL-C, and

a not completely linear relationship with BMI in the WGHS (Figure 4).

There were two differences between results from the WGHS and the UK Biobank: 1) for SBP

and DBP, PGS-adjusted AAM showed roughly U-shaped relationships in the WGHS (Figure 4)

rather than the not fully linear relationships seen in the UK Biobank (Figure 3), and 2) for waist-

hip ratio, PGS-adjusted AAM showed a negative linear relationship for values earlier than the

mean but no significant relationship for values later than the mean in the WGHS (Figure 4)

compared to the clear U-shaped relationship seen in the UK Biobank (Figure 2).

For risk of CAD itself, the relationship of genetically predicted AAM with CAD in the WGHS

was similar to that in the UK Biobank (Figure 5, Supplemental Table 1, (29)), with a negative

linear relationship in both cohorts. For the relationship of PGS-adjusted AAM with CAD,

analyses in the WGHS demonstrated a reverse-J shaped relationship (Figure 5, Supplemental

Table 1, (29)), slightly different from the U-shaped relationship seen in the UK Biobank.

**DISCUSSION**

In this study, we dissected variation in AAM into variation attributable to common genetic

variants, as estimated by a PGS, (as reflected by genetically predicted AAM), and variation

adjusted for the PGS (as reflected by PGS-adjusted AAM), and we found different relationships

with these two sources of variation in AAM with risk of CAD and with CAD risk factors,

particularly when causing AAM to occur later.

In general, later AAM showed favorable associations when attributable to common genetic

variation (as estimated by the PGS) and harmful or neutral associations when attributable to

other yet-to-be-identified sources of variation. If all sources of variation were affecting CAD and

CAD risk factors wholly through AAM itself, the associations would be similar regardless of the

source of variation studied. Our finding that these associations varied based on the underlying

source of variation driving later AAM therefore indicates that it is not later AAM itself that

causes increased risk of CAD. Rather, there appear to be PGS-independent factors that cause

both later AAM and increased risk of CAD and unfavorable cardiometabolic risk profiles. Such

factors could include environmental or acquired influences (such as chronic illnesses, chronic

stress, undernutrition) as well as genetic influences not captured by the PGS, and future studies

will identify these factors and determine how they contribute to CAD risk.

An alternative possibility is that later AAM itself does in fact cause increased risk of CAD,

regardless of underlying source of variation. For this to be true, given our finding that later

genetically predicted AAM is associated with lower CAD risk, there would have to be strong

direct (pleiotropic) effects of common genetic variants on risk of CAD, with later genetically

predicted AAM strongly protective against CAD, such that the net effect is the lower risk of

CAD that we observed with later genetically predicted AAM. However, previous MR studies

have suggested that such pleiotropic effects of common genetic variants for AAM on risk of

CAD are small (10,31–33). Hence, this alternative possibility is not supported by existing

evidence, and the more likely explanation is that PGS-independent factors that cause later AAM

have direct deleterious effects on CAD risk factors and CAD.

Earlier AAM, whether attributable to common genetic variants or other sources of variation, was

consistently associated with greater cardiometabolic risk. Thus, it seems that earlier AAM itself

is intrinsically associated with risk for CAD and worsening CAD risk factors; indeed, some

Mendelian randomization studies suggest that earlier AAM is causative of these negative

outcomes (11,31). However, other Mendelian randomization studies have suggested that,

because many loci that affect AAM also affect BMI, the associations with increased risk of CAD

are mainly through effects on BMI, and AAM itself may have only a small direct influence

(10,33).

The U-shaped relationship of PGS-adjusted AAM with CAD was mirrored by the relationships

with HbA1c, triglycerides, HDL-C, and waist-hip ratio. This raises the possibility that

dysglycemia, dyslipidemia, and central adiposity contribute to the relationship between later

AAM and increased risk of CAD; further studies will be required to formally evaluate these

CAD risk factors as potential mediators of this relationship. As noted above, previous studies

evaluating associations of later AAM with these CAD risk factors have had conflicting results.

While differences between study cohorts may have accounted for some of the differing results,

our findings raise the additional possibility that the relationships between later AAM and these

outcomes may have been obscured by opposing effects of genetically predicted and PGS-

adjusted variation in AAM. Of note, the associations with waist-hip ratio differed from those

with BMI, suggesting that central adiposity, reflected by waist-hip ratio, is more relevant than

BMI for CAD, as has been suggested by prior studies (34,35).

Given the well-known effects of increased adiposity on CAD and CAD risk factors such as

dysglycemia and dyslipidemia, it is possible that associations of PGS-adjusted variation in AAM

with CAD, dysglycemia, and dyslipidemia are largely mediated by associations with BMI and

central adiposity; however, we were unable to test this possibility with UK Biobank data. The

relationship between AAM and BMI is complex because childhood BMI – not available in the

UK Biobank – affects both AAM and adult BMI, and AAM is itself also associated with adult

BMI. Thus, adjusting for adult BMI would introduce collider bias. Future work could focus on

disentangling these associations by using cohorts with measures of childhood BMI and/or

genetic tools such as clustering analyses to generate partitioned polygenic scores (36,37).

Our analyses in the Women's Genome Health Study (WGHS) largely validated our results from

the UK Biobank. Genetically predicted AAM demonstrated linear relationships with CAD and

CAD risk factors, and PGS-adjusted AAM demonstrated mostly non-linear relationships with

these outcomes, supporting the conclusions described earlier. However, the two cohorts also

demonstrated some differences, most notably in the association of PGS-adjusted AAM with the

risk of CAD and waist-hip ratio. In the UK Biobank, PGS-adjusted *later* AAM was associated

with an increased risk of CAD, but there was no association in the WGHS. For waist-hip ratio,

PGS-adjusted AAM demonstrated a clear U-shaped association in the UK Biobank but a reverse

J-shaped relationship in the WGHS. There are several potential reasons for this difference. First,

it is possible that the smaller sample size and lower power in the WGHS affected the ability to

find significant associations with PGS-adjusted AAM and risk of CAD and waist-hip ratio.

Second, environmental influences affecting AAM (which would contribute to PGS-adjusted

AAM) could differ between the two cohorts. The WGHS recruited women in the United States

of America born in 1950 or earlier, while the UK Biobank recruited women in the UK who were

born between 1932 and 1969. The different impact of global events such as World War II on the

two countries could contribute to differences in the PGS-independent factors (which includes

environmental factors) and, in turn, to different associations with risk of CAD. Third, the WGHS

excluded women with a history of CAD at the time of enrollment whereas the UK Biobank did

not, and this may also have led to differences in PGS-adjusted factors between the cohorts.

Fourth, the participants in the WGHS were health professionals while the UK Biobank drew

from the general UK population, and this may have led to further differences in PGS-adjusted

factors, such as higher socioeconomic status, greater knowledge of CAD and its risk factors,

healthier diets and lifestyles, and use of preventative interventions, as well as potentially less

variation in these factors. While the analyses also differed in the CAD measure used from each

cohort – prevalence of CAD was analyzed in the UK Biobank compared to incidence of CAD in

the WGHS – it is unlikely to account for the difference in results, as an analysis of incident CAD

in the Million Women Study in the UK also showed a U-shaped relationship between AAM and

CAD (1). Despite these differences in the results between the two cohorts, results from both

cohorts consistently demonstrated differences between the associations of *earlier* vs. *later* PGS-

adjusted AAM  with these outcomes.

In 2021, Liang et al. used a PGS to represent genetically predicted AAM and examined

associations with all-cause mortality, also using data from the UK Biobank. Interestingly, they

found a U-shaped association with mortality, with both earlier and later genetically predicted

AAM associated with higher risk; this finding contrasts with the linear relationship we found

between genetically predicted AAM and CAD. This difference suggests that later genetically

predicted AAM increases the risk of causes of mortality other than CAD, and future studies of

genetically predicted AAM are needed to identify these causes.

Prior studies that have also dissected influences on human traits into genetic vs. environmental

influences have found differences in the magnitude of effect of genetics vs. environmental

influences on health outcomes (21,22). Interestingly, our results show not only different

magnitudes of association of genetically predicted and PGS-adjusted AAM with risk of CAD,

but also opposite directionality. This further underscores the value of separating the effects of

genetics vs. other influences while studying human traits as they can have starkly different

effects.

Sensitivity analyses using a GWAS that did not include the primary cohort, the UK Biobank,

produced similar results and suggested that these results were not biased by overfitting.

Additionally, sensitivity analyses excluding women with extreme values of AAM also produced

similar results, suggesting that results were not heavily influenced by outliers.

One limitation of this study is that while the PGS represents genetic influences on AAM, it does

not represent all genetic factors that influence AAM. Our analyses demonstrated that the PGS

explains 15.8% of the variation in the observed AAM, but prior studies suggest that 49-73% of

variation in AAM is inherited (18,19); hence, a large amount of the variation in AAM due to

genetic factors remains unexplained. Another limitation of this study is that the PGS represents

just one method of capturing the effects of common genetic variants that affect AAM. There may

be several pathways causing later AAM represented within these common genetic variants, and

using a single PGS to represent all those effects may obscure relationships with each individual

pathway. Future studies may identify these different pathways by methods such as clustering

analyses (36,37), which would then allow an estimation of multiple polygenic scores, each

representing a different pathway, to study their associations with risk of CAD and CAD risk

factors.

Distinguishing between sources of variation in AAM has provided a novel lens through which to

study associations of AAM with CAD and has allowed us to uncover differences in the

associations of genetically predicted vs. PGS-adjusted AAM with CAD and CAD risk factors.

Because later puberty in women, but not men, has been associated with an increased risk of

CAD, studying these differences further may provide unique insights into mechanisms that affect

CAD risk specifically in women.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Evan Schafer and Jia Zhu for their support with statistical analyses. This
research has been conducted using data from UK Biobank, a major biomedical database:
www.ukbiobank.ac.uk

SOURCES OF FUNDING

A.S. was supported by National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant T32DK007699. The WGHS and
its parent cohort, the Women's Health Study (WHS), have been supported by the National Heart,
Lung, and Blood Institute (HL043851 and HL080467) and the National Cancer Institute
(CA047988 and UM1CA182913), with support and funding for genotyping provided by Amgen.
Some cardiovascular endpoints in the WHS were funded by HL099355.

**REFERENCES**

1. Canoy D, Beral V, Balkwill A, Wright FL, Kroll ME, Reeves GK, et al. Age at menarche and risks of coronary heart and other vascular diseases in a large UK cohort. Circulation [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2021 Dec 11];131(3):237–44. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25512444/

2. Zhu J, Chan YM. Adult Consequences of Self-Limited Delayed Puberty. Pediatrics [Internet]. 2017 Jun 1 [cited 2021 Aug 29];139(6). Available from: www.aappublications.org/news

3. Day FR, Elks CE, Murray A, Ong KK, Perry JRB. Puberty timing associated with diabetes, cardiovascular disease and also diverse health outcomes in men and women: the UK Biobank study. Sci Rep [Internet]. 2015 Jun 18 [cited 2021 Dec 11];5. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26084728/

4. Lee JJ, Cook-Wiens G, Johnson BD, Braunstein GD, Berga SL, Stanczyk FZ, et al. Age at Menarche and Risk of Cardiovascular Disease Outcomes: Findings From the National Heart Lung and Blood Institute-Sponsored Women's Ischemia Syndrome Evaluation. J Am Heart Assoc [Internet]. 2019 Jun 18 [cited 2024 Jun 10];8(12). Available from: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1161/JAHA.119.012406

5. Santos MP, Li Y, Bazzano LA, He J, Rexrode KM, Ley SH. Age at menarche, type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease complications in US women aged under 65 years: NHANES 1999-2018. BMJ Nutr Prev Health [Internet]. 2023 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Apr 10];6(2):293–300. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38264363/

6. Janghorbani M, Mansourian M, Hosseini E. Systematic review and meta-analysis of age at menarche and risk of type 2 diabetes. Acta Diabetol [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2024 Apr 10];51(4):519–28. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24671509/

7. Stöckl D, Meisinger C, Peters A, Thorand B, Huth C, Heier M, et al. Age at menarche and its association with the metabolic syndrome and its components: results from the KORA F4 study. PLoS One [Internet]. 2011 Oct 18 [cited 2021 Dec 11];6(10). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22028807/

8. Liu D, Qin P, Liu Y, Sun X, Li H, Wu X, et al. Association of age at menarche with hypertension in rural Chinese women. J Hypertens. 2021 Mar 1;39(3):476–83.

9. Kheradmand M, Hamzehgardeshi Z, Shahhosseini Z, Mirjalili R, Moosazadeh M. The association between early menarche and higher-risk cardiometabolic profile: a dose-response analysis of the Tabari cohort at enrollment phase. Front Cardiovasc Med [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Apr 10];10. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37719973/

10. Cao M, Cui B. Negative Effects of Age at Menarche on Risk of Cardiometabolic Diseases in Adulthood: A Mendelian Randomization Study. J Clin Endocrinol Metab [Internet]. 2020 Jan 23 [cited 2022 Feb 23];105(2). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31614369/

11. Gill D, Brewer CF, Del Greco M F, Sivakumaran P, Bowden J, Sheehan NA, et al. Age at menarche and adult body mass index: a Mendelian randomization study. International Journal of Obesity

2018 42:9 [Internet]. 2018 Feb 26 [cited 2023 Feb 12];42(9):1574–81. Available from:
https://www-nature-com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/articles/s41366-018-0048-7

12.    Prentice P, Viner RM. Pubertal timing and adult obesity and cardiometabolic risk in women and
men: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Obes (Lond) [Internet]. 2013 Aug [cited 2021
Dec 11];37(8):1036–43. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23164700/

13.    Yang L, Li L, Millwood IY, Lewington S, Guo Y, Sherliker P, et al. Adiposity in relation to age at
menarche and other reproductive factors among 300 000 Chinese women: findings from China
Kadoorie Biobank study. Int J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1 [cited 2022 Mar 17];46(2):502–12.
Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27524817/

14.    Chen L, Zhang L, Chen Z, Wang X, Zheng C, Kang Y, et al. Age at menarche and risk of
hypertension in Chinese adult women: Results from a large representative nationwide
population. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich) [Internet]. 2021 Aug 1 [cited 2023 Dec 7];23(8):1615–
21. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34255920/

15.    Liu D, Zhao Y, Liu Y, Sun X, Li H, Yin Z, et al. Adiposity and insulin resistance as mediators between
age at menarche and type 2 diabetes mellitus. Menopause [Internet]. 2020 May 1 [cited 2022
Apr 1];27(5):579–85. Available from: https://pubmed-ncbi-nlm-nih-gov.ezp-
prod1.hul.harvard.edu/32068689/

16.    Elks CE, Ong KK, Scott RA, Van Der Schouw YT, Brand JS, Wark PA, et al. Age at menarche and
type 2 diabetes risk: the EPIC-InterAct study. Diabetes Care [Internet]. 2013 Nov [cited 2022 Apr
1];36(11):3526–34. Available from: https://pubmed-ncbi-nlm-nih-gov.ezp-
prod1.hul.harvard.edu/24159179/

17.    Schlomer GL, Marceau K. Father absence, age at menarche, and genetic confounding: A
replication and extension using a polygenic score. Dev Psychopathol [Internet]. 2022 Feb 27
[cited 2024 May 13];34(1):355–66. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33107423/

18.    Morris DH, Jones ME, Schoemaker MJ, Ashworth A, Swerdlow AJ. Familial concordance for age at
menarche: Analyses from the breakthrough generations study. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol. 2011
May;25(3):306–11.

19.    Towne B, Czerwinski SA, Demerath EW, Blangero J, Roche AF, Siervogel RM. Heritability of age at
menarche in girls from the Fels Longitudinal Study. Am J Phys Anthropol. 2005 Sep;128(1):210–9.

20.    Day FR, Thompson DJ, Helgason H, Chasman DI, Finucane H, Sulem P, et al. Genomic analyses
identify hundreds of variants associated with age at menarche and support a role for puberty
timing in cancer risk. Nat Genet [Internet]. 2017 Jun 1 [cited 2022 Jul 26];49(6):834. Available
from: /pmc/articles/PMC5841952/

21.    Ojalehto E, Zhan Y, Jylhävä J, Reynolds CA, Dahl Aslan AK, Karlsson IK. Genetically and
environmentally predicted obesity in relation to cardiovascular disease: a nationwide cohort
study. EClinicalMedicine [Internet]. 2023 Apr 1 [cited 2024 Jun 9];58. Available from:
http://www.thelancet.com/article/S2589537023001207/fulltext

22.   Hawkes G, Yengo L, Vedantam S, Marouli E, Beaumont RN, Tyrrell J, et al. Identification and
analysis of individuals who deviate from their genetically-predicted phenotype. PLoS Genet
[Internet]. 2023 Sep 21 [cited 2024 Jun 9];19(9). Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37733769/

23.   Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK biobank: an open access
resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age.
PLoS Med [Internet]. 2015 Mar 1 [cited 2022 Mar 10];12(3). Available from: https://pubmed-
ncbi-nlm-nih-gov.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/25826379/

24.   Zhu J, Pujol-Gualdo N, Wittemans LBL, Lindgren CM, Laisk T, Hirschhorn JN, et al. Evidence From
Men for Ovary-independent Effects of Genetic Risk Factors for Polycystic Ovary Syndrome. J Clin
Endocrinol Metab [Internet]. 2022 Mar 24 [cited 2022 Jul 27];107(4):e1577–87. Available from:
https://academic-oup-com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/jcem/article/107/4/e1577/6432124

25.   UK Biobank age at menarche data collection:
https://biobank.ctsu.ox.ac.uk/crystal/field.cgi?id=2714.

26.   Ridker PM, Chasman DI, Zee RYL, Parker A, Rose L, Cook NR, et al. Rationale, design, and
methodology of the Women's Genome Health Study: a genome-wide association study of more
than 25,000 initially healthy american women. Clin Chem [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2023 Nov
2];54(2):249–55. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18070814/

27.   Ge T, Chen CY, Ni Y, Feng YCA, Smoller JW. Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and
continuous shrinkage priors. Nat Commun [Internet]. 2019 Dec 1 [cited 2022 Dec 7];10(1).
Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30992449/

28.   Choi SW, O'Reilly PF. PRSice-2: Polygenic Risk Score software for biobank-scale data. Gigascience
[Internet]. 2019 Jul 1 [cited 2022 Dec 7];8(7). Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31307061/

29.   Sonawalla A, Chasman D, Chan YM. Hold for placement of supplemental materials.

30.   Perry JRB, Day F, Elks CE, Sulem P, Thompson DJ, Ferreira T, et al. Parent-of-origin specific allelic
associations among 106 genomic loci for age at menarche. Nature [Internet]. 2014 Oct 10 [cited
2024 Jun 17];514(7520):97. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4185210/

31.   Zheng J, Chen K, Huang T, Shao C, Li P, Wang J, et al. Genetically Determined Lifestyle and
Cardiometabolic Risk Factors Mediate the Association of Genetically Predicted Age at Menarche
With Genetic Predisposition to Myocardial Infarction: A Two-Step, Two-Sample Mendelian
Randomization Study. Front Cardiovasc Med [Internet]. 2022 Apr 25 [cited 2023 Apr 20];9.
Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC9081496/

32.   Ardissino M, Slob EAW, Carter P, Rogne T, Girling J, Burgess S, et al. Sex-Specific Reproductive
Factors Augment Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Women: A Mendelian Randomization Study.
Journal of the American Heart Association: Cardiovascular and Cerebrovascular Disease
[Internet]. 2023 Mar 7 [cited 2024 Nov 17];12(5):e027933. Available from:
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10111460/

33.    Bell JA, Carslake D, Wade KH, Richmond RC, Langdon RJ, Vincent EE, et al. Influence of puberty
timing on adiposity and cardiometabolic traits: A Mendelian randomisation study. PLoS Med
[Internet]. 2018 Aug 1 [cited 2022 Feb 23];15(8). Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30153260/

34.    Huxley R, Mendis S, Zheleznyakov E, Reddy S, Chan J. Body mass index, waist circumference and
waist:hip ratio as predictors of cardiovascular risk--a review of the literature. Eur J Clin Nutr
[Internet]. 2010 Jan [cited 2024 May 30];64(1):16–22. Available from: www.nature.com/ejcn

35.    Sahakyan KR, Somers VK, Rodriguez-Escudero JP, Hodge DO, Carter RE, Sochor O, et al. Normal-
Weight Central Obesity: Implications for Total and Cardiovascular Mortality. Ann Intern Med
[Internet]. 2015 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Jun 9];163(11):827–35. Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26551006/

36.    Chasman DI, Giulianini F, Demler O V., Udler MS. Pleiotropy-Based Decomposition of Genetic Risk
Scores: Association and Interaction Analysis for Type 2 Diabetes and CAD. Am J Hum Genet
[Internet]. 2020 May 7 [cited 2024 Jun 9];106(5):646–58. Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32302534/

37.    Udler MS, Kim J, von Grotthuss M, Bonàs-Guarch S, Cole JB, Chiou J, et al. Type 2 diabetes genetic
loci informed by multi-trait associations point to disease mechanisms and subtypes: A soft
clustering analysis. PLoS Med [Internet]. 2018 Sep 1 [cited 2024 Jun 9];15(9). Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30240442/

| Coronary artery disease | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Change per year increase in AAM** | | | | |
| | **Values earlier than the mean** | | **Values later than the mean** | | **_p_ for difference between slopes** |
| | Odds ratio (95% CI) | _p_ | Odds ratio (95% CI) | _p_ | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | 0.91 (0.83 to 0.99) | $3\times10^{-2}$ | 0.92 (0.84 to 1) | 0.063 | 0.87 |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | 0.92 (0.88 to 0.95) | $3\times10^{-6}$ | 1.11 (1.08 to 1.15) | $2\times10^{-9}$ | $7\times10^{-10}$ |
| **Coronary artery disease risk factors** | | | | | |
| | **Change per year increase in AAM** | | | | |
| | **Values earlier than the mean** | | **Values later than the mean** | | **_p_ for difference between slopes** |
| | Slope (95% CI) | _p_ | Slope (95% CI) | _p_ | |
| **Hemoglobin A1c (%)** | | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | -0.034 (-0.041 to -0.027) | $<2\times10^{-16}$ | -0.01 (-0.02 to -0.006) | $3\times10^{-3}$ | $6\times10^{-5}$ |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | -0.022 (-0.025 to -0.019) | $<2\times10^{-16}$ | 0.007 (0.004 to 0.01) | $1.3\times10^{-6}$ | $<2\times10^{-16}$ |
| **Triglycerides (mg/dL)** | | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | -2.82 (-3.84 to -1.79) | $7\times10^{-8}$ | -2.63 (-3.62 to -1.64) | $2\times10^{-7}$ | 0.83 |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | -4.25 (-4.7 to -3.8) | $<2\times10^{-16}$ | 1.2 (0.78 to 1.62) | $2\times10^{-8}$ | $<2\times10^{-16}$ |
| **High-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol (mg/dL)** | | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | 0.90 (0.69-1.11) | $<2\times10^{-16}$ | 0.74 (0.54-0.95) | $8\times10^{-13}$ | 0.38 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PGS-adjusted AAM | 0.85 (0.76-0.95) | <2x10$^{-16}$ | -0.28 (-0.37 to -0.20) | 2x10$^{-10}$ | <2x10$^{-16}$ |
| **Low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol (mg/dL)** | | | | | |
| | Adjusted for LDL-lowering medications | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | 0.27 (-0.15 to 0.69) | 2x10$^{-1}$ | -0.53 (-0.93 to -0.12) | 1x10$^{-2}$ | 0.026 |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | -0.46 (-0.65 to -0.28) | 1x10$^{-6}$ | 0.067 (-0.11 to 0.24) | 0.45 | 7x10$^{-4}$ |
| | Including only those not taking LDL-lowering medications (n = 177,542) | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | 0.14 (-0.31 to 0.59) | 0.054 | -0.59 (-1.02 to -0.16) | 8x10$^{-3}$ | 0.059 |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | -0.53 (-0.72 to -0.33) | 3x10$^{-7}$ | 0.0065 (-0.18 to 0.19) | 0.9 | 2x10$^{-3}$ |
| **Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)** | | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | -0.73 (-0.99 to -0.47) | 4x10$^{-8}$ | -0.71 (-0.96 to -0.45) | 5x10$^{-8}$ | 0.91 |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | -0.69 (-0.81 to -0.58) | <2x10$^{-16}$ | -0.21 (-0.31 to -0.10) | 2x10$^{-4}$ | 5x10$^{-7}$ |
| **Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)** | | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | -0.49 (-0.63 to -0.34) | 5x10$^{-11}$ | -0.49 (-0.63 to -0.35) | 9 x10$^{-12}$ | 0.98 |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | -0.52 (-0.59 to -0.46) | <2x10$^{-16}$ | -0.14 (-0.20 to -0.08) | 5 x10$^{-6}$ | 2x10$^{-12}$ |
| **Body-mass index (kg/m$^2$)** | | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | -0.98 (-1.05 to -0.91) | <2x10$^{-16}$ | -0.77 (-0.84 to -0.70) | <2 x10$^{-16}$ | 4x10$^{-4}$ |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | -0.80 (-0.83 to -0.77) | <2x10$^{-16}$ | -0.079 (-0.11 to -0.051) | 4 x10$^{-8}$ | <2x10$^{-16}$ |
| **Waist-hip ratio** | | | | | |
| Genetically predicted AAM | -0.0038 (-0.0047 to -0.0029) | 1.1x10$^{-15}$ | -0.0029 (-0.0038 to -0.0020) | 2x10$^{-10}$ | 0.28 |
| PGS-adjusted AAM | -0.0046 (-0.0050 to -0.0042) | <2x10$^{-16}$ | 0.0016 (0.0012 to 0.0020) | <2x10$^{-16}$ | <2x10$^{-16}$ |

**Table 1:** Associations of genetically predicted and PGS-adjusted AAM with coronary artery

disease and its risk factors.

AAM: age at menarche; PGS: polygenic score

**FIGURES**

**Figure 1:** Relationships of different sources of variation in age at menarche (AAM) with

coronary artery disease (CAD) and CAD risk factors. Variation in AAM was dissected into

variation associated with common genetic variants (as estimated by a polygenic score for AAM)

and variation independent of the polygenic score, then associations of these sources of variation

with CAD and CAD risk factors were studied. When associated with common genetic variants,

later AAM was associated with a lower risk of CAD and favorable changes in CAD risk factors

(blue arrows). However, when occurring independently of the polygenic score, later AAM was

associated with higher risk of CAD and unfavorable changes in CAD risk factors (red arrows).

The "other factors" causing later AAM independent of the PGS have yet to be identified and

could potentially include chronic illness, underweight, and rare genetic variants.

| | 9 | 9.5 | 10 | 10.5 | 11 | 11.5 | 12 | 12.5 | 13 | 13.5 | 14 | 14.5 | 15 | 15.5 | 16 | 16.5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Genetically predicted AAM, *n* | | | | | 2,276 | 11,346 | 34,601 | 58,525 | 55,294 | 28,780 | 8,619 | 1,596 | | | | |
| PGS-adjusted AAM, *n* | 1,142 | 2,034 | 4,927 | 9,900 | 15,890 | 20,529 | 24,350 | 26,981 | 26,105 | 23,173 | 17,446 | 12,250 | 7,684 | 4,283 | 2,237 | 2,106 |

**Figure 2: Associations of different sources of variation in age at menarche (AAM) with odds of coronary artery disease (CAD) in the UK Biobank.** For each individual in the cohort, variation in AAM was dissected into variation attributable to common genetic variants as estimated by a polygenic score (PGS) for AAM (represented by "genetically predicted AAM") and variation attributable to sources other than common genetic variants (represented by "PGS-adjusted AAM"), then associations with risk of CAD were studied. Genetically predicted AAM showed a linear association with risk of CAD, whereas PGS-adjusted AAM showed a U-shaped

association. The different associations of genetically predicted AAM and PGS-adjusted AAM

with risk of CAD suggest that it's not later AAM itself that causes increased risk of CAD, but

that factors other than the PGS can cause both later AAM and increased risk of CAD.. To

achieve bin sizes of ≥1000 individuals, the first and last bins for each variable represent the

group of individuals with AAM ≤ or ≥ the value listed on the x-axis, respectively. Dots represent

estimates; bars represent standard errors.

**Figure 3: Associations of genetically predicted and PGS-adjusted AAM with risk factors for CAD in the UK Biobank.** We observed linear (or roughly linear) relationships between genetically predicted AAM and most CAD risk factors. In contrast, for PGS-adjusted AAM we observed mostly non-linear relationships with CAD risk factors. The U-shaped relationship of PGS-adjusted AAM with CAD was mirrored by the relationships with HbA1c, triglycerides, HDL-C, and waist-hip ratio. This raises the possibility that dysglycemia, dyslipidemia and central adiposity may mediate the relationship between later AAM and increased risk of CAD. For LDL-C, n = 177,542 after excluding those taking LDL-C lowering medications. Dots represent estimates, bars represent standard errors.

663   AAM: age at menarche; BMI: body mass index; CAD: coronary artery disease; HDL-C: high-

664   density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C: low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; PGS: polygenic

665   score

**Figure 4: Associations of genetically predicted and PGS-adjusted AAM with risk factors for CAD in the WGHS.** genetically predicted AAM showed linear or roughly linear associations with most CAD risk factors and PGS-adjusted AAM showed mostly non-linear associations with most CAD risk factors. Similar to results in the UK Biobank, hemoglobin A1c, triglycerides and HDL-C showed U-shaped associations with PGS-adjusted AAM which support conclusions from the primary analyses that dysglycemia, dyslipidemia and central adiposity may mediate the relationship between later AAM and increased risk of CAD. For LDL-C, n = 22,495 after excluding those taking cholesterol-lowering medications. Dots represent estimates, bars represent standard errors.

676     AAM: age at menarche; BMI: body mass index; CAD: coronary artery disease; HDL-C: high

677     density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C: low density lipoprotein cholesterol; PGS: polygenic

678     score; WGHS: Women's Genome Health Study.

| | 10 | 10.5 | 11 | 11.5 | 12 | 12.5 | 13 | 13.5 | 14 | 14.5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Genetically predicted AAM, *n* | | | 2,533 | 4,143 | 5,878 | 5,462 | 3,367 | 1,885 | | |
| PGS-adjusted AAM, *n* | 1,275 | 1,557 | 2,445 | 3,527 | 4,070 | 3,826 | 1,691 | 2,779 | 938 | 1,160 |

**Figure 5: Associations of genetically predicted and PGS-adjusted AAM with hazard ratio for risk of CAD in the WGHS.** Genetically predicted AAM demonstrated a negative linear association with risk of CAD, similar to the results in the UKBB. PGS-adjusted AAM demonstrated a reverse-J shaped relationship, slightly different from the U-shaped relationship seen in the UK Biobank. Analyses in the WGHS largely validated the results from the UK

685     Biobank. The different associations of later PGS-adjusted AAM with risk of CAD may have

686     been due to differences in environmental factors between the two study cohorts.

687     AAM: age at menarche; $\Delta$AAM: change in AAM; CAD: coronary artery disease; PGS:

688     polygenic score. Dots represent estimates, bars represent standard errors.