medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The differential effects of common and rare genetic variants on cognitive performance across development

Daniel S. Malawsky[1,*], Mahmoud Koko[1], Petr Danacek[1], Wei Huang[1], Olivia Wootton[1], Qinqin Huang[1], Emma E. Wade[1], Sarah J. Lindsay[1], Rosalind Arden[2], Matthew E. Hurles[1], Hilary C. Martin[1,*]

1. Human Genetics Programme, Wellcome Sanger Institute, Hinxton, UK
2. Centre for Philosophy of Natural and Social Science, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK

* Correspondence to dm22@sanger.ac.uk and hcm@sanger.ac.uk

Abstract

Common and rare genetic variants that impact adult cognitive performance also contribute to risk of rare neurodevelopmental conditions involving cognitive deficits in children. However, their influence on cognitive performance across early life remains poorly understood. Here, we investigate the contribution of common genome-wide and rare exonic variation to cognitive performance across childhood and adolescence primarily using the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (n=6,495 unrelated children). We show that the effect of common variants associated with educational attainment and cognitive performance increases as children age. Conversely, the negative effect of deleterious rare variants attenuates with age. Using trio analyses, we show that these age-related trends are driven by direct genetic effects on the individual who carries these variants. We further find that the increasing effects of common variants are stronger in individuals at the upper end of the phenotype distribution, whereas the attenuating effects of rare variants are stronger in those at the lower end. Concordant results were observed in the Millenium Cohort Study (5,920 children) and UK Biobank (101,232 adults). The effects of common and rare genetic variation on childhood cognitive performance are broadly comparable in magnitude to those of other factors such as parental educational attainment, maternal illness and preterm birth. The effects of maternal illness and preterm birth on childhood cognitive performance also attenuate with age, whereas the effect of parental educational attainment does not. Furthermore, we show that the relative contribution of these various factors differ depending on whether one considers their contribution to phenotypic variance across the entire population or to the risk of poor outcomes. Our findings may help explain the apparent incomplete penetrance of rare damaging variants associated with neurodevelopmental conditions. More generally, they also show the importance of studying dynamic genetic influences across the life course and their differential effects across the phenotype distribution.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Main text

Cognitive ability is an important predictor of life outcomes such as health, education, occupation, and mortality[1–6]. It is influenced both by genetic and environmental factors[7], including extrinsic factors that have both genetic and environmental components such as parental educational attainment (EA), gestational age at birth, and maternal illness during pregnancy[8–10]. Results from twin studies show that the heritability of cognitive ability increases throughout development, from ~0.2 in infancy to ~0.6 in adulthood[11]. In adults, the heritability of cognitive performance attributable to common single-nucleotide polymorphisms (the 'SNP heritability') was recently estimated to be 0.24, with about 60% of this being due to direct genetic effects[12,13], i.e. effects of genetic variants in an individual on that individual's own phenotype. The remaining SNP heritability is likely to be explained by a variety of other sources, including the indirect effects of "genetic nurture" (a phenomenon whereby an individual's rearing environment is influenced by their relatives' genetic make-up), assortative mating, and uncontrolled population stratification in genome-wide association studies (GWASs)[14–17]. The relative contribution of genetic nurture, assortative mating and population stratification to genetic associations is still a matter of debate, and may differ between cognitive performance and related traits such as EA and academic achievement[14,18–20]. However, the role of direct versus indirect genetic effects on cognitive and academic performance across different timepoints in development is under-studied, and we explore this in this work.

It has become increasingly clear that the genetics of rare neurodevelopmental conditions (NDCs) involving cognitive impairment overlap with genetic factors impacting cognitive ability in the general population. While Mendelian-acting rare variants play a large role in NDCs, explaining ~50% of probands in the Deciphering Developmental Disorders (DDD) study[21–23], common variants explain ~10% of variation in risk of these conditions on the liability scale[24,25], and this common variant risk is negatively genetically correlated with EA and adult cognitive performance in the general population[24,25]. Additionally, rare damaging coding variants in NDC-associated genes are associated with lower fluid intelligence as well as lower EA and reproductive success in UK Biobank[26–28], and estimates suggest rare coding variants explain 1% of the variance in adult cognitive performance[29].

Multiple lines of evidence from both clinical[30–32] and population cohorts[28,33] suggest that some rare variants conferring risk of NDCs can be shared between affected children and their seemingly unaffected parents. This so-called 'incomplete penetrance' is seen both for large copy-number variants[31] and for protein-truncating variants (PTVs) and damaging missense variants in genes in which such variants have been under negative selection throughout human history ('constrained genes'[34])[32]. There are several possible explanations for this apparent incomplete penetrance, including the following. Firstly, polygenic background may modify the penetrance of these rare variants; there is evidence of this from the general population[28], but recent within-family analyses in NDC cohorts failed to find support for it[25]. Secondly, it may be that the burden of deleterious rare variants does not only impact *average* cognitive ability, but also its *variance*; in other words, in a linear regression of phenotype on genotype, the variance of the residuals varies by genotype - a statistical phenomenon known as 'heteroscedasticity'. Specifically, it may be that there is a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

higher variance in cognitive ability amongst individuals with higher burden of damaging rare variants, and only a subset of these pass the threshold for being diagnosed with intellectual disability. Thirdly, it may be that these rare variants (or at least a subset of them) influence cognitive ability in childhood more than they do in adulthood. Here, we investigate these two latter hypotheses.

In this work, we sought to dissect the contribution of genome-wide common variants and rare exonic variants to cognitive performance across childhood and adolescence, using genotype data and new exome-sequence data from two British birth cohorts, the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC)[35] and the Millenium Cohort Study (MCS)[36]. Our first aim was to examine the effects of genetic measures on average cognitive performance and academic achievement as children age, then test whether these change across time and the extent to which they are due to direct genetic effects. Our second aim was to explore whether these genetic measures have differential effects at the tails of the phenotype distribution (in other words, whether they impact the variance in cognitive ability). Finally, our third aim was to compare these genetic effects to those of parental educational attainment and perinatal exposures, and to explore whether they are robust to controlling for these other measures. Our results illuminate the dynamic genetic architecture of cognitive performance across development and shed light on the factors that best predict cognitive impairment in childhood as opposed to average cognitive performance in adulthood.

Results

In this work, we used measurements of cognitive performance and/or school achievement from three cohorts: ALSPAC, MCS and UK Biobank. Our primary analyses were based on measures of IQ from ALSPAC that were collected at ages 4 (n=1,012), 8 (n=7,347), and 16 (n=5,270). These IQ tests have good psychometric properties[37] and are longitudinally invariant, meaning that they measure the same latent construct across ages[38], making them suitable for longitudinal analyses. Since missingness can induce ascertainment biases and reduce power, we imputed missing IQ values across ages by leveraging the lower missingness of other cognitive and behavioral tests and demographic variables (Supplementary Note 1; Extended Data Figure 1). We report results analyzing only the observed IQ values (“pre-imputation”) and both the observed and imputed IQ values (“post-imputation”).

Influence of common variants on cognitive performance across development

To assess the common variant contribution to cognitive development, we first considered the heritabilities and genetic correlations of the IQ measures across development in ALSPAC, using 6,495 unrelated children with SNP genotype data, genetically-inferred European ancestry and observed or imputed IQ values. Using GREML-LDMS[39], we estimated that the heritability of IQ increased between ages 4 to 16 from 0.46 to 0.56 (post-imputation), though the increase was not significant (p=0.053) (Table S2). The pairwise genetic correlations between IQ across ages were all significantly greater than zero ($p<10^{-10}$) and indistinguishable from 1 (Table S2), suggesting

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

the common variant genetic architecture is largely stable across development. These results are consistent with previous studies[40,41].

We then considered the associations between IQ and polygenic indices (PGIs), which capture the effect of common SNPs ascertained for their association with a given trait. We first considered a PGI for EA (PGI_{EA}). EA is known to have a cognitive component as well as a non-cognitive component which may capture factors such as personality traits and socioeconomic status that affect people's ability to progress through education[42]. Genetic effects on these two components have been previously derived from GWASs in adults using Genomic Structural Equation Modeling[42], so we also included PGIs representing each of them (PGI_{Cog} and PGI_{NonCog}). For each PGI, we modeled IQ across all ages as the outcome of individual-specific random effects and several fixed effects, namely age (relative to age 4), the PGI, and their interaction, with sex and genetic principal components as covariates. With this mixed-effects linear model, we were able to account for intra-individual repeated IQ measures and estimate two parameters of interest: the effect of the PGI at baseline i.e. at age 4 (the "main effect", estimated leveraging the data at all ages) and whether the effect changed with age (the "interaction effect"; see Box 1). We detected significant ($p<.05/3$) positive main effects for all PGIs pre- and post-imputation, and significant positive PGI-by-age interaction effects for all PGIs post-imputation as well as for PGI_{EA} pre-imputation ("population model, full cohort" in Figure 1A, Table S4). These results imply that the common variants ascertained for their association with cognitive performance and final educational attainment in adults explain more variance in IQ as children age.

As noted above, these results give estimates of the association between children's PGIs and IQ which do not only include direct genetic effects; they also include the influence of other correlates of the child's genotype including the influence of parental genotypes on the child's IQ (often termed "indirect genetic effects" or "genetic nurture") and potential confounding due to population stratification and assortative mating. We thus sought to estimate the direct genetic effects of PGIs on IQ across development, as opposed to the 'population effects' just described. We repeated the above analyses adding parental PGIs as covariates in a subset of 4,968 unrelated parent-offspring trios for which we measured parental genotypes or could infer them via Mendelian imputation[20] ("trio model"; see Methods). After conditioning on parental PGIs, the coefficient on the child's PGI provides an estimate of the direct genetic effects[14], while the coefficient on the parents' PGIs represents the association between the child's phenotype and alleles in the parents that are not transmitted to the child. We found no evidence for a direct main effect of the PGI_{NonCog} (Figure 1A), implying that the population effect reflects genetic nurture or potential confounding. In contrast, we detected significant direct main effects of PGI_{EA} and PGI_{Cog} on IQ, though of weaker magnitude than the population effects both pre- and post-imputation ($p<0.005$, z test for difference between direct and population main effects for PGI_{EA} and PGI_{Cog}) (Figure 1A). The positive PGI_{EA}-by-age and PGI_{Cog}-by-age population effects were recapitulated when examining the direct effects ($p<.05/3$), and their magnitudes were statistically indistinguishable from the population effects both pre- and post-imputation ($p>0.05$, z test). We found no significant differences between the direct effects for PGI_{EA} and PGI_{Cog} ($p>0.05$ for difference in the main and interaction effects, z test), suggesting the cognitive component of EA fully captured the direct genetic effect of PGI_{EA} on IQ.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Box 1: Genetic effects estimated in this study

We estimate a variety of genetic effects from mixed-effects models (see Methods section on "Associations between genetic measures and traits"), including either main or interaction effects combined with either population effects, direct effects or effects of non-transmitted parental alleles.

Population main effect: The effect of a child's genetic score on the phenotype at the first measurement time point (e.g., age 4 in the ALSPAC IQ analysis). This effect is estimated without adjusting for parental genetic scores in the regression, and reflects a combination of the effects of the child's genetic score on their own phenotype, genetic nurture, assortative mating, and uncontrolled population stratification. It does **not** have a causal interpretation.

Population interaction effect: The *change* in the population effect of a genetic score on the phenotype with age.

Direct main effect: The effect of a child's genetic score on the phenotype at the first measurement time point, adjusting for the parental genetic scores (i.e., a trio model). This effect isolates the influence of the child's own genetic score on their own phenotype and has a causal interpretation (see section IV in [43] for further discussion).

Direct interaction effect: The *change* in the direct effect of a genetic score on the phenotype with age.

Effects of non-transmitted alleles: These are the effects of the parental genetic scores on the phenotype, estimated in the trio model; in this model, the effect of transmitted alleles is captured by the coefficient on the child's score, whereas the coefficients on the parents' scores are mathematically equivalent to the effect of the non-transmitted alleles in the parents. These effects reflect a combination of genetic nurture, assortative mating, and uncontrolled population stratification. They do **not** have a causal interpretation.

Note that all of these effects are estimated both on the mean of the phenotype with linear regression (Figures 1, 2, 4A), and also on quantiles of the phenotype (e.g., the median) with quantile regression (Figure 3, 4B).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 1

Association between PGIs and IQ across ages. Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals estimated for the main effects and PGI-by-age-interaction effects for each PGI, either pre- (top) and post-imputation (bottom) A) Results for the children's PGIs not controlling (i.e. 'population model') and controlling (right) for parental PGIs (i.e. trio model). Population effect sizes are shown estimated in the full sample (opaque) and in the subset of children with parental PGIs (translucent), with the corresponding sample sizes shown in black and gray text respectively. B) Results for the parental PGIs from the trio model. SD: standard deviation; PGI: polygenic index; EA: educational attainment; Cog: cognitive component of EA from [19]; NonCog: non-cognitive component of EA from [19]. The square brackets indicate significant comparisons highlighted in the text (z tests).

In the trio model, we found all parental PGIs had significant main effects pre- and post-imputation and there was a nominally significant positive PGI_{NonCog}-by-age interaction post-imputation (Figure 1B, Table S4). Additionally, we found the main effect of the maternal PGI_{NonCog} was significantly greater than the paternal effect post-imputation (difference in coefficients = 0.067, p=0.014, z test), though we did not find significant differences between maternal and paternal effects for PGI_{EA} and PGI_{Cog}. These results suggest that indirect genetic effects and/or confounding effects captured by the parental PGIs are significantly associated with IQ, and that the effects captured by parental PGI_{NonCog} are stronger for the maternal than the paternal PGI. The association between non-transmitted alleles in PGI_{NonCog} and children's IQ could be because parenting behaviors correlated with PGI_{NonCog} increase children's cognitive ability, or due to cross-trait parental assortment based on the cognitive and non-cognitive components of educational attainment. The fact that we observe a significant difference between the associations with mothers' and fathers' non-transmitted alleles suggest that these potentially reflect at least some 'genetic nurture' component which differs between parents.

As a complementary approach, we assessed the influence of the PGIs on academic performance in ALSPAC. In Year 6 and Year 9 (roughly ages 11 and 14, respectively; known as Key Stages 2 and 3 in the UK) children were administered three standardized exams covering English, Mathematics, and Science from which we derived a composite academic performance metric which we showed was measuring the same latent construct across time (Table S1; Methods). We assessed the contribution of the three PGIs to academic performance as before, for children who had complete data for the three exams at both ages (n=3,895). We found significant ($p<1.1x10^{-17}$) population effects for all PGIs and significant increases in effects with age for PGI_{EA} and PGI_{NonCog}($p<2.1x10^{-8}$) (Extended Data Figure 2, Table S5). In a trio analysis (n=3,024), we found evidence for direct genetic effects of PGI_{EA} and PGI_{Cog} on academic performance (Extended Data Figure 2), consistent with previous work in other cohorts[19]. Though all of the PGI-by-age interactions were positive, only the PGI_{EA} showed a significant increase in direct effects (p=0.014), likely due to the reduction in power of the decreased sample size and the narrower age range considered. However, broadly these results for the impact of common genetic variation on academic performance mirror what we observed for IQ.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Influence of rare variant burden on cognitive performance across development

We generated new exome sequencing data on ALSPAC (8,436 children and 3,215 parents) and MCS (7,667 children and 6,925 parents) to supplement the SNP genotype and longitudinal phenotype data already available. We first used these to assess the associations between IQ and deleterious rare variant burden (RVB) in ALSPAC. We quantified RVB as the sum of gene-specific selection coefficients[44] (reflecting evolutionary constraint, or negative selection) for genes in which an individual carries a rare (within-sample minor allele frequency, MAF <0.1%) predicted loss-of-function, deleterious missense, or synonymous variant (RVB_{pLoF}, $RVB_{Missense}$ and $RVB_{Synonymous}$ respectively; see Methods).

RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ were significantly negatively associated with IQ pre- and post-imputation (main effects p<.05/3) (Figure 2A left, Table S6). As the variance of RVB_{pLoF} was significantly lower than that of $RVB_{Missense}$ (0.008 versus 0.03, $p<10^{-10}$ F test), we compared their unstandardized effects and found that, as expected, RVB_{pLoF} had a stronger effect, with its main effect being 3.2-times larger than that of $RVB_{Missense}$ ($p=4x10^{-7}$, z test) (Extended Data Figure 3). $RVB_{Synonymous}$ (a negative control) was not significantly associated with IQ at any age pre- and post-imputation (Figure 2A). The effect of RVB_{pLoF} significantly attenuated at later ages both pre- and post-imputation (p<.05/3) and we saw the same trend at nominal significance for $RVB_{Missense}$ post-imputation (Figure 2A right). Similarly, we found that RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ were significantly negatively associated with academic performance at age 11 but their effects attenuated with age (Extended Data Figure 4, Table S7).

Next we considered the effects of RVB_{pLoF} calculated for specific gene sets. We found that genes prioritized via common variant-based GWAS of educational attainment[45] showed a stronger association with IQ in childhood than expected for similarly evolutionarily constrained genes, highlighting the convergence of common and rare variant associations for these related phenotypes on the same genes (Supplementary Note 2, Extended Data Figure 5). We also observed suggestive evidence that the attenuation of the effect of RVB_{pLoF} on IQ with age was strongest in genes that showed preferential expression in the prenatal rather than postnatal brain[46] (Supplementary Note 2, Extended Data Figure 5A), although this was less clear when examining academic performance (Figure S5).

We next sought to estimate the direct genetic effects of RVB on IQ across development in a subset of 958 unrelated exome-sequenced trios by adding parental RVBs as covariates as before. We found that the estimated population and direct main effects were not significantly different from each other for either RVB_{pLoF} nor $RVB_{Missense}$ (p>0.05, z test) (Figure 2A, Table S6) and that no maternal or paternal RVBs were significantly associated with IQ after accounting for multiple testing (Figure 2B, Table S6), though this may be in part due to the larger standard errors of the estimates at this smaller sample size. This result implies that the population effects are likely minimally biased in estimating the direct effects, in contrast to what we observed for PGIs. Notably, we found significant RVB_{pLoF}-by-age and $RVB_{Missense}$-by-age interactions for direct effects both pre- and post-imputation (p<.05/3). Thus, our results show that higher exome-wide burden of rare damaging variants is associated with lower IQ in childhood, though with attenuated effects at later age, and that this pattern is recapitulated when examining the direct genetic effects. When

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

partitioning the effect of the burden of rare pLoFs in constrained genes into inherited variants versus *de novo* mutations in ALSPAC, we estimated that the former explained 3.5-4 times more variance in IQ across development than the latter (Supplementary Note 3; Extended Data Figure 6). We obtained similar results when considering the association of *de novo* or rare inherited alleles on a composite measure of childhood cognitive performance in MCS (see Methods; Figure S1).



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 2

Association between rare variant burden (RVB) and IQ across ages. Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals estimated for the main effects and RVB-by-age-interaction effects for RVB calculated with three different consequence classes (pLoF, missense or synonymous), either pre- (top) and post-imputation (bottom) . A) Results for the children's RVBs not controlling (i.e. 'population model') and controlling (right) for parental RVBs (i.e. trio model). Population effect sizes are shown estimated in the full sample (opaque) and in the subset of children with parental RVBs (translucent), with the corresponding sample sizes shown in black and gray text respectively. B) Results for the parental RVBs from the trio model. The square brackets indicate comparisons highlighted in the text (z tests).

Influence of genetic factors on the tails of the IQ distribution

Our results thus far show that deleterious rare exonic and common variants influence mean IQ. However, we have yet to consider whether they differentially impact IQ at different quantiles in the IQ distribution. Importantly, deleterious rare variants in constrained genes are known to affect risk of neurodevelopmental conditions[21], hinting that they may possibly have larger effects at the lower tail end of the IQ distribution. To test whether there are heterogenous genetic effects at the tails of the IQ distribution, we used quantile regression to estimate the influence of PGIs and RVB on both the median IQ as well as the bottom and top 5th percentiles in ALSPAC (Figure 3A), which roughly correspond to IQ<75 and IQ>125, respectively[37].

First, we considered the influence of PGI_{EA} and PGI_{Cog}, which had significant direct genetic effects on IQ in Figure 1. The effects on these different quantiles in the IQ distribution were largely concordant at any given time point (Figure S2, Table S8). For both PGI_{EA} and PGI_{Cog}, we found significant positive age interaction effects at the median and 95th quantile for population effects ($p<.05/3$), which were at least nominally significant when considering the direct effects (Figure 3B). Notably, there was no evidence for significant age interactions at the 5th percentile for either PGI. Repeating this analysis using academic performance in ALSPAC replicated the results, showing that the standardized effect size of the PGI only significantly increased at the median and nominally at the 95th percentile (Extended Data Figure 7A). Parental PGI associations with IQ were largely uniform across the phenotype distribution and consistent across development (Extended Data Figure 8). Collectively, these results suggest the observed increase with age in the effect of the two PGIs on IQ was driven by increasing genetic effect in the upper half of the IQ distribution.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 3

Influence of common and rare variants on the tails of the IQ distribution, using IQ measures post-imputation in ALSPAC. A) Schematic showing two scenarios where a genetic measure is associated with IQ and has

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

uniform effects across the IQ distribution (left) versus a scenario in which the genetic measure has heterogeneous effects on IQ across the IQ distribution (right). B) Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals for quantile regression of the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentile estimated from mixed-effects modeling with post-imputation IQ at ages 4, 8, and 16 for EA and EA-cog PGIs before (left) and after (right) controlling for parental genetic measures. C) Same as (B) using RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ as genetic measures. See Figure S3 for results from this mixed-effects model pre-imputation, and Figure S2 and Figure S4 for cross-sectional estimates at each age. The square brackets indicate significant comparisons highlighted in the text (z tests).

As additional replication, we then considered the association between PGI_{EA} and a single measure of cognitive performance from each of MCS and UK Biobank. In MCS, cognitive tests were administered at multiple ages, but previous work showed that these are not longitudinally invariant[47], so we instead extracted a single composite cognitive measure from the tests administered at ages 3 and 7 (see Methods) to represent overall cognitive performance in early childhood. In UK Biobank, we used the results for the verbal-numerical reasoning test (sometimes called “fluid intelligence”) conducted at baseline, to represent adult cognitive performance. We hypothesized that we would see relatively uniform effects across quantiles of early childhood cognitive performance measured in MCS, as we did for IQ in ALSPAC at age 4 (Figure S2). Given the differential age interactions across quantiles observed in ALSPAC (namely the increasing effect with age that is seen only in the top half of the distribution), we predicted that, in UK Biobank adults, the PGI_{EA} effects would be markedly stronger at the top 5% and median than the bottom 5%. Our results were concordant with these two predictions (Extended Data Figure 7B): neither the population (n=5,920) nor direct (n=5,309) effects were statistically different across quantiles in MCS, while we found significant heterogeneity in UK Biobank when examining both the population effect (n=101,232) and direct effect (n=11,859), with the direct effect at the top 5% being 1.62 times greater than that at the bottom 5% (p=0.0084).

Secondly, we considered the influence of rare variant burden on these different quantiles of the IQ distribution at different ages in ALSPAC. We found substantial heterogeneity in effects of RVB_{pLoF} across the IQ distribution earlier in development that attenuated with age (Figure S4; Table S9). Notably, at age 4, the population effect of RVB_{pLoF} at the 5th percentile was 3.9-times greater than that at the 95th percentile ($p=9x10^{-5}$, z test) and 2.2-times greater than at the median ($p=7x10^{-4}$), whereas by age 16, the estimates at the different quantiles were not significantly different from one another. Put another way, this implies that, at age 4, the variance in IQ in people with high RVB_{pLoF} is greater than in those with lower RVB_{pLoF}, but this is driven by there being more people with lower rather than higher IQ, as illustrated in the right-hand plot in Figure 3A; however, by age 16, RVB_{pLoF} shows uniform effects at the distribution tails. As a consequence of this, the significant attenuation of population effects with age was observed only at the 5th percentile and median, but not at the 95th percentile, for both RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ (Figure 3B). This finding was recapitulated when examining direct genetic effects of RVB_{pLoF} although not $RVB_{Missense}$ (Figure 3B). Although we detected no significant effects of parental RVB on mean IQ in the trio model (Figure 2B), we detected a nominally significant negative effect of maternal RVB_{pLoF} on the bottom 5th percentile, suggesting that the effect of genetically-influenced parental behaviors on IQ may vary across the IQ distribution (Extended Data Figure 8). This is in line with our recent finding of a significant effect of non-transmitted rare damaging maternal alleles on risk

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

of neurodevelopmental conditions (Extended Data Figure 10B in [25]). Repeating the RVB_{pLoF} analysis on school grades in ALSPAC, we similarly find stronger associations between RVB_{pLoF} and academic performance at the 5th percentile that attenuate as children age (Extended Data Figure 7A). These results stand in contrast to those for the PGIs for which the significant age interactions were seen only in the top half of the IQ distribution.

To try to replicate these results in independent cohorts, we then considered the association between the RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ and measures of cognitive performance in MCS (n=5,666) and UK Biobank (n=101,232). Given the heterogeneity of effects on IQ observed at age 4 in ALSPAC (Figure S4), we hypothesized that in MCS, we would find stronger effects for RVB_{pLoF} at the bottom 5% of our composite cognitive performance measure from early childhood. In UK Biobank, we predicted that the differences across quantiles would be minimal since we observed increasingly uniform effects across the quantiles by age 16 in ALSPAC (Figure S4). Our findings were concordant with these two predictions: the bottom 5% had an effect 1.82-times stronger than the median and 2.4-times stronger than the 95th percentile in MCS (p=0.019 and 0.011, respectively), while we found no significant differences in effects across quantiles in UK Biobank (Extended Data Figure 7B). Thus, in summary, we show that the negative effects of RVB are strongest on the lower tail of the distribution of cognitive ability, and that these effects attenuate with age, driving the overall attenuation of the RVB effect on mean IQ previously observed in Figure 2.

Relative contribution of genetic and other exposures to IQ

Finally, we compared the longitudinal effects of common and rare genetic variants on IQ (Figures 1 and 2) to the effects of other factors that have previously been associated with children's academic and cognitive outcomes (see Methods). We tested the effects of two perinatal factors, namely maternal illness during pregnancy and premature birth (as measured by the number of weeks born preterm), and the effect of realized parental educational attainment on IQ in ALSPAC using a mixed-effects linear model. When fitting the variables separately (i.e. marginal associations shown in blue points in Figure 4A), we found that paternal and maternal EA were strongly associated with IQ (Figure 4A top) and showed no evidence for an age interaction effect (Figure 4A bottom). We additionally found that maternal illness and weeks born preterm are negatively associated with IQ (Figure 4A top) and that these associations attenuated with age (Figure 4A bottom), consistent with previous findings using school grades in ALSPAC and MCS[48,49]. The standardized effects for these perinatal exposures were weaker than those for rare variants, with maternal illness and weeks born preterm explaining 0.18% and 0.35% of the variance in IQ at age 4 respectively, versus 1.40% for RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ collectively ($p=5.2\times10^{-4}$ and 0.027, respectively) (Figure 4A top).

Since these perinatal factors considered are both associated with lower parental EA[50–52], and parental EA is correlated with both the parents' and the child's genetics, the effects of these various factors on the child's cognitive ability are likely not independent. Thus, we considered a model in which we jointly fit parental EA and the perinatal exposures together with the genetic scores that showed significant direct effects in Figure 1 and 2, namely offspring and parental PGI_{EA} and the child's RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ (conditional estimates shown in orange in Figure

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

4A). The incremental R^2 of the joint model (excluding weeks born preterm due to the lower sample size) relative to a baseline model with sex and genetic 10 PCs was 22.8% at age 4, 21.2% at age 8 (p=0.29 for a z-test for difference in variance explained compared to age 4) and 25.6% at age 16 (p=0.073 and 0.0045 relative to age 4 and 8 respectively, z test). We found that when jointly fit with the other variables, the parental PGI_{EA} associations became nonsignificant, though the child's direct effect estimate did not significantly change (Figure 4A top). Similarly, the effects of the child's RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ on IQ did not significantly attenuate after controlling for these different exposure variables and PGI_{EA}. The association between weeks born preterm and IQ was no longer significant in the conditional analysis, though this may be due to reduced power in the joint model. Maternal and paternal EA showed similar effect sizes to each other, which were also similar to those captured by the direct genetic effect of the child's PGI_{EA}. Collectively, these results highlight that the magnitude of effects of these genetic measures on childhood IQ is comparable to those of other well-established influences. Importantly also, the changing effects of RVB and PGS_{EA} on IQ with age that we have described above still persist after conditioning on parental EA and these perinatal exposures (Figure 4A bottom).

Given our prior observation of differential effects of genetic measures on the tails of the IQ distribution, we further considered the influence of parental EA and these perinatal exposures on the median and top and bottom 5th percentiles of the IQ distribution. When considering each of the variables in separate mixed-effects quantile regressions (Figure 4B, marginal estimates), we found that paternal and maternal education had similar magnitudes of main effects as well as uniform effects across quantiles, and we detected a nominally significant positive age interaction (p=0.029) for paternal education at the 95th percentile (Figure 4B). We also found substantial heterogeneity in the effect of weeks born preterm, displaying highly significant main effects at the 95th percentile (effect size = -0.120, $p=8.44\times10^{-6}$) that significantly attenuated with age (p=0.00421), as previously observed when examining the effect on mean IQ (Figure 4A bottom), while we detected no significant effects at the 5th percentile (effect size = -0.022, p=0.389). In contrast, for maternal illness, we detected significant main effects at the 5th ($p=5.97\times10^{-8}$) that attenuated with age ($p=5.06\times10^{-4}$), while the main effect at the 95th percentile was nonsignificant. These results suggest that different perinatal factors may have varying impacts across the IQ distribution, with some factors predominantly affecting the upper or lower tails of cognitive ability.

We then further explored the differential effects on the different quantiles of the IQ distribution in a joint model of the genetic and other exposures (Figure 4B, conditional estimates), excluding weeks born preterm due to high missingness. We detected significant maternal PGI_{EA} main effects on the 5th and 50th percentiles of the IQ distribution (Figure 4B) which were not observed in the conditional analysis of mean IQ (Figure 4A), suggesting the heterogeneous effects across the IQ distribution may have masked these associations. This result suggests that the mother's PGI_{EA}, independently of its influence on the mother's actualized EA, is associated with the child's IQ at the lower tail of the IQ distribution either due to genetic nurture or confounding tagged by the paternal PGI_{EA}. In comparison, neither paternal nor maternal EA showed heterogeneity of main effects across the IQ distribution (Figure 4B top). However, paternal EA did show a significant positive age interaction at the 95th percentile (Figure 4B bottom) which was not observed when considering the effect on mean IQ (Figure 4A bottom), suggesting the influence of paternal EA on

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

IQ increases at later stages of development among those at the top of the IQ distribution. Thus, in summary, our results indicate that the factors that best predict which children will have cognitive difficulties or will excel cognitively across childhood are different from those that best predict average IQ.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .





435

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 4

Associations between genetic and other factors and IQ across ages in ALSPAC. A) Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals for the main effects (top) and measure-by-age-interaction effects (bottom) obtained from mixed-effects models fitted for IQ post-imputation. These were obtained from four models, as indicated in the key: marginal associations from models in which only the indicated variable(s) were included in the model (in addition to standard covariates), and conditional associations from models in which all the variables were included in the same model. Note that we estimated the marginal and conditional effects either using only individuals who had gestational age information (n=1,595) or all individuals (n=4,563), dropping the "weeks born preterm" variable in the latter case. See Methods for details. B) Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals for the main effects (top) and measure-by-age-interaction effects (bottom) for quantile regression of the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentile estimated from mixed-effects quantile regression modeling for IQ post-imputation using both marginal and conditional associations as in (A). In (B), marginal effect sizes for the child's PGI_{EA}, RVB_{pLoF}, and $RVB_{Missense}$, which were previously shown in Figures 1 and 2 are replotted to facilitate comparisons of effect size with the conditional analysis results. Asterisks indicate whether the estimate is significantly different from 0; note that curly brackets with asterisks indicate that the estimates spanned by the bracket are all significant.

Discussion

Here we explored the contribution of common and rare variants to cognitive performance longitudinally across childhood and adolescence. We showed that common and rare variants differ in their effects on IQ and school achievement across time. While the effect of rare damaging variants attenuates between childhood and adolescence (Figure 2), the effect of common variants associated with educational attainment and cognitive performance in adulthood increases (Figure 1). In both cases, these changes are due to direct genetic effects, with no evidence for an age interaction effect of non-transmitted common or rare alleles in parents (Figure 1B), nor indeed for any effects of non-transmitted rare alleles on average IQ at all (Figure 2B). Our common variant findings are similar to those of Malanchini *et al.* who showed that the effect of a polygenic score for non-cognitive skills on academic achievement increased over development in a different cohort, including in within-family analyses[53].

In theory, the increasing effect of polygenic indices for educational attainment and adult cognitive performance with age could simply be because the underlying SNP effects have been estimated on adult phenotypes which are better correlated with IQ in later childhood than early childhood[54,55]. Having said that, we observed suggestive evidence for an increase in the total SNP heritability of IQ with age in ALSPAC (p=0.053) (Table S2), consistent with the trend reported in another cohort[40]. Additionally, the common variant genetic correlations between IQ measured at the different ages and educational attainment measured in adulthood were not significantly different from 1 (Table S3), suggesting the increase in PGI effects are most likely due to genome-wide amplification of genetic effects as opposed to different common variants impacting cognitive ability differentially at different ages[11]. By contrast, our finding that the effects of rare variants attenuate as children age cannot be explained by the way the variant weights were obtained; this is because the weights are based on estimates of historical negative selection against deleterious variants in each gene in large population-based cohorts of adults[44], rather than through association studies with a phenotype.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Genetic studies typically test for genetic effects on the mean of the phenotype, although some have also considered effects on variance[56–59] or differential effects on different quantiles of anthropometric traits and biochemical measures[60]. Here, we examined the longitudinal effects of common and rare variants on different quantiles of the IQ distribution, which essentially tests for an effect on the phenotypic variance and skew. In so doing, we found that increasing effects of PGI_{EA} and PGI_{Cog} on mean IQ with age were driven by effects on the top half of the phenotype distribution, whereas the attenuating effects of RVB_{pLoF} were driven by those in the lower tail (Figure 3). The latter observation appears to be driven by RVB_{pLoF} having a larger effect on the 5th than the 95th percentile of IQ at age 4 and 8, but similar effects at the distribution tails by age 16 (Figure S4). Results based on measures of cognitive performance in MCS and UK Biobank were concordant with these observations from ALSPAC (Extended Data Figure 7B). These results imply that the genetic profile of children in the highest and lowest ranges of cognitive ability differ across development (Extended Data Figure 9). Figure 5 summarizes our key findings for the IQ trajectories of individuals with different common and rare variant genetic backgrounds; children in the high versus low PGI_{EA} groups become more differentiated across development, though with more of the stratification occurring due to increasing IQ particularly in the high PGI_{EA} group, while the stratification in IQ due to RVB_{pLoF} is strongest at the earlier ages and attenuates particularly in the high RVB_{pLoF} group.

Our results imply that there is higher variance in IQ amongst individuals with higher RVB_{pLoF} in early childhood, which could be potentially due to gene-by-environment or gene-by-gene effects, or simply to stochasticity. This effect on the variance, particularly due to increased effects on the lower tail of the IQ distribution, provides a mechanism to explain the pervasiveness of incomplete penetrance and variable clinical presentation in rare neurodevelopmental conditions. This is because an increased proportion of children with high rather than low RVB_{pLoF} will cross the liability threshold and be diagnosed with these conditions, but some will be well below diagnostic thresholds. Multiple neurodevelopmental conditions exhibit a high degree of phenotypic variability, even amongst carriers of the same causal mutation, such as in neurofibromatosis type 1[61]. Although quantitative measures of intellectual impairment are relatively rare in studies of these conditions, there is evidence, for example, that patients with tuberous sclerosis complex (TSC) have not only lower *mean* IQ but also higher *variance* in IQ than unaffected sibling controls (F-test for a difference in variance between cases and controls; p=0.004 for TSC1, p=0.033 for TSC2)[62]. Taken together, our results support two hypotheses for the incomplete/variable penetrance of rare NDC-associated variants. Firstly, these variants impact variance in cognitive ability early in life, consistent with heterogeneous phenotypes of children with NDCs. Secondly, they have larger effects on average cognitive ability in early childhood than later in life, consistent with apparently clinically unaffected parents passing on these pathogenic variants to affected children.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 5

Summary of phenotypic trajectories across development, as inferred in this work. The plot shows average trajectories of IQ (inferred post-imputation) for individuals grouped by genetic measures. The high/low PGI_{EA} groups are individuals with a value that is one or more standard deviations above/below 0. The low RVB_{pLoF} group are individuals with RVB_{pLoF} below 0.01 (approximately 9.6% of individuals) and the high RVB_{pLoF} group are individuals with RVB_{pLoF} greater than 0.4 (approximately 1.5% of individuals); these cutoffs were chosen arbitrarily for illustrative purposes. The change in mean genetic measure/IQ between ages 4 and 16 are shown on the right hand side of the plots. Bands indicate 95% CI. The decrease in mean IQ in the low PGI_{EA} group is explained by the fact that, due to PGI_{EA} effects becoming stronger towards the top of the IQ distribution, those that had a high IQ earlier in development will tend towards their genetically predicted lower IQ at later ages, thereby lowering the average IQ in this group.

The increasing heritability of IQ with age is well established but its causes remain unclear[11]. In contrast to our results for rare variants, we found evidence across cohorts for *increasing* direct genetic effects of PGIs with age, particularly at the top of the IQ distribution; to our knowledge, this has not been previously demonstrated. This may be relevant to the so-called 'Matthew effect', the phenomenon whereby individual differences in ability compound over time and increase gaps in cognitive and academic outcomes as children age[63–66]. If this effect is particularly driven by those with high cognitive performance, this could explain the increase in common variant effects over time that we observe for the upper tail of the phenotype distribution. Several potential

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

mechanisms could drive this, including evocative gene-environment correlations, such as high-performing children being selected into more from cognitively-stimulating environments, or active gene-environment correlations, such as high-performing children being more effective learners and hence increasing their cognitive performance more relative to their peers[67]. Potentially relevant to this is our observation for a significant age interaction effect for paternal EA at the 95th quantile (Figure 4B).

When comparing the relative magnitude of the main effects of genetic versus other factors on IQ in ALSPAC, we found that the RVB contribution was slightly larger than but broadly comparable to those of the perinatal exposures, and the direct effect of common variants associated with EA was comparable to that of parental EA (Figure 4A top), highlighting the substantial contribution of genetic variation across the allele frequency spectrum to variance in cognitive performance. Importantly, we showed that inherited rare damaging coding variants explain more variance in childhood IQ in the general population than do *de novo* mutations (Supplementary Note 3), in contrast to what is observed in cohorts of children with neurodevelopmental disorders[21,32]. We further showed that the effects of both rare damaging variants and perinatal factors on cognitive ability attenuate as children age (Figure 4A bottom). This may be due to acute, time-limited effects during early neurodevelopment that can be attenuated by later plasticity, potentially in response to environmental influences. If this is true, one might predict that the attenuation of these effects with age are strongest in less deprived households. Testing this hypothesis will need larger datasets than studied here. In contrast to these other factors, the effect of parental EA on average IQ does not change across development, whereas the direct effect of EA-associated common variants increases (Figure 4A bottom), suggesting a cumulative influence. These observations have important implications for how we identify people at risk of poor outcomes in early versus in later life.

There are several limitations of this study. Firstly, our primary findings about changing genetic effects with time are based on measurements of IQ at only three time points in a single cohort (ALSPAC). There is a dearth of cohorts with longitudinal measures of IQ in childhood and adolescence with sufficient sample size and appropriate genetic data for us to attempt direct replication. Thus, we have relied on replication with school grades measured at two timepoints in ALSPAC (not totally independent of our IQ results, given the overlapping sample) (Extended Data Figures 2 and 4; Figure S5), or, for some analyses, a single measure of cognitive performance from MCS and UK Biobank (Extended Data Figure 7, Figure S1, Figure S6), which we found to show strong genetic correlations with IQ in ALSPAC (r_g 1.09, 95% CI [0.97-1.21]) and with adult cognitive performance[42] (r_g 0.89, [0.69-1.09]) and EA[45] (r_g 0.89, [0.72-1.08]). Broadly, the results from these replication analyses supported our primary findings in ALSPAC. Secondly, IQ tests are less reliable in early life[68], and those used in ALSPAC may be less accurate at measuring the tails of the distribution[69]. If the accuracy at the tails differed between the tests used at different ages, this could potentially have induced spurious interaction effects between the genetic scores and age. However, the fact that we see age interaction effects in opposite directions for common versus rare variants for the same trait, and replicate trends in other cohorts and with other cognitive performance measures, suggests that this is not a likely scenario. Thirdly, our assessment of perinatal factors affecting IQ is limited by sample size (so that we had to aggregate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

various maternal illnesses into a single variable) and by the limited range of gestational ages in ALSPAC; all children in this subsample were born after 32 weeks' gestation, thus excluding very and extremely premature babies who might be expected to have the greatest cognitive deficits[8], potentially explaining why we saw no effects of gestational age on the 5th centile (Figure 4B). A final limitation is that our results may be affected by non-random missingness within the cohorts and biased ascertainment and attrition across time, known to be present in both birth cohorts[35,70]. We have attempted to mitigate non-random missingness by imputation of missing IQ measures in ALSPAC (Figure S1) and by Mendelian imputation of unmeasured parental genotypes for our trio-based PGI analyses. To mitigate ascertainment bias and attrition, we incorporated weights in MCS to render the sample representative of the whole UK population. In general, our conclusions in ALSPAC were unchanged when analyzing IQ before versus after imputation, although the latter was obviously better powered, and there were some differences particularly in the findings from the quantile regressions (Supplementary Note 4**;** Figure 3BC *versus* Figure S3**;** Figure S4A *versus* S4B). However, one example of an analysis that is likely to have been impacted by ascertainment bias is the estimation of the fraction of the rare variant effect on IQ that is due to *de novo* mutations, as noted in Supplementary Note 3 (Extended Data Figure 6).

Our study prompts several strands of future work. Perhaps most importantly, future research should extend upon our findings to investigate how genetic and other factors might be best employed to identify children at risk of poor cognitive outcomes, so that interventions may be targeted at those who most need help. It should also seek to confirm the relevance of our observations to the incomplete penetrance of rare damaging variants in NDCs. If we had NDC cohorts with genetic and longitudinal phenotype data from both affected children and parents who appear to be clinically unaffected, we could directly test whether in fact, these variants were associated with reduced cognitive ability or educational achievement earlier in the parents' lives, and whether their effects on these traits attenuate as they aged. Finally, future work should seek to better understand why there are differential time-varying genetic effects on children depending on their level of cognitive ability, and why the effect of our rare variant burden scores attenuates with time. For example, is the latter observation purely driven by the expression patterns of the evolutionarily constrained genes that are more heavily weighted in this score (Extended Data Figure 5A), with these prenatally expressed genes becoming progressively less important in brain function as children age? Or is it that children with particularly marked cognitive deficits in early childhood, who appear to be particularly influenced by these rare variants (Figure 3C), are targeted for interventions which help to mitigate the effects of these rare variants over time? More broadly, our results suggest that heteroscedastic and time-varying effects of genetic variants on human phenotypes deserve more exploration.

Abbreviations

GWAS: Genome-wide association study; NDCs: neurodevelopmental conditions; PTV: protein truncating variant; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism; ALSPAC: Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children; MCS: Millennium Cohort Study; IQ: Intelligence quotient; PGI: polygenic index; EA: educational attainment; Cog: the cognitive component of educational attainment; NonCog: the non-cognitive component of educational attainment; RBV: rare variant burden; pLoF:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

predicted loss of function; TSC: tuberous sclerosis complex; QC: quality control; PCA: principal component analysis; MAF: minor allele frequency; HWE: Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium; LD: linkage disequilibrium.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Human Genetic Informatics group at the Wellcome Sanger Institute for assisting in the generation and preparation of the whole exome sequencing data for the ALSPAC and MCS cohorts and general technical support. We thank Alexandra Havdhal for helpful discussions.

ALSPAC: We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in ALSPAC, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses. The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (Grant ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. This publication is the work of the authors and Hilary Martin will serve as a guarantor for the contents of this paper. Genome-wide genotyping data was generated by Sample Logistics and Genotyping Facilities at the Wellcome Sanger Institute and LabCorp (Laboratory Corporation of America) using support from 23andMe. This research was specifically funded by the UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (Grant ref: 076467/Z/05/Z) and the Department for Education and Skills (Grant ref: EOR/SBU/2002/121). A comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the ALSPAC website: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf

MCS: We are grateful to the Centre for Longitudinal Studies (CLS), UCL Social Research Institute, for the use of these data and to the UK Data Service for making them available. However, neither CLS nor the UK Data Service bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of these data.

UKB: This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under application number 44165.

This research was funded in part by Wellcome (grant no. 220540/Z/20/A, “Wellcome Sanger Institute Quinquennial Review 2021–2026”). For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a CC-BY public copyright license to any author accepted manuscript version arising from this submission. D.S.M. is supported by a Gates Cambridge Scholarship (OPP1144).

Author contributions

DSM conducted all the analyses. DSM, MK, PD, QH, WH, and EW carried out data preparation and quality control with supervision by SL, MEH, and HCM. MK led the whole exome sequencing data preparation for ALSPAC and MCS with assistance from DSM and EW. PD conducted the *de novo* variant calling in ALSPAC and MCS and conducted variant quality control for the UK Biobank whole exome sequencing data. WH conducted sample quality control for the UK Biobank whole

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

exome sequencing data and assisted with preparation of UK Biobank exome data. OW assisted with selection of other non-genetic factors and generated PGI SNP weights. DSM, OW, QH, RA, MEH and HCM provided key intellectual input. HCM supervised the analyses and directed the study. DSM and HCM wrote the first draft of the manuscript with input from MEH. All authors read and commented on the final manuscript.

Data availability

Researchers can apply to access data from ALSPAC (https://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/access/), MCS (https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/dataaccess-training/data-access/), and UK Biobank (https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/enable-your-research/apply-for-access).

Online Methods

Cohorts

We report results from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC)[35,71], Millennium Cohort Study[36] (MCS), and UK Biobank cohorts.

ALSPAC

In ALSPAC, pregnant women with expected deliveries between April 1st 1991 and December 31 December were recruited in the greater Bristol area (formerly Avon county), resulting in an initial sample of 14,541 pregnancies enrolled into the study, of which 13,988 resulted in live births of children surviving to age 1. Data collected after the age of 7 was available for an additional 906 pregnancies from other phases of enrollment, which resulted in an additional 913 children that survived to age 1. At initial enrollment, 14,203 unique mothers were in the study, which increased to 14,833 unique mothers enrolled after the additional phases of enrollment (G0 mothers). The partners of G0 mothers (G0 partners) were also invited to participate in the study, of which 12,113 provided data at one point in the study and 3,807 are currently enrolled. From birth to early adulthood, mother and children were followed up with questionnaires and clinical and psychometric data collection across several time points. Biosamples used for genotyping and exome sequencing were obtained from most children and some of the mothers and fathers.

In the current study, data from 6,495 unrelated children with European inferred genetic ancestry (G1 children; described below) were used, along with genetic and/or survey data collected on 4,968 G0 mothers and 4,563 G0 partners. Please note that the study website contains details of all the data that is available through a fully searchable data dictionary and variable search tool: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/. Ethical approval for the study was obtained

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees. Consent for biological samples has been collected in accordance with the Human Tissue Act (2004). Informed consent for the use of data collected via questionnaires and clinics was obtained from participants following the recommendations of the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee at the time. At age 18, study children were sent 'fair processing' materials describing ALSPAC's intended use of their health and administrative records and were given clear means to consent or object via a written form. Data were not extracted for participants who objected, or who were not sent fair processing materials.

MCS

MCS recruited 18,552 pregnant mothers (2000-2002) using a sampling scheme to ensure a nationally representative sample across the UK, as previously described[36]. Mothers and children were followed longitudinally and had genetic data collected at age 14 from children, mother, and fathers where available. Ethical approval for the collection of saliva samples from these individuals as part of the sixth sweep was obtained from London-Central Research Ethics Committee. Genotype and newly generated exome data are available for ~8,000 and ~7,000 children, respectively (~13,000 and ~7,000 parents).

UK Biobank

The UK Biobank is a prospective cohort of over 500,000 individuals sampled throughout the UK between 2006 and 2010. Individuals have extensive phenotype data and genetic data including genotype array [72] and whole exome sequence data[73].

Cognitive performance measures across cohorts

In this study we used various cognitive performance and school performance measures across the three cohorts.

In ALSPAC, children had IQ measured at ages 4 (Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence), 8 (Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children), and 16 (Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence). Linked educational records are available, including national standardized exam scores in English, Math, and Science administered at the end of Key Stage 2 (Year 6 at around 11 years old) and Key Stage 3 (Year 9 at around 14 years old). To create a composite measure of academic performance, we standardized each score and, at a given Key Stage examination point, computed a one-factor model score using *factanal* function in R using the Bartlett method for scoring, explaining 74% and 77% of the variance at Key Stage 2 and 3 exams, respectively. The factor loadings and factor variance explained for the three exams were nearly identical at Key Stage 2 and 3 (Table S1), implying longitudinal invariance.

In MCS, children completed various cognitive performance tests at several ages. Those at later ages had a greatly reduced sample size, so we focused on those at ages 3 to 7. These included Bracken School Readiness at age 3, reading vocabulary at ages 3 and 5, pattern construction at

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ages 5 and 7, and word reading and progress in math at age 7. These were summarized into a single cognitive performance measure using a one-factor model score using the *factanal* function in R and Bartlett method for scoring, explaining 39% of the variance.

In UK Biobank, individuals were asked thirteen questions testing verbal-numerical reasoning in a limited time frame during the initial assessment visit. We used the sum of questions answered correctly as a measure of fluid intelligence (data field 20016.0), as has been used previously in genetic studies of cognitive ability [74].

Imputation of IQ values in ALSPAC

Imputation of missing IQ values was carried out using SoftImpute[75] using rank.max = 4.5 and lambda = 4.5. Before imputation, all variables were standardized to have mean 0 and variance 1. To assess the imputation accuracy obtained using three potential sets of variables (described below), we set 100 random individuals with measured IQ values at a given age to missing, conducted phenotype imputation, and calculated correlations between the true measured values and the imputed values, repeating this procedure 100 times.

We considered the following sets of variables:

1) Base set: sex (kz021), birth weight (kz030), maternal and paternal socio-economic groups (b_seg_m and b_seg_p), and IQ values at ages 4 (cf813), 8 (f8ws112), and 16 (fh6280).
2) Expanded set: base set plus development score at age 2 (cf783), sociability score at age 3 (kg623a/c), additional verbal and performance IQ at age 4 (cf811, cf812), nonword repetition and multisyllabic word repetition at age 5 (cf470, cf480), communication score at age 6 (kq517), Skuse social cognition score at age 7 (kr554a/b), cognitive scores at age 8 including Sky Search, Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy, nonword repetition, verbal and performance IQ, children communication checklist score (f8at062, f8dv443, f8dv444, 8dv445, f8dv446, f8sl100, f8sl101, f8sl102, f8ws110, and f8ws111, ku506a).
3) Auxiliary set: expanded set excluding base set variables.

When calculating the imputation accuracy using the expanded or auxiliary sets, we removed verbal and performance IQ at each age, although in practice very few children had only one measured at a given age.

For the imputation of the final IQ values, we used the expanded set and required that each individual had nonmissing values for at least one IQ test and at least 20% of the variables used for imputation. Final IQ values were standardized to mean 0 and standard deviation of 1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Genotype data preparation and imputation

ALSPAC

ALSPAC genotype data were generated and processed as described in [71]. We further removed individuals with high genotype missingness >3%. We restricted analyses to autosomal SNPs with MAF >0.5%, missingness rate <3%, and that had HWE test $p>1x10^{-5}$.

We used KING[76] for relatedness inference and removed 152 samples who had first degree relationships but were reported as coming from different families and another 16 samples who did match available exome sequencing data supposedly for the same individuals resulting in 8,831 children, 9,302 mothers, and 1,706 fathers. To identify a set of unrelated children, we iteratively identified the child with the greatest number of genetically inferred relatives (3rd degree or closer) and removed them, recalculated the number of inferred relatives per child, and repeated the first step until no children were inferred to have any relatives. This resulted in a total of 6,495 unrelated children with genotype array and whole exome sequence data.

To identify individuals of genetically inferred European ancestry, we projected samples onto 1,000 Genomes phase 3 individuals[77] using the smartpca function from EIGENSOFT version 7.2.1[78]. We used linkage disequilibrium (LD)-pruned SNPs (pairwise r^2 <0.2 in batches of 50 SNPs with sliding windows of 5) with MAF > 5% and removed 24 regions with high or long-range LD, including the HLA[79]. All ALSPAC samples projected onto European ancestry samples. We then performed PCA identically on the unrelated ALSPAC samples and projected all individuals into the PCA space.

Prior to imputation, we removed palindromic SNPs, SNPs that were not in the imputation reference panel, and SNPs with mismatched alleles. We imputed the samples to the TOPMed r2 reference panel using the TOPMed imputation server[80–82]. We kept well imputed common variants with Minimac4 R^2 >0.8 and MAF >1%.

MCS

MCS genotyped data were generated and processed as described in [83]. A set of unrelated individuals with genetically-inferred European ancestry were described in a similar manner to ALSPAC, as described previously [25]. We kept well imputed common variants with Minimac4 R^2 >0.8 and MAF >1%.

UK Biobank

UK Biobank genotype data were generated, processed, and imputed by UKB as described in [72]. Sample quality control consisted of excluding individuals with >3% missingness, inconsistent sex, sex aneuploidy, or withdrawn consent and relatedness was similarly calculated using KING as previously described. As in the other cohorts, we kept autosomal SNPs with MAF >1%, missingness rate <3%, and passed the HWE test (p-value>$1x10^{-5}$). To identify UKB individuals with genetically inferred European ancestry, we similarly projected samples onto the 1,000

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Genomes Phase 3 individuals and assigned individuals to a genetic ancestry based on their Mahalanobis distance to the nearest continental ancestry group centroid using the top 6 PCs. Those more than 6 standard deviations from the centroid along any axis were removed. Unrelated individuals were identified using the iterative exclusion procedure as previously described, resulting in 387,531 unrelated individuals. PCs were recalculated in this subset of unrelated individuals using smartpca as previously described, and related individuals were projected into this PCA space.

Calculating polygenic scores

SNP weights for polygenic scores were estimated using LDpred2-auto[84], which does not require a tuning dataset and automatically estimates the required hyper-parameters from the discovery sample[85]. The LD reference panel was computed from unrelated individuals from the target dataset for a set of 1,444,196 HapMap3+[86] variants[72]. GWAS summary statistics for EA[16] excluding 23andMe or 23andMe only (used for PGI_{EA} UK Biobank samples), EA-Cog and EA-NonCog[42] were matched with the list of overlapping SNPs.

Once the weights were generated, we scored individuals using the --score function in PLINK v1.9, which calculates the weighted sum of genotypes across a set of SNPs for each individual.

Mendelian imputation of parental genotypes

When an individual had at least one parent with genotype data in the cohort, we imputed the expected parental genotype of the other parent. To do so, we used *snipar*[20] across the three cohorts. We supplied relatedness inference using KING output and used the default options throughout. We used the previous weights derived from each GWAS using LDpred2-auto to calculate the PGIs in the full trios using the pgs.py script provided in the *snipar* package.

GWAS of IQ and cognitive performance

We used the linear regression function *lm* in R to conduct GWASs on the IQ measures pre- and post-imputation in ALSPAC and the cognitive performance measure in MCS on unrelated genetically inferred European ancestry individuals, controlling for 10 genetic PCs and sex. We removed variants with MAF<1% or missingness >2%.

Heritability and genetic correlations

We used both GREML-LDMS[39] and LD score regression[87,88] to estimate SNP heritabilities and genetic correlations from the summary statistics of the GWASs conducted on the IQ measures and external GWASs using the previously described LD reference panel on HapMap3 SNPs.

Other exposures impacting IQ in ALSPAC

We considered the following exposures: maternal and paternal educational attainment (EA), weeks born preterm, and a composite variable representing maternal illness. For educational attainment, we used the highest qualification reported by the parent and coded it as done

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

previously reported[16], with a university degree equalling 20 years of education, A levels as 13, O levels/vocational as 10, and Certificate of Secondary Education/no degree as 5 (c645a and c666a for the mother and father, respectively). Maternal illness was defined as a binary variable indicating whether or not a mother had at least one of the following conditions reported during the pregnancy in her obstetric clinical records: preeclampsia, anemia (DELP_1060), any diabetes (pregnancy_diabetes), or genital herpes, gonorrhea, syphilis, urinary tract infection, vaginal infection, or hepatitis B noted during delivery (DEL_P1050-1055). Weeks born preterm was coded as 40 minus the gestational age at birth in weeks assessed in a formal pediatric assessment (DEL_B4401). All variables were standardized to have mean zero and standard deviation 1.

Exome sequencing data preparation

Whole exome sequencing data quality control for ALSPAC and MCS cohorts was carried out by the Human Genetics Informatics team at the Sanger Institute as described in [89]. Briefly, GATK v4.2 was used to call short variants (SNVs and indels) in 11,994 samples from ALSPAC and 11,916 samples from MCS. Sample quality-control (QC) measures were employed to remove outliers on several metrics (e.g., heterozygosity, variant counts) and likely sample mismatches. To identify low quality variants (variant QC), a random forest was trained on pre-defined truth sets in each cohort individually. The random forest filtering was then applied in combination with genotype-level and missingness filters to balance precision, recall, true and false positive rates, and synonymous transmission ratios. Specifically, SNVs were filtered (genotypes set to missing) if they an allele depth (DP) < 5, a heterozygous allele balance ratio (AB) < 0.2, or a genotype quality (GQ) < 20 (ALSPAC) or < 15 (MCS); Indels were filtered using these thresholds: DP < 10, AB < 0.3, GQ <10 (ALSPAC) or GQ < 20 (MCS). The variants were excluded if they failed the random forest filtering or if the fraction of missing genotypes (missingness) exceeded 0.5. The final dataset included 8,436 children and 3,215 parents in ALSPAC and 7,667 children and 6,925 parents in MCS. Calling and QC of *de novo* mutations is described in the Supplementary Methods.

In UK Biobank, we performed quality control for whole exome sequencing data on 469,836 participants within the UKB research analysis platform. First, we split and left-aligned multi-allelic variants in the population-level Variant Call Format files into separate alleles using *bcftools norm*[90]. Next, we performed genotype-level filtering using bcftools filter separately for Single Nucleotide Variants (SNVs) and Insertions/Deletions (InDels) using a missingness-based approach. Specifically, SNV genotypes with a depth lower than 7 and genotype quality lower than 20, or InDel genotypes with a depth lower than 10 and genotype quality lower than 20, were set to missing. We further tested for an expected alternate allele contribution of 50% for heterozygous SNVs using a binomial test, and SNV genotypes with a binomial test p-value ≤ 0.0001 were set to missing. Finally, we recalculated the proportion of individuals with a missing genotype for each variant and excluded all variants with a missingness value greater than 50%.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Classification of deleterious rare variants

All variants were annotated using the MANE transcript from Ensembl[91]. In MCS and ALSPAC, rare pLoFs were defined as pLoFs annotated as high confidence by LOFTEE[34] that had CADD[92] (if SNVs) > 25, were not located in the last exon or intron, and had a gnom-AD[34] V3 allele frequency of $<3\times10^{-5}$ (up to ~ 5 occurrences in gnomAD r3 genomes & ~ 10x in exomes) and an in sample allele frequency of <0.1% among the unrelated set of children from that cohort[91]. Rare damaging missense variants were defined using identical allele frequency and CADD filters to pLoFs but were additionally required to have an MPC score[93] ≥ 2. Rare synonymous variants were defined with identical allele frequency thresholds.

In UKB individuals with inferred European genetic ancestry, we defined rare variants as those with a within-sample allele frequency <0.001%. For pLoFs, we retained only those variants defined as high-confidence PTVs by LOFTEE and CADD > 25 as in MCS and ALSPAC. For missense variants, we defined the damaging missense variants by including variants with REVEL > 0.5, AlphaMissense[94] > 0.56, and MPC > 2.

Calculating rare variant burden scores

We calculated RVB using the following formula:

$$RVB_{i,c} = \sum_{g \in G} I_{g,c}(i) S_g$$

where $I_{g,c}(i)$ is an indicator function for whether an individual *i* has a variant of consequence *c* in gene *g*, S_g is the fitness cost for heterozygous carriers of a pLoF allele in gene *i* estimated in Sun *et al.*[44] , and *G* is the set of all autosomal genes.

For analyses to ascertain the relative contribution of *de novo* versus inherited variants (Supplementary Note 2), we also calculated a separate rare variant burden metric which we call constrained variant count:

$$constrained\ pLoF\ count_i = \sum_{g \in constrained\ genes} I_{g,pLoF}(i)$$

where $I_{g,pLoF}(i)$ is an indicator function for whether an individual *i* has a pLoF in gene *g,* and *constrained genes* is the set of genes identified as constrained in [44].

Sampling and non-response weights in MCS

Sampling weights were developed by MCS to adjust for the nonrandom sampling scheme devised for the study[95]. We used the full UK sampling weights. Nonresponse inverse probability weights were developed for each sample as described previously[25]. Briefly, we used logistic regression to predict whether an individual had complete data for a given regression. We then extracted the predicted values for all individuals with complete data from the logistic regression which

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

correspond to their relative probabilities of having complete data, calculated the inverse of that value, and used that as the nonresponse weight. To combine sampling and nonresponse weights, we multiplied the two weights and incorporated them into the regressions.

Associations between genetic measures and traits

Cross-sectional associations for a genetic score and IQ were conducted using the *lm* function in R, restricting to unrelated samples with genetically-inferred European ancestry as follows:

$$IQ_i \sim G_i+PC1_i+..+PC10_i+sex_i$$

where G_i is the genetic score (PGI or RVB) for child *i* and PC1-10$_i$ are their genetic PCs.

Genetic scores, unless otherwise stated, were standardized to mean 0 and standard deviation 1. In trio-based analyses, the parental genetic values were similarly standardized and regression was conducted as follows:

$$IQ_i \sim G_i+G_{i,m}+G_{i,p}+PC1_i+..+PC10_i+sex_i$$

where $G_{i,m}$ and $G_{i,p}$ are the genetic scores for child *i*'s mother and father, respectively.

Mixed effect linear models were conducted using the *lme4* package in R[96]. The same covariates were used for the cross-sectional analysis with the addition of age, an age-by-genetic score interaction effect and a child-specific random intercept term as follows:

$$IQ_{i,t} \sim age_{i,t}+G_i+age_{i,t}*G_i+PC1_i+..+PC10_i+sex_i+C_i$$

where $age_{i,t}$ and $IQ_{i,t}$ are child *i*'s age and IQ at age *t* and C_i is a child-specific random effect intercept. Age was coded as age-4 such that the genetic predictor intercept estimate was equivalent to the effect at the first age at which IQ data were collected. In the trio-based analyses, an age interaction effect was additionally modeled for the parental genetic values as follows:

$$IQ_{i,t} \sim age_{i,t}+G_i+age_{i,t}*G_i+G_{i,m}+age_{i,t}*G_{i,m}+G_{i,p}+age_{i,t}*G_{i,p}+PC1_i+..+PC10_i+sex_i+C_i$$

For cross-sectional and longitudinal quantile regression modeling, we used the R package *quantreg*[97] and *rqpd*[98], respectively, using the same models as above. Mixed-effects model standard errors were determined using bootstrapping with 500 bootstrap replications.

For the academic performance score, the cross-sectional models were performed in the same way described above, with the addition of age at testing in weeks as a covariate (ks2age_w and ks3age_w). As there were only two timepoints, a slightly different longitudinal model was used for the linear modeling (Extended Data Figures 2 and 4) as follows:

$$(APS_{9,i}-APS_{6,i}) \sim G_i+age_{6,i}+age_{9,i}+PC1_i+..+ PC10_i+sex_i$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

where $APS_{6/9,i}$ and $age_{6/9,i}$ are the academic performance scores and ages of individual *i* at Year 6 and 9, respectively. The coefficient estimated for G_i in this regression is equivalent to G's effect at Year 9 minus that at Year 6 within an individual, i.e. the age interaction effect. To compare the effects for the quantile regression effect size estimates at Years 6 and 9, we conducted z tests between the effect sizes (Extended Data Figure 7A).

Marginal and conditional associations between genetic and other factors and IQ

To assess the associations between genetic and other factors with IQ (Figure 4), we considered both marginal and conditional models. For marginal models, we conducted the following regressions:

$$IQ_{i,t} \sim age_{i,t}+E_i+age_{i,t}*E_i+PC1_i+..+PC10_i+sex_i+C_i$$

where E_i is the given measure of interest. In Figure 4, the coefficient on the E_i term (i.e. the main effect) is shown in the top panel, and the coefficient on the $age_{i,t}*E_i$ term (i.e. the interaction effect) in the bottom panel.

As maternal and paternal EA are highly correlated, we modified the model for the effects of parental EA as follows:

$$IQ_{i,t} \sim age_{i,t}+EA_{i,m}+EA_{i,p}+age_{i,t}*EA_{i,m}+age_{i,t}*EA_{i,p}+PC1_i+..+PC10_i+sex_i+C_i$$

where $EA_{i,m}$ and $EA_{i,p}$ are the maternal and paternal EA respectively. Similarly, we fit the PGI_{EA} values for the child, mother, and father jointly in a trio model.

To calculate the variance explained by a given variable, we took the square of the standardized effect size of that variable's main effect. To calculate the total variance explained by two uncorrelated variables (e.g. RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ that have a correlation of -0.01, p=0.16), we summed the squares of their standardized effect sizes. To test for difference in effect size between the combination of $RVB_{Missense}$ and RVB_{pLoF} *versus* other factors, we used the square root of the previous variance explained estimate as the effect size estimate and determined the standard error for that effect size by summing the square of the standard error for each effect estimate and then taking the square root of the new estimate. We were then able to use z tests to compare the effect size estimates as done previously.

For the full joint models, we included all genetic and other measures in a single model, with a main and age interaction effect for each measure. Since only a subset of probands had information on gestational age, we fitted the full joint model both with and without the 'weeks born preterm' variable.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A. & Goldberg, L. R. The Power of Personality: The Comparative Validity of Personality Traits, Socioeconomic Status, and Cognitive Ability for Predicting Important Life Outcomes. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **2**, 313–345 (2007).
2. Johnson, W., Corley, J., Starr, J. M. & Deary, I. J. Psychological and physical health at age 70 in the Lothian Birth Cohort 1936: links with early life IQ, SES, and current cognitive function and neighborhood environment. *Health Psychol.* **30**, 1–11 (2011).
3. Strenze, T. Intelligence and socioeconomic success: A meta-analytic review of longitudinal research. *Intelligence* **35**, 401–426 (2007).
4. Schmidt, F. L. & Hunter, J. General mental ability in the world of work: occupational attainment and job performance. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **86**, 162–173 (2004).
5. Deary, I. J., Whalley, L. J. & Starr, J. M. *A Lifetime of Intelligence: Follow-up Studies of the Scottish Mental Surveys of 1932 and 1947*. (American Psychological Association, 2009).
6. Christensen, G. T., Mortensen, E. L., Christensen, K. & Osler, M. Intelligence in young adulthood and cause-specific mortality in the Danish Conscription Database – A cohort study of 728,160 men. *Intelligence* **59**, 64–71 (2016).
7. Deary, I. J., Cox, S. R. & Hill, W. D. Genetic variation, brain, and intelligence differences. *Mol. Psychiatry* **27**, 335–353 (2022).
8. Husby, A., Wohlfahrt, J. & Melbye, M. Gestational age at birth and cognitive outcomes in adolescence: population based full sibling cohort study. *BMJ* **380**, e072779 (2023).
9. Makharia, A. *et al.* Effect of environmental factors on intelligence quotient of children. *Ind. Psychiatry J.* **25**, 189–194 (2016).
10. Brynge, M. *et al.* Maternal infection during pregnancy and likelihood of autism and intellectual disability in children in Sweden: a negative control and sibling comparison cohort study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Lancet Psychiatry **9**, 782–791 (2022).

11. Plomin, R. & Deary, I. J. Genetics and intelligence differences: five special findings. *Mol. Psychiatry* **20**, 98–108 (2015).
12. Savage, J. E. *et al.* Genome-wide association meta-analysis in 269,867 individuals identifies new genetic and functional links to intelligence. *Nat. Genet.* **50**, 912–919 (2018).
13. Howe, L. J. *et al.* Within-sibship genome-wide association analyses decrease bias in estimates of direct genetic effects. *Nat. Genet.* **54**, 581–592 (2022).
14. Kong, A. *et al.* The nature of nurture: Effects of parental genotypes. *Science* **359**, 424–428 (2018).
15. Young, A. I. *et al.* Relatedness disequilibrium regression estimates heritability without environmental bias. *Nat. Genet.* **50**, 1304–1310 (2018).
16. Okbay, A. *et al.* Polygenic prediction of educational attainment within and between families from genome-wide association analyses in 3 million individuals. *Nat. Genet.* **54**, 437–449 (2022).
17. Nivard, M. G. *et al.* More than nature and nurture, indirect genetic effects on children's academic achievement are consequences of dynastic social processes. *Nat Hum Behav* **8**, 771–778 (2024).
18. Wang, B. *et al.* Robust genetic nurture effects on education: A systematic review and meta-analysis based on 38,654 families across 8 cohorts. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **108**, 1780–1791 (2021).
19. Demange, P. A. *et al.* Estimating effects of parents' cognitive and non-cognitive skills on offspring education using polygenic scores. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 4801 (2022).
20. Young, A. I. *et al.* Mendelian imputation of parental genotypes improves estimates of direct genetic effects. *Nat. Genet.* **54**, 897–905 (2022).
21. Deciphering Developmental Disorders Study. Prevalence and architecture of de novo

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

mutations in developmental disorders. *Nature* **542**, 433–438 (2017).

22. Martin, H. C. *et al.* Quantifying the contribution of recessive coding variation to developmental disorders. *Science* **362**, 1161–1164 (2018).
23. Martin, H. C. *et al.* The contribution of X-linked coding variation to severe developmental disorders. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 627 (2021).
24. Niemi, M. E. K. *et al.* Common genetic variants contribute to risk of rare severe neurodevelopmental disorders. *Nature* **562**, 268–271 (2018).
25. Huang, Q. Q. *et al.* Dissecting the contribution of common variants to risk of rare neurodevelopmental conditions. *bioRxiv* (2024) doi:10.1101/2024.03.05.24303772.
26. Chen, C.-Y. *et al.* The impact of rare protein coding genetic variation on adult cognitive function. *Nat. Genet.* **55**, 927–938 (2023).
27. Gardner, E. J. *et al.* Reduced reproductive success is associated with selective constraint on human genes. *Nature* **603**, 858–863 (2022).
28. Kingdom, R., Beaumont, R. N., Wood, A. R., Weedon, M. N. & Wright, C. F. Genetic modifiers of rare variants in monogenic developmental disorder loci. *Nat. Genet.* **56**, 861–868 (2024).
29. Weiner, D. J. *et al.* Polygenic architecture of rare coding variation across 394,783 exomes. *Nature* **614**, 492–499 (2023).
30. Wright, C. F. *et al.* Evaluating variants classified as pathogenic in ClinVar in the DDD Study. *Genet. Med.* **23**, 571–575 (2021).
31. Wolstencroft, J. *et al.* Neuropsychiatric risk in children with intellectual disability of genetic origin: IMAGINE, a UK national cohort study. *Lancet Psychiatry* **9**, 715–724 (2022).
32. Samocha, K. E. *et al.* Substantial role of rare inherited variation in individuals with developmental disorders. *bioRxiv* (2024) doi:10.1101/2024.08.28.24312746.
33. Wright, C. F. *et al.* Assessing the Pathogenicity, Penetrance, and Expressivity of Putative Disease-Causing Variants in a Population Setting. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **104**, 275–286 (2019).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

34. Karczewski, K. J. *et al.* The mutational constraint spectrum quantified from variation in 141,456 humans. *Nature* **581**, 434–443 (2020).

35. Fraser, A. *et al.* Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **42**, 97–110 (2013).

36. Connelly, R. & Platt, L. Cohort profile: UK Millennium Cohort Study (MCS). *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **43**, 1719–1725 (2014).

37. Wechsler, D. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale--Third Edition. *Front. Psychol.* doi:10.1037/t49755-000.

38. Niileksela, C. R. & Reynolds, M. R. Enduring the tests of age and time: Wechsler constructs across versions and revisions. *Intelligence* **77**, 101403 (2019).

39. Yang, J. *et al.* Genetic variance estimation with imputed variants finds negligible missing heritability for human height and body mass index. *Nat. Genet.* **47**, 1114–1120 (2015).

40. Trzaskowski, M., Yang, J., Visscher, P. M. & Plomin, R. DNA evidence for strong genetic stability and increasing heritability of intelligence from age 7 to 12. *Mol. Psychiatry* **19**, 380–384 (2014).

41. Mollon, J. *et al.* Genetic influence on cognitive development between childhood and adulthood. *Mol. Psychiatry* **26**, 656–665 (2021).

42. Demange, P. A. *et al.* Investigating the genetic architecture of noncognitive skills using GWAS-by-subtraction. *Nat. Genet.* **53**, 35–44 (2021).

43. Benjamin, D. J., Cesarini, D., Turley, P. & Young, A. S. Social-Science Genomics: Progress, Challenges, and Future Directions. (2024) doi:10.3386/w32404.

44. Sun, K. Y. *et al.* A deep catalogue of protein-coding variation in 983,578 individuals. *Nature* (2024) doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07556-0.

45. Lee, J. J. *et al.* Gene discovery and polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1.1 million individuals. *Nat. Genet.* **50**, 1112–1121 (2018).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

46. Li, M. *et al.* Integrative functional genomic analysis of human brain development and neuropsychiatric risks. *Science* **362**, (2018).

47. McElroy, E. *et al.* Feasibility of retrospectively harmonising cognitive measures in five British birth cohort studies. *UK: CLOSER* (2021).

48. Odd, D., Evans, D. & Emond, A. M. Prediction of school outcome after preterm birth: a cohort study. *Arch. Dis. Child.* **104**, 348–353 (2019).

49. Alterman, N. *et al.* Gestational age at birth and academic attainment in primary and secondary school in England: Evidence from a national cohort study. *PLoS One* **17**, e0271952 (2022).

50. Noghanibehambari, H., Salari, M. & Tavassoli, N. Maternal human capital and infants' health outcomes: Evidence from minimum dropout age policies in the US. *SSM Popul Health* **19**, 101163 (2022).

51. Granés, L., Torà-Rocamora, I., Palacio, M., De la Torre, L. & Llupià, A. Maternal educational level and preterm birth: Exploring inequalities in a hospital-based cohort study. *PLoS One* **18**, e0283901 (2023).

52. Baranowska-Rataj, A., Barclay, K., Costa-Font, J., Myrskylä, M. & Özcan, B. *Preterm Births and Educational Disadvantage: Heterogeneous Effects Across Families and Schools*. (CESifo, Center for Economic Studies & Ifo Institute, 2019).

53. Malanchini, M. *et al.* Genetic associations between non-cognitive skills and academic achievement over development. *Nat Hum Behav* (2024) doi:10.1038/s41562-024-01967-9.

54. McCall, R. B. Childhood IQ's as Predictors of Adult Educational and Occupational Status. *Science* **197**, 482–483 (1977).

55. Keage, H. A. d. *et al.* Age 7 intelligence and paternal education appear best predictors of educational attainment: The Port Pirie Cohort Study. *Aust. J. Psychol.* **68**, 61–69 (2016).

56. Wang, H. *et al.* Genotype-by-environment interactions inferred from genetic effects on

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

phenotypic variability in the UK Biobank. *Sci Adv* **5**, eaaw3538 (2019).

57. Paré, G., Cook, N. R., Ridker, P. M. & Chasman, D. I. On the use of variance per genotype as a tool to identify quantitative trait interaction effects: a report from the Women's Genome Health Study. *PLoS Genet.* **6**, e1000981 (2010).
58. Cao, Y., Wei, P., Bailey, M., Kauwe, J. S. K. & Maxwell, T. J. A versatile omnibus test for detecting mean and variance heterogeneity. *Genet. Epidemiol.* **38**, 51–59 (2014).
59. Ek, W. E. *et al.* Genetic variants influencing phenotypic variance heterogeneity. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* **27**, 799–810 (2018).
60. Wang, C. *et al.* Genome-wide discovery for biomarkers using quantile regression at biobank scale. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 6460 (2024).
61. Pasmant, E., Vidaud, M., Vidaud, D. & Wolkenstein, P. Neurofibromatosis type 1: from genotype to phenotype. *J. Med. Genet.* **49**, 483–489 (2012).
62. Tye, C. *et al.* Long-term cognitive outcomes in tuberous sclerosis complex. *Dev. Med. Child Neurol.* **62**, 322–329 (2020).
63. Bast, J. & Reitsma, P. Analyzing the development of individual differences in terms of Matthew effects in reading: results from a Dutch Longitudinal study. *Dev. Psychol.* **34**, 1373–1399 (1998).
64. Shaywitz, B. A. *et al.* A Matthew Effect for IQ but Not for Reading: Results from a Longitudinal Study. *Read. Res. Q.* **30**, 894–906 (1995).
65. Stanovich, K. E. Matthew Effects in Reading: Some Consequences of Individual Differences in the Acquisition of Literacy. *Journal of Education* **189**, 23–55 (2009).
66. Duff, D., Tomblin, J. B. & Catts, H. The Influence of Reading on Vocabulary Growth: A Case for a Matthew Effect. *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.* **58**, 853–864 (2015).
67. Tucker-Drob, E. M. & Harden, K. P. Early childhood cognitive development and parental cognitive stimulation: evidence for reciprocal gene-environment transactions. *Dev. Sci.* **15**,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

250–259 (2012).

68. Schuerger, J. M. & Witt, A. C. The temporal stability of individually tested intelligence. *J. Clin. Psychol.* **45**, 294–302 (1989).
69. Whitaker, S. Error in the estimation of intellectual ability in the low range using the WISC-IV and WAIS-III. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* **48**, 517–521 (2010).
70. Mostafa, T. & Ploubidis, G. Millennium Cohort Study. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10060140/1/mcs6_report_on_response.pdf.
71. Boyd, A. *et al.* Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **42**, 111–127 (2013).
72. Bycroft, C. *et al.* The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature* **562**, 203–209 (2018).
73. Backman, J. D. *et al.* Exome sequencing and analysis of 454,787 UK Biobank participants. *Nature* **599**, 628–634 (2021).
74. Davies, G. *et al.* Study of 300,486 individuals identifies 148 independent genetic loci influencing general cognitive function. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 2098 (2018).
75. Hastie, T., Mazumder, R., Lee, J. D. & Zadeh, R. Matrix Completion and Low-Rank SVD via Fast Alternating Least Squares. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **16**, 3367–3402 (2015).
76. Manichaikul, A. *et al.* Robust relationship inference in genome-wide association studies. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 2867–2873 (2010).
77. 1000 Genomes Project Consortium *et al.* A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature* **526**, 68–74 (2015).
78. Patterson, N., Price, A. L. & Reich, D. Population structure and eigenanalysis. *PLoS Genet.* **2**, e190 (2006).
79. Price, A. L. *et al.* Long-range LD can confound genome scans in admixed populations. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **83**, 132–5; author reply 135–9 (2008).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

80. Taliun, D. *et al.* Sequencing of 53,831 diverse genomes from the NHLBI TOPMed Program. *Nature* **590**, 290–299 (2021).

81. Das, S. *et al.* Next-generation genotype imputation service and methods. *Nat. Genet.* **48**, 1284–1287 (2016).

82. McCarthy, S. *et al.* A reference panel of 64,976 haplotypes for genotype imputation. *Nat. Genet.* **48**, 1279–1283 (2016).

83. Fitzsimons, E. *et al.* Collection of genetic data at scale for a nationally representative population: the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Longit. Life Course Stud.* **13**, 169–187 (2021).

84. Privé, F., Arbel, J. & Vilhjálmsson, B. J. LDpred2: better, faster, stronger. *Bioinformatics* **36**, 5424–5431 (2021).

85. Vilhjálmsson, B. J. *et al.* Modeling Linkage Disequilibrium Increases Accuracy of Polygenic Risk Scores. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **97**, 576–592 (2015).

86. Privé, F., Albiñana, C., Arbel, J., Pasaniuc, B. & Vilhjálmsson, B. J. Inferring disease architecture and predictive ability with LDpred2-auto. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **110**, 2042–2055 (2023).

87. Bulik-Sullivan, B. *et al.* An atlas of genetic correlations across human diseases and traits. *Nat. Genet.* **47**, 1236–1241 (2015).

88. Bulik-Sullivan, B. K. *et al.* LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nat. Genet.* **47**, 291–295 (2015).

89. Koko, M. *et al.* Exome sequencing of UK birth cohorts. *Wellcome Open Research* (2024).

90. Danecek, P. *et al.* Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *Gigascience* **10**, (2021).

91. Kersey, P. J. *et al.* Ensembl Genomes 2016: more genomes, more complexity. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, D574–80 (2016).

92. Rentzsch, P., Schubach, M., Shendure, J. & Kircher, M. CADD-Splice-improving genome-wide variant effect prediction using deep learning-derived splice scores. *Genome Med.* **13**,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

31 (2021).

93. Samocha, K. E. *et al.* Regional missense constraint improves variant deleteriousness prediction. *bioRxiv* 148353 (2017) doi:10.1101/148353.
94. Cheng, J. *et al.* Accurate proteome-wide missense variant effect prediction with AlphaMissense. *Science* **381**, eadg7492 (2023).
95. Plewis, I. Millennium cohort study first survey: Technical report on sampling (3rd. Edition). (2004).
96. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using lme4. *arXiv [stat.CO]* (2014).
97. Wan, C. & Zhong, W. Estimation and Inference for Multi-Kink Quantile Regression [R package MultiKink version 0.1.0]. (2020).
98. Koenker, R. & Bache, S. H. rqpd: Regression quantiles for panel data. *R package version 0. 6/r10* (2014).
99. DDG2P (Version 3.79). https://panelapp.genomicsengland.co.uk/panels/484/.
100. Pardiñas, A. F. *et al.* Common schizophrenia alleles are enriched in mutation-intolerant genes and in regions under strong background selection. *Nat. Genet.* **50**, 381–389 (2018).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figures

Extended Data Figure 1



Assessing quality of IQ imputation across ages and sets of variables in ALSPAC. A) Upset plot indicating number of individuals with a given set of measured IQ values. B) Correlations between masked measured and imputed values for 100 random individuals for 100 trials for three different combinations of variables (base, expanded and auxiliary variables, as described in Methods) used in the SoftImpute imputation for IQ measured at age 4, 8, and 16.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 2



Association between PGIs and academic performance in ALSPAC. The points show the effect at age 11 (main effect, left panel) and the difference in effects between age 14 and 11 (PGI x age interaction, right panel) and error bars show 95% confidence intervals. Results are shown for the children's PGIs not controlling (i.e. 'population model') and controlling (right) for parental PGIs. Population effect sizes are shown estimated in the full sample.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 3



Association between unstandardized rare variant burden (RVB) and IQ across ages in ALSPAC, estimated with a mixed-effects linear model. (i.e. as for Figure 2 but with unstandardized rather than standardized RVB scores.) Absolute effects and 95% confidence intervals estimated for the main effects and RVB-by-age-interaction effects for RVB calculated with three different consequence classes (pLoF, missense or synonymous), either pre- (top) and post-imputation (bottom). Results for the children's RVBs not controlling (i.e. 'population model') and controlling (right) for parental RVBs (i.e. trio model). Population effect sizes are shown estimated in the full sample (opaque) and in the subset of children with parental RVBs (translucent). The square brackets indicate significant comparisons highlighted in the text (z tests).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 4



Association between RVBs and academic performance in ALSPAC. The points show the effect at age 11 (main effect, left panel) and the difference in effects between age 14 and 11 (RVB x age interaction, right panel) and error bars show 95% confidence intervals. Results are shown for the children's RVB not controlling (i.e. 'population model') and controlling (right) for parental RVB. Population effect sizes are shown estimated in the full sample.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 5



Associations and enrichment of gene set-specific RVB across development. A) Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals estimated for main effects and RVB-by-age-interaction effects for each RVB in three mutually exclusive gene sets from Li et al[46]. These comprise genes in co-expressed clusters that are

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

more highly expressed in prenatal or postnatal brain or that are not detected in the study (non-brain). B) Main effects of RVB_{pLoF} on IQ (post-imputation) stratified by gene set, divided by the number of genes in the given gene set, with 95% confidence intervals. Red horizontal line indicates the average effect for RVB_{pLoF} across all genes. Asterisks indicate the p value for difference in per-gene effects between a given gene set and all genes using a z test, with * indication nominal significance and ** indicating bonferroni significance for 8 tests. C) Boxplots of the distribution of s_{het} (selection coefficient against heterozygous pLoFs in that gene[44]) per gene set, where a coefficient of 0 indicates no selection against heterozygous pLoFs in a given gene and 1 indicates a 100% reduction in fitness for heterozygous pLoF carriers relative to non-carriers. D) Ratio of the main effect for RVB_{pLoF} for the indicated gene set relative to randomly sampled gene sets with matching underlying s_{het} distributions (enrichment). E) As in (B) for gene sets defined using different FDR threshold cutoffs based on gene prioritization in [45] (5%, 1%, 0.1%) and by restricting to prioritized genes at a given cutoff that are also the closest genes to the prioritizing SNP in the Lee et al. GWAS. Results are shown before (black) or after (grey) excluding overlapping genes from the set of autosomal dominant neurodevelopmental condition genes with a loss-of-function mechanism from DDG2P (AD NDC). AD/AR NDC: Autosomal dominant/recessive neurodevelopmental disorder genes with loss-of-function mechanism from DDG2P[99], EA: educational attainment GWAS prioritized genes by Lee et al.[45] at 5% FDR threshold, Intelligence: intelligence GWAS prioritized genes from Savage et al.[12], SCZ: schizophrenia GWAS prioritized genes from Pardiñas et al.[100]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 6



Association between inherited and *de novo* pLoF variant counts in constrained genes and IQ in ALSPAC. A) Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals of RVB_{pLoF} and constrained pLoF count (see **Supplementary Methods**) on IQ across ages post-imputation. Black line indicates the y=x line. B) Standardized effects for the main and RVB-by-age interaction effect from a longitudinal mixed-effects model of constrained pLoF counts on standardized IQ when considering all variants or *de novo* mutations and inherited variants separately, both pre- and post-imputation. C) Variance explained by constrained pLoF counts on standardized IQ when considering all variants or *de novo* and inherited separately, both pre- and post-imputation. See Figure S1 for results from a similar analysis of cognitive performance in MCS.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 7



Influence of genetic measures on the tails of the phenotypic distribution using academic performance in ALSPAC and cognitive performance measures in MCS and UK Biobank. A) Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals for quantile regression of the 5th (red), 50th (green), and 95th (blue) percentiles of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

genetic measures on academic performance in Year 6 and Year 9 in the full ALSPAC cohort showing population effects. The square brackets with asterisks indicate significant age interactions. B) Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals for quantile regression of the 5th (red), 50th (green), and 95th (blue) percentiles and linear regression (OLS; gray) estimated from cross-sectional associations with cognitive performance measures in MCS and UK Biobank. The PGI_{EA} used in UK Biobank was constructed from an EA GWAS in 23andMe only [16], as the GWAS excluding 23andMe includes UK Biobank. We only considered PGI_{EA} as we could not construct PGI_{Cog} to apply in UK Biobank since we did not have an independent GWAS for cognitive ability in adults that excluded this cohort. The square brackets indicate significant comparisons highlighted in the text (z tests).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 8



Influence of parental common and rare variants on different quantiles of the IQ distribution post-imputation. Standardized effects and 95% confidence intervals for quantile regression of the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentiles estimated from mixed-effects modeling with post-imputation IQ at ages 4, 8, and 16 for parental PGI_{EA}, PGI_{Cog}, RVB_{pLoF} and $RVB_{Missense}$ estimated in a trio model.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.04.24313061; this version posted September 4, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 9



Summary of genetic trajectories across development, as inferred in this work. Mean PGI_{EA} (left) and RVB_{pLoF} (right) for individuals in the top (light blue) or bottom (brown) 5% percentile of IQ at a given age (inferred post-imputation of IQ). Note that the individuals in the top and bottom 5th percentile groups vary across development. Children at the top 5th percentile of IQ at age 16 have a higher mean PGI_{EA} than those at the top of the distribution at age 4, while those at the bottom 5th percentile have a relatively steady mean PGI_{EA}. In contrast, the quantile-specific age interactions for RVB_{pLoF} suggest that children in the bottom 5th percentile of IQ at age 4 have a much higher burden of damaging rare variants than those at age 16, while those at the top 5th percentile have a stable and low rare variant burden.

Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Tables 1-9

Supplementary Notes

Supplementary note 1: IQ imputation in ALSPAC

Supplementary note 2: Differential effects of rare variants in different gene sets on IQ

Supplementary note 3: Relative contributions of deleterious pLoF *de novo* and inherited variants to IQ

Supplementary note 4: Results of quantile regressions pre- versus post-imputation of IQ