Genealogy based trait association with LOCATER boosts power at loci with allelic heterogeneity

Xinxin Wang,[1,2,3] Ryan Christ,[1,2] Erica Young,[4,5,+] Chul Joo Kang,[4] Indraniel Das,[5, ++] Edward A. Belter Jr.,[5,+++] Markku Laakso,[6] Louis J.M. Aslett,[7] David Steinsaltz,[8] Nathan O. Stitziel,[4,9] Ira M. Hall[1,2,*]

1. Department of Genetics, Yale University, New Haven, CT, 06520, USA
2. Center for Genomic Health, Yale University, New Haven, CT, 06520, USA
3. Roy and Diana Vagelos Division of Biology and Biomedical Sciences, Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, MO, 63110, USA.
4. Center for Cardiovascular Research, Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, MO, 63110, USA.
5. McDonnell Genome Institute, Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, MO, 63108, USA
6. Institute of Clinical Medicine, Internal Medicine, University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio, FI-70211, Finland
7. Department of Mathematical Sciences, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, United Kingdom
8. Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, OX1 4BH, United Kingdom
9. Department of Genetics, Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, MO, 63110, USA.

+ Current affiliation: Food and Drug Administration

++ Current affiliation: Institute for Informatics, Data Science & Biostatistics, Washington University in St. Louis, Saint Louis, MO, 63110, USA

+++ Current affiliation: Collaborative and Integrative Genomics Lab at the McDonnell Genome Institute at Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, MO, 63108, USA

*Correspondence: ira.hall@yale.edu

ABSTRACT

A key methodological challenge for genome-wide association studies is how to leverage haplotype

diversity and allelic heterogeneity to improve trait association power, especially in noncoding regions

where it is difficult to predict variant impacts and define functional units for variant aggregation.

Genealogy-based association methods have the potential to bridge this gap by testing combinations

of common and rare haplotypes based purely on their ancestral relationships. In parallel work, we

have developed an efficient local ancestry inference engine and a novel statistical method (LOCATER)

for combining signals present on different branches of a locus specific haplotype tree. Here, we

developed a genome-wide LOCATER analysis pipeline and applied it to a genome sequencing study

of 6,795 Finnish individuals with 101 cardiometabolic traits and 18.9 million autosomal variants. We

identify 351 significant trait associations at 47 distinct genomic loci and find that LOCATER boosts

single marker test (SMT) association signal at 5 loci by combining independent signals from distinct

alleles. LOCATER successfully recovers known quantitative trait loci not found by SMT, including

LIPG, recovers known allelic heterogeneity at the *APOE/C1/C4/C2* gene cluster, and suggests one

novel association. We find that confounders have a more pronounced effect on genealogy-based

methods than SMT, and we propose a new randomization approach and a general method for

genomic control to eliminate their effects. This study demonstrates that genealogy-based methods

such as LOCATER excel when multiple causal variants are present and suggests that their application

to larger and more diverse cohorts will be fruitful.

INTRODUCTION

Genome-wide association studies have been extremely successful at identifying variants and genes

associated with common human diseases and other complex traits. The vast majority of studies have

used one or both of two statistical methods for trait association: common variant association using

single marker tests (SMT) and rare variant association using gene-based aggregation tests (Lee et al.

2014; Povysil et al. 2019). However, neither method is well suited for identifying rare variant

associations in noncoding regions where most causal variants are known to reside (Maurano et al.

2012), or for testing the combined association of multiple independent common and/or rare variant

signals (potentially with opposing effects) in cases of allelic heterogeneity (i.e., when multiple causal

variants are present at a locus). Region-based methods have been adapted to noncoding regions

using sliding window approaches, with some success (Li et al. 2019), but this approach is limited by

two major challenges. First, it is difficult to decide which intervals and sets of variants to test in

noncoding regions where knowledge of variant function is limited. Second, including nonfunctional

variants in these tests can greatly reduce power.

In theory, genealogy-based methods that seek to associate local ancestral clades with traits have the

potential to overcome these limitations through their ability to combine independent and potentially

opposing signals present in different regions of the local ancestral tree, without the need to define

functional regions or variant sets. Despite notable early progress (Zöllner and Pritchard 2005;

Minichiello and Durbin 2006), these methods have proven difficult to implement in practice due to the

computational challenges of genome-wide population-scale haplotype inference and the statistical

challenges of tree-based association testing. Recent advances in haplotype inference have eased the

computational burden of building local genealogies (Rasmussen et al. 2014; Zhang et al. 2023; Speidel

et al. 2019; Kelleher et al. 2019; Aslett and Christ 2024), making genome-wide trait association studies

feasible (albeit still computationally expensive). Building on this, several new methods have recently

been developed to test genome-wide local genealogies for trait association.

The first, ARG-Needle (Zhang et al. 2023), builds local genealogies using a scalable ARG-based

algorithm, samples a set of inferred clades that may harbor an unobserved variant, and adds the

genotypes corresponding to those clades to the list of genotypes tested in genome-wide SMT.

Although ARG-Needle is an extremely powerful method for reference free imputation, this "inferred

variant" SMT approach is not designed to combine independent genetic signals at loci with allelic

heterogeneity.

A second method (Link et al. 2023) uses the Li and Stephens (LS) model HMM implemented in Relate

(Speidel et al. 2019) to generate local expected genetic relatedness matrices (eGRMs) which are then

tested for association with the phenotype. Link et al. showed via simulations that this approach can

boost power when multiple independent causal variants are present at a locus, and their analysis of

two chromosomes in a Native Hawaiian cohort of 5,384 individuals found evidence for a robust (albeit

not genome-wide significant) BMI association signal with allelic heterogeneity. A more recent method

(Gunnarsson et al. 2024; Zhu et al. 2024) uses a highly scalable local ancestry inference engine and a

statistical testing approach similar to Link et al. (Link et al. 2023), and has been applied to gene-based

trait association in the UK Biobank. However, since both of the above methods are based purely on a

quadratic form test statistic, they struggle against the enormous multiple-testing burden incurred by

attempting to test all of the clades in a local tree, genome-wide.

Our method, LOCATER (Christ et al. 2025), employs a novel three-step procedure to test for the

association of local genealogical relationships with traits, including a traditional single marker test

(SMT), the newly developed Stable Distillation (SD) association test (Christ et al. 2022), and a quadratic

form (QForm) association test similar to the method used in Link et al (Link et al. 2023). SD is a

specialized association test that is much more powerful than quadratic form testing at assessing the

combined effects of many small clades marked by ultra-rare variants. When used in conjunction with

an optimized implementation of the LS model we developed to infer local ancestry, kalis (Aslett and

Christ 2024), our simulation studies have shown that LOCATER outperforms SMT in cases of allelic

heterogeneity, that this advantage is more pronounced as the number of causal variants increases and

their allele frequency decreases, and that the SD sub-test is the primary driver of power gains (Christ

et al. 2025).

Recent evidence suggests that allelic heterogeneity is widespread in humans. For example, a recent

massive parallel reporter assay (MPRA) study estimated that 10%~20% of expression quantitative trait

loci (eQTLs) have multiple causal variants in humans (Abell et al. 2022), and a previous study showed

that by inference, the proportion of all loci with allelic heterogeneity is 4 to 23% in eQTLs, 35% in

GWASs of high-density lipoprotein (HDL), and 23% in GWASs of schizophrenia (Hormozdiari et al.

2017). These and related observations (GTEx Consortium 2020) suggest that methods such as

LOCATER that leverage allelic heterogeneity to improve power have the potential to discover novel

trait associated alleles and genes not found by other methods.

Here, we use LOCATER to screen for trait-associated loci in the METSIM cohort. METSIM is a

population sampled cohort of Finnish men with whole-genome sequencing data and a large number of

cardiometabolic traits. Prior genome-wide association studies in METSIM have mapped many loci

associated with cardiometabolic traits and disease, including studies based on array-based genotype

data (Karjalainen et al. 2024; Davis et al. 2017), exome sequencing data (Locke et al. 2019), and

whole-genome sequencing data (Chen et al. 2021; Ganel et al. 2021). Due to a recent population

bottleneck and subsequent expansion, genetic diversity is somewhat reduced in Finland and there is a

larger fraction of deleterious variants at intermediate allele frequencies, facilitating trait mapping at

relatively modest sample sizes (Manolio et al. 2009; Locke et al. 2019). These features, coupled with

extensive prior knowledge of Finnish genetics, make this an ideal cohort to test new trait mapping

methods such as LOCATER.

RESULTS

The LOCATER method has been described in detail and tested on simulated data in separate work (Christ et al. 2025). Briefly, LOCATER involves a 3-step process, the first of which is to run local ancestry inference at each genetic marker. LOCATER uses an optimized version of the LS model and represents (Speidel et al. 2019). The second step is to identify small clades, which we refer to as "sprigs". Sprigs are independent predictors that were derived from the smallest possible inferred clades.

LOCATER tests discretely called clade genotypes in $X(\ell)$ and clades encoded in the local relatedness matrix in $\Omega(\ell)$. As in Christ et al. (Christ et al. 2025), we use $X(\ell)$ to only encode very small clades (sprigs): each typically has at most 10 haplotypes under it. LOCATER includes a sprig calling algorithm that clusters the genomic distances and calls sprigs with a greedy clique finding procedure. Then, at each genetic marker, LOCATER performs three association tests sequentially: (1) a standard SMT to measure the contribution of that specific marker; (2) Stable Distillation (SD) to measure the contribution of the inferred small clades based on inferred local ancestry; and (3) a quadratic-form based test (QForm) to measure the contribution of remaining ancestral relationships (Christ et al. 2025). Steps 2 and 3 use a residualized phenotype vector from the prior step. This, combined with the independence guarantees of SD (Christ et al. 2022), ensures that the resulting three p-values from SMT, SD, and QForm are mutually independent under the null hypothesis. We then combine the three p-values using an adapted version of Fisher's method that we call Maximizing over Subsets of Summed Exponentials (MSSE) (Christ et al. 2025). Multiple optimizations for computing efficiency were implemented throughout the LOCATER pipeline, with more details in Christ et al. (Christ et al. 2025) and the Methods section.

Applying LOCATER in this study required overcoming two key methodological challenges that were

not addressed in our prior simulation-based work (Christ et al. 2025): tuning our ancestry inference

engine for use with real-world whole-genome sequencing (WGS) data, specifically from the METSIM

cohort in Finland, and fully accounting for the effects of cryptic confounders in haplotype screening.

Although the specific details of these analysis steps will need to be worked out for any new

association study that uses LOCATER or similar methods on a new dataset, the approaches we

describe below may provide a general solution that helps guide future implementation of these

methods.

Parameter tuning for local ancestry inference

The LOCATER pipeline used for our prior and current work uses the Speidel version (Speidel et al.

2019) of the LS model implemented in kalis (Aslett and Christ 2024), which includes recent

developments to improve efficiency for genome-wide testing (Christ et al. 2025). As described in Aslett

& Christ (Aslett and Christ 2024), the LS model in kalis has two parameters: the effective population

size parameter (N_e), and the mutation probability (μ). Since N_e acts by rescaling the provided

recombination map in the LS model (Equation 3, Aslett and Christ 2024), we will refer to $-\log_{10}N_e$ as the

recombination penalty parameter. Analogously, we will refer to $-\log_{10}\mu$ as the mutation penalty

parameter.

To best represent local genealogy structure and propagate association signals, tuning these

parameters has been a focus of recent work on the LS model (Speidel et al. 2019; Jin and Terhorst

2023). Rather than using the data likelihood and expectation-maximization (EM) (Baum et al. 1970) to

select these two parameters for our METSIM analysis, Relate (Speidel et al. 2019) proposes using a

more relevant objective aimed at maximizing the performance of the LS model for their specific

purpose: capturing local variants in their inferred ancestral trees. Here, we propose an objective aimed

at optimizing the discovery power of LOCATER and other methods aiming to leverage allelic

heterogeneity. At a given locus, LOCATER works on matrices representing inferred local genealogy

derived from the modified LS model, and LOCATER boosts the power of SMT by applying Stable

Distillation (SD) and a quadratic form test (QForm) to the local genealogy representations (Christ et al.

2025). Thus, we selected HMM parameters that optimize the propagation of nearby signals using the

following objective function and sampling scheme.

We randomly sampled many genomic regions from the dataset and assigned a causal variant and a

target variant that are 0.05 cM away (see Methods for details). We then simulated a phenotype vector

with a strong effect driven by the causal variant and ran LOCATER at the target variant to measure

how well it could capture the signal driven by the nearby causal variant. We calculated the relative

signal as our metric, defined as

187
$$\frac{-log(p_{SD}^l p_Q^l)}{-log(p_{SMT}^m)},$$

where l is the index of the target variant and m is the index of the causal variant. p_{SMT} refers to p-

values returned by SMT, p_{SD} and p_Q refer to p-values returned by the SD and QForm sub-tests in

LOCATER, respectively. This objective focused on association signal propagation could be used to

train parameters for any association method targeting loci with allelic heterogeneity.

The trimmed mean surface for this relative signal showed that multiple parameters have comparable

efficiency and formed a plateau (Figure S1) (See Methods, see Table S3 for HMM parameters

evaluated). Our result aligns with a similar finding in Speidel et al. (Speidel et al. 2019) that high

mutation penalties combined with low recombination penalties are not well suited for haplotype

inference. After ruling out parameters that require a much longer time to run, we randomly picked one

parameter (recombination penalty of 6 and a mutation penalty of 8) on the plateau of the surface,

averaging across allele frequency bins. We also generated surfaces for different allele frequency bins

and confirmed that the shape of the surfaces remains consistent across allele frequency bins for both

the QForm and SD association methods.

Methodological improvements to the LOCATER pipeline to account for cryptic confounders

In our initial trait association experiments we observed deviations in the empirical p-value distributions

from LOCATER, with cases of both mild inflation and mild deflation across the 101 traits analyzed in

this study, despite using standard procedures to correct for population structure using principal

component analysis (PCA). In contrast, we did not observe inflation when running SMT on the exact

same data, nor did we observe inflation when running LOCATER on simulated phenotype data. This

suggests that genealogy-based trait association methods are especially sensitive to the effects of

cryptic confounders. We believe that this is due to the fact that there is a much greater degree of

correlation between nearby genetic markers for tree-based tests than for SMT, and that this causes a

much larger fraction of markers to be affected by confounders. Notably, this implies that these

confounders are also affecting the SMT results, just in a less readily detectable way.

To more precisely calibrate LOCATER results, we took inspiration from the phenotype rank-matching

procedure used in LOCATER. By default, LOCATER normalizes phenotypes by mapping ranks to

simulated Gaussian random variables rather than to fixed quantiles (Christ et al. 2025). This approach

avoids the subtle dependence induced when mapping to fixed quantiles. Under the assumption that

the original residuals are exchangeable, matching to simulated Gaussian random variables indeed

yields independent Gaussian phenotypes, which is assumed by the SD procedure underlying

LOCATER.

Building on this procedure, we repeated the rank-matching process for the same phenotype several

times, each version of the phenotype vector is a subtly different perturbation of the original phenotype.

We found that when we ran LOCATER across these different perturbations, the amount of inflation

observed via Q-Q plots differed moderately across perturbations. We believe this variation reflects the

fact that, by chance, different perturbations can have stronger or weaker correlations with

confounding factors such as population structure. Thus, the rank-matching procedure allows us to

modulate the correlation between the phenotype and confounding variables such that we can identify

a rank-matched version that is the least correlated with confounders. We therefore rank matched each

phenotype 100 times and chose the version that showed the least alignment with confounders for our

modified genomic control (GC) (see Methods). For each version of each phenotype, we conducted an

association test for ~30,000 evenly spaced variants and selected the version for which the p-value

distribution is the closest to a uniform distribution for both SD and QForm (see Methods). We found

that SMT p-values of all versions are consistently well calibrated, and SD and QForm p-values from

different versions will have substantially different deviations from the theoretical null (Figures S2, S3

and S4, column "Rank matched chosen", "Rank matched 2" and "Rank matched 3"). We also found

that the rank-matched phenotype chosen for the association study indeed has the least deviation and

eliminated the inflated body of the QForm p-value distribution. Our study is the first to report genome-

wide Q-Q plots for a genealogy-based association method and demonstrate calibration of that

method after rigorously adjusting for unobserved confounding factors.

We then sought to apply a more general genomic control to the p-values. In short, we fit a line to the

Q-Q plot of LOCATER -$\log_{10}$p of the selected rank-matched phenotype. We applied modified GC to p-

values using the slope and intercept of the fitted line (see Methods). This is similar to traditional

genomic control (Devlin and Roeder 1999), which only fits a slope to the Q-Q plot. By incorporating a

non-zero intercept, we can achieve a much more accurate fit to the tail of our null distribution of -

$\log_{10}$p. In order to gain a better intuition for the role of this intercept, it is helpful to think in terms of a

simple application like single-marker testing where each p-value corresponds to a Z-score. In this

setting, fitting a slope via classic genomic control to the Q-Q plot is equivalent to fitting a scale

parameter to the distribution of null Z-scores while keeping the location of that null distribution fixed at

zero. Introducing a non-zero intercept allows one to fit a null distribution to the Z-scores where the

location may also be adjusted. A similar procedure is described in Chapter 6 of Efron (Efron 2010) and

is standard in large-scale testing problems where the null assumptions are not satisfied (e.g., when

there is confounding). In Figures S2, S3 and S4, we applied this modified GC procedure to p-value

distributions from LOCATER-specific tests, and all distributions align with the expected distribution

much better (Figures S2, S3 and S4, row "SD modified GC" and "QForm modified GC").

GWAS of 101 traits

We then performed an association analysis of 6,795 METSIM individuals with 101 quantitative

metabolic phenotypes (see Table 1 for highlighted associations) using LOCATER. We also analyzed

these traits with SMT as our benchmark. All traits were residualized based on trait-specific covariates

beforehand, exactly as described in our prior exome based study of this same cohort (Locke et al.

2019). After filtering out indels and variants lacking ancestral allele annotation (see Methods), we

tested 18,949,137 autosomal variants. We used the top 10 Finnish-specific principal components as

background covariates for the association test. As mentioned above, during the pre-screening stage

we selected the phenotype vector perturbation that yielded the most calibrated Q-Q plot (see

Methods). Post-screening we applied modified GC to the resulting p-values based on the slope and

intercept (as described above, see Methods) in the Q-Q plot to ensure that both SD and QForm sub-

tests in LOCATER were well-calibrated.

In terms of computational performance, we ran LOCATER using a total of 4,780 jobs, each of which

was assigned 12 cores and 60 GB of memory in an academic high-throughput computing system. On

average, each job took ~32 minutes. This shows the feasibility of running LOCATER at scale on real-

world datasets. However, we note that LOCATER runtimes are sensitive to the number of genomic loci

that show promising p-values during the initial screening procedure, and will vary on a dataset-by-

dataset basis.

Considering that this genome sequencing dataset contains an abundance of rare variants, applying

the canonical genome-wide significance threshold (5×10^{-8}), which assumes one million independent

tests, is not appropriate. We used permuted phenotypes to estimate the effective number of

independent tests (Gao et al. 2008; Hoh et al. 2001) (see Methods). Based on the distribution of

minimum p-values, we estimated that the effective number of independent tests for SMT (T_{SMT}) is

6,977,438, and for LOCATER ($T_{LOCATER}$) is 3,551,616 ($\alpha = 0.05$). Based on T_{SMT}, the genome-wide

significance threshold for SMT should be 7.17×10^{-9}. Note that LOCATER and SMT used the exact

same set of variants, but that the p-values reported by LOCATER are more dependent across loci due

to shared local genealogies. For a clearer comparison with SMT in visualizations (e.g., Fig. 2A), we

further standardized the LOCATER p-value with

$$p_{LOCATER\ standardized} = p_{LOCATER\ modified\ GCed} * T_{LOCATER}/T_{SMT}$$

to make the LOCATER genome-wide Bonferroni threshold match that of SMT (7.17×10^{-9}). This does

not change the interpretation of LOCATER results since both the results and the significance cutoff

were rescaled to the same extent. To enable a direct comparison between SMT and LOCATOR, all

LOCATER results reported below are standardized.

After the screening, we identified loci of interest as genomic regions with one or more variants with

significant p-values by either LOCATER or SMT in any of the 101 traits. To compare LOCATER and

SMT signals at these loci, we defined a common shared association interval by merging the set of

significantly associated variants identified by either method, where the merging includes a 600 kb

flanking region for each variant. For convenience, we used a similar process to merge association

intervals across traits to obtain a nonredundant set of genomic regions, although in this case, we note

that independent signals for different traits may often be lumped together (see Table S2 for the full

set). Altogether, we identified 47 genomic regions with 351 associations across all traits.

When comparing the most significant signal for LOCATER and SMT at every identified association

(identified as $\min(p_{LOCATER\ standardized}) <$ threshold or $\min(p_{SMT}) <$ threshold), we found that LOCATER

and SMT identified many associations together (327 out of 351, Figure 1D). Many of these are in

canonical regions known to be associated with cardiovascular diseases, such as *PCSK9*, *APOB*, *LPL*,

LIPC, *CETP*, and the *APOE/C1/C4/C2* gene cluster. A small number of associations are significant

only in LOCATER (7 out of 351), and SMT found 17 associations that LOCATER did not (Figure 1B).

Notably, in the cases where SMT is more significant than LOCATER (321 out of 351 associations), it is

typically by a very small margin, whereas in the cases where LOCATER is more significant (30 out of

351), it is typically by a relatively substantial margin (Figure 1C). Our interpretation of this result is that

LOCATER has less power than SMT at trait associations resulting from a single causal variant because

of the statistical penalty incurred by attempting to incorporate nearby signals, but that LOCATER

greatly outperforms SMT at loci with multiple causal variants. In total, 5 of the 47 significant loci

(10.6%) show a signal boost from LOCATER, indicating that allelic heterogeneity is fairly common,

even in a relatively small sample of the Finnish population that is known to be depleted of genetic

diversity relative to most other human populations due to historical bottlenecks.

For the 30 associations with a more significant signal from LOCATER, we inferred the number of

independent causal variants based on the Stable Distillation (SD) and quadratic form (QForm) sub-test

signals from LOCATER (Table S5). These 30 associations reside in 13 distinct genomic regions. After

clumping associations that reside in the same genomic region (with 600 kb flanking regions) and

involve traits that are highly correlated to each other (r^2>0.8) in our dataset, there were 21

nonredundant associations. Of these, the LOCATER signal boost came from SD in 15 cases, and from

QForm in 6 cases.

Of the 15 nonredundant associations that were boosted by SD, 7 of them were boosted by only one

sprig, while the other 8 of them had 2-12 significant sprigs contributing to the signal. All significant

sprigs represent distinct haplotype groups in the local ancestry trees. As a result, the total number of

inferred causal variants for these 15 associations ranges from 2 to 13. We also report the variants that

are completely linked with significant sprigs in Table S4. For the 6 associations boosted by QForm, we

used iterative conditional analysis to infer the number of causal variants. One association became

insignificant after accounting for the lead marker, and signals in 5 other associations were diminished

after multiple (2-5) rounds of conditional analysis, suggesting that the total number of inferred causal

variants for these six associations ranges from 1-5.

Rare variant association methods such as STAAR (Li et al. 2020) also seek to assess the combined

effects of multiple causal variants at a locus, albeit using a very different approach than LOCATER. To

test whether STAAR could potentially detect the same signals as LOCATER, we ran STAAR on the 30

associations mentioned above for which LOCATER had a more significant p-value than SMT. Notably,

STAAR did not detect any of these 30 associations at genome-wide significance. A caveat to this

analysis is that there are many different ways to run STAAR based on window size, variant inclusion,

variant annotation and weighting criteria, and so we cannot discount the possibility that STAAR might

be able to detect some of these signals. For example, if STAAR is provided with variant impact scores

from CADD (Rentzsch et al. 2019), it is able to identify 4 significant associations at the LIPC locus,

albeit with far less significant p-values than SMT and LOCATER (>30 orders of magnitude difference).

These results suggest that the trait association signals detected by LOCATER are not easily captured

by current rare variant association methods such as STAAR. This is perhaps not surprising given that

such methods are designed and primarily used for gene-based association, where the target interval is

well defined and variant annotations are much more informative.

Below, we discuss some of the trait associations detected by LOCATER. We highlight five known

association signals that LOCATER detected but SMT did not, three cases where both LOCATER and

SMT detected the association but LOCATER provided a substantial boost in signal strength, and two

potentially novel association signals detected solely by LOCATER.

LOCATER recovers known associations at the *LIPG* locus

LOCATER recovered several known quantitative trait loci that would otherwise have been missed by

SMT in our present study (see Figure 1B), an example being the *LIPG* locus. *LIPG* encodes a well-

known member of the triglyceride lipase family of proteins and is primarily involved in the metabolism

of HDL (Jaye et al. 1999; Jin et al. 2003; Ma et al. 2003; Strauss et al. 2002). LOCATER recovered

genome-wide significant associations for triglycerides in medium HDL ($p=1.68 \times 10^{-9}$) and

apolipoprotein A-I ($p=6.51 \times 10^{-9}$), the major protein component of HDL particles. These two trait

associations are likely to be independent given that the lead markers are in low LD (r^2 of 7.29×10^{-4})

and the two traits are not significantly correlated (Pearson correlation of 0.132), which is consistent

with prior work (Davis et al. 2017). Neither of these associations was captured by SMT at genome-

wide significance. The smallest SMT p-value for triglycerides in medium HDL within a 1.2 Mb window

of *LIPG* was 4.71×10^{-7}, and that for apolipoprotein A-I was 2.15×10^{-8} (Table 1). The lead variant for

apolipoprotein A-I was also found in a prior study of Finns ($p=2 \times 10^{-10}$) using many of the same

METSIM samples analyzed here (Davis et al. 2017), and the lead variant for triglycerides in medium

HDL was found in a large study of 233 metabolic traits in 33 cohorts (Karjalainen et al. 2024).

We first discuss the *LIPG* association with triglycerides in medium HDL, where LOCATER detected a significant signal but SMT did not (Figure 2A). LOCATER's improved power over SMT in this case comes from the Stable Distillation (SD) sub-test (Figure S5C, D), which indicates contributions from multiple ultra-rare causal variants. We confirmed that the p-value distribution after modified GC aligns very well with the expected distribution, and the QQ-plot-based modified GC required to control confounding was minimal (Figure S5A, B).

The LOCATER SD sub-test has the advantage that p-values from all predictors (sprigs, defined as the smallest possible inferred clades) are independent under the null hypothesis. A Q-Q plot of all $-\log_{10}$ sprig p-values calculated at the lead marker shows that the top 12 sprigs significantly deviated from the expected distribution and thus contributed to the SD signal (Figure 2B). To highlight the coalescent path of significant haplotypes, we plotted a dendrogram of haplotypes based on hierarchical clustering of the similarity matrix at the lead marker, which showed that different significant sprigs were present within distinct clades in the local coalescent tree, and that haplotypes in the same sprig were very similar. Haplotypes in the same sprig have a very recent coalescence, and haplotypes from different sprigs have a much more distant coalescence (Figure 2D). This suggests that the SD sub-test captured signals from multiple distinct haplotype groups rather than multiple signals driven by a single variant.

Notably, SD is able to combine signals from individuals at both extremes of the phenotype distribution, which correspond to alleles with opposing effects. As expected, all samples within significant sprigs have phenotype values that are far from the mean (Figure 2C). Individuals within each sprig resided on the same side of the distribution, but different sprigs could reside on different sides.

We next sought to visualize variants influencing the SD signal at this locus using residual analysis. The

first phase involved conducting SMT based on a phenotype that projected out the lead marker

genotype vector, removing its effect on the signal. We defined the p-values resulting from this

experiment as p_S. The second phase involved performing SMT based on the residualized phenotype

orthogonal against the lead marker SMT and SD signal, yielding a second set of p-values defined as

p_D. The difference between p_S and p_D shows the contribution of genomic variants to the SD signal. We

plotted -$\log_{10}p_S$ and -$\log_{10}p_D$ on a Manhattan plot (Figure S5E) and a scatter plot (Figure S5F),

highlighting variants where $p_S < 1 \times 10^{-3}$ and $p_D > 10 * p_S$. This experiment shows that SD captured

signals from many variants scattered in an extensive genomic region (> 10 Mb), supporting the

success of our ancestry inference model tuning procedure.

By plotting principal components (PCs), we confirmed that SD-significant individuals do not form a

tight cluster in any specific area of the plot, so this association signal was not obviously confounded

by population structure (Figure S5G).

We now turn to the second *LIPG* association, apolipoprotein A-I. LIPG is known to regulate serum

apolipoprotein A-I (Jaye et al. 1999; Ishida et al. 2003). A previous study in METSIM (Davis et al. 2017)

showed that our lead marker is associated with five HDL subclass traits and apolipoprotein A-I (Figure

3A), and in this study, LOCATER recovered the signal in apolipoprotein A-I, but SMT missed it.

LOCATER gained its advantage over SMT from SD (Figure S6A). The Q-Q inflation plot of sprig -$\log_{10}$

p-values showed that 6 sprigs contributed to the signal (Figure S6B). Similar to the first *LIPG*

association result discussed above, haplotypes from the same sprig have a very recent coalescence

and those from different sprigs have a more distant coalescence (Figure S6C), and samples within

outlying sprigs had phenotypes that were far away from the median and on different sides of the

distribution (Figure 3B).

In summary, LOCATER was able to discover two independent trait associations at *LIPG* based on the

presence of allelic heterogeneity, where both trait associations were missed by SMT. In addition to

these two examples at *LIPG*, three additional trait associations at other known loci were also detected

by LOCATER but not by SMT. The association with HDL2 cholesterol on Chr11 (Figure S13) and the

association of monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA) on Chr7 (Figure S9) were also identified based on

SD signals and also showed consistent phenotype values across relevant individuals. Both

associations were boosted by only one sprig, and phenotype values of individuals assigned to

significant sprigs are all far from the mean of the corresponding phenotype distribution. There was

also an association with 'large VLDL particle concentration' on chromosome 7 (Figure S11) that was

boosted by QForm; however, this association is somewhat less confident than others given that only

one variant crossed the significance threshold and that a substantial post-hoc adjustment for

confounding was required to calibrate the corresponding QQ-plot.

A potentially new association on Chr11

LOCATER found an association of 'triglycerides in medium VLDL' on chromosome 11, while SMT did

not (Figure 4A), and the GWAS catalog (Sollis et al. 2023) did not report any known association with

correlated traits. LOCATER was much more significant than SMT due to the SD sub-test, implying a

contribution from ultra-rare haplotypes (Figure S7C). The SD signal was distributed evenly across the

entire ~1 Mb locus (Figure 4B). Among all sprigs called at the lead marker position, the top five sprigs

significantly deviated from the expected distribution (Figure 4C). The phenotype distribution of

individuals in significant sprigs showed that they are outliers, and that trait outliers are found at both

extremes of the distribution (Figure 4D). The dendrogram from hierarchical clustering of the local

similarity matrix, with highlighted coalescent paths for significant haplotypes, showed that the signal was not coming from a larger clade but rather from multiple distinct small groups of haplotypes (Figure 4E). These results suggest that LOCATER is combining association signals from 5 rare haplotype groups with distinct genealogical histories, while these signals were not detectable by standard SMT.

We performed residual analyses to investigate the contribution of genomic variants to the SD signal and noticed many variants with drastically different p_S and p_D (i.e., substantial contribution to the SD signal). These variants extend across a mega-base long genomic distance, highlighting LOCATER's ability to merge sub-significant signals from a large genomic region.

We investigated this association and found that the lead marker resides in a predicted transcription factor (TF) binding site for KLF16 and KLF9. KLF9 is a metabolic TF acting in the liver, where its increased expression promotes gluconeogenesis and alters glucose and lipid homeostasis (Cui et al. 2019). The adjacent 1.2 Mb region includes CASP1, CASP4, CASP5, CASP12, CARD18, and CARD16. CASP1 (encoding Caspase-1) has a core role as the central effector of the canonical inflammasome, and there is evidence from mouse studies that CASP1/inflammasome signaling can raise circulating TGs by increasing hepatic VLDL/apoB secretion, and may also impair TG clearance via IL-1–mediated suppression of LPL in adipose tissues (Bartolomé et al. 2008; van Diepen et al. 2013). The other genes in this region encode inflammasome-related caspases and CARD-family regulators, some of which enhance and others suppress CASP1–dependent inflammatory signaling. The genic content of this locus supports the plausibility of its association with 'triglycerides in medium VLDL'. On the other hand, eQTLs for CASP1 and CASP4 have been identified in METSIM adipose tissue (Raulerson et al. 2019), but the lead eQTL variants are not strongly linked to the lead variant from LOCATER ($r^2 < 0.03$) and are not associated with any traits in our study.

In addition, we detected a second potentially novel association with HDL3 cholesterol on Chr21

(Figure S14). This association was attributable to SD combining signals from a single sprig. However,

in this case, only one variant is significant, and even though the lead marker is genotyped in gnomAD,

it resides in a 305 bp recent segmental duplication within which variant calling is likely to be prone to

artifacts, making this result less confident than others presented here.

LOCATER boosted a classic association at the apolipoprotein gene cluster

LOCATER recovered a known association for remnant cholesterol at the well studied *APOE/C1/C4/C2*

gene cluster on chromosome 19 (Richardson et al. 2022; Karjalainen et al. 2024). This same locus is

associated with various other traits that are correlated with remnant cholesterol (Table S2). Although

SMT also achieved genome-wide significance for remnant cholesterol, LOCATER's advantage over

SMT implies that there are additional signals from other haplotypes (Figure 5A).

In contrast to the other examples outlined above, LOCATER's advantage over SMT in this case came

from QForm (Figure 5B, Figure S8C), indicating that the causal haplotypes are likely to be more

common (i.e., not ultra-rare). Unlike the SD subtest, QForm does not inherently provide direct insight

into the number of distinct haplotypes and how they relate to each other in the genealogy; however,

using multiple rounds of conditional analysis with SMT, we confirmed that there are at least four

groups of causal variants. We iteratively conditioned on the genotype vector of lead markers, and

observed that a significant association signal ($p < 3.52 \times 10^{-5}$) persisted through three rounds of

conditional analyses (Figure 5C, D). We found that the variants used as covariates in the conditional

analyses are not in LD with each other, and one of them (Chr19-44908822-C-T) is the most significant

known marker associated with remnant cholesterol (Figure 5D, black arrow). These results show that

LOCATER effectively combined signals from four distinct causal haplotypes, resulting in a substantial

boost in power.

There are also two additional examples of known loci found by both LOCATER and SMT, where

LOCATER has a more significant p-value (implying the presence of multiple causal variants): the

association with 'triglycerides in small HDL' on chromosome 20 (Figure S10) and the association of

triglycerides in VLDL on chromosome 7 (Figure S12). In both of these cases the power boost was

driven by the SD sub-test.

DISCUSSION

We have used our new genealogy-based trait association method, LOCATER, to perform a genome-

wide screen in a cohort of 6,795 Finnish individuals with deep cardiometabolic trait measurements and

whole-genome sequencing data. In total we identified 30 associations at 13 known GWAS loci at

which LOCATER was genome-wide significant and provided a clear power boost over SMT, 7

associations of which (at 5 loci) were not genome-wide significant by SMT and would have been

missed. LOCATER also identified two novel association signals, one of which is fairly compelling

based on the underlying haplotype structure. At each locus, dissection of the association signals and

underlying haplotype structure revealed evidence for allelic heterogeneity in the form of multiple

independent association signals present in distinct portions of the local ancestry tree. Moreover, in the

process of optimizing LOCATER's performance on real world genomic data, we made several key

methodological improvements, including a novel approach for tuning ancestry inference parameters

for trait association and a rigorous approach to account for the effects of cryptic confounders.

Genealogy based trait association has been a topic of interest for nearly two decades. Seminal early

work established its potential value using theory, simulations, and single-locus analysis (Minichiello

and Durbin 2006; Zöllner and Pritchard 2005), yet the practical advantages of these methods are only

now becoming accessible due to recent advances in scalable tree inference (Wong et al. 2024;

Kelleher et al. 2016; Zhang et al. 2023; Gunnarsson et al. 2024; Speidel et al. 2019; Deng et al. 2024),

"clade association" methods capable of testing unobserved variants inferred by imputation (Zhang et

al. 2023), and "global tree association" methods capable of combining association signals across

multiple causal variants (Link et al. 2023; Christ et al. 2025, 2022; Zhu et al. 2024). In particular, our

genome-wide analysis of 101 traits across 6,795 individuals greatly exceeds the scale and statistical

power of two prior efforts (Minichiello and Durbin 2006; Link et al. 2023) that applied global tree

association to human data, both of which focused on smaller cohorts, a single trait, and a subset of

the genome – a single locus in the former case, and two chromosomes in the latter – and failed to

detect any trait associations at genome-wide significance. More recently, Palamara and colleagues

developed a new ARG inference engine and performed a gene-based association study with traits in

the UK Biobank samples using a quadratic form test statistic (Zhu et al. 2024; Gunnarsson et al. 2024).

This approach has impressive scalability and shows promise for improving gene-based testing;

however, it remains unclear how this approach can be extended to genome-wide association testing

while maintaining power, and whether it is well calibrated on real-world data with population structure.

Here, we have used Stable Distillation and QForm to perform global tree association genome-wide, at

virtually all non-singleton SNPs discovered by WGS, performed rigorous empirical correction for

cryptic confounders, and identified hundreds of genome-wide significant trait associations. In the

process, we encountered and overcame several key methodological obstacles related to parameter

tuning and statistical calibration that have not previously been examined at this level of detail. These

lessons are applicable to any haplotype association method, not just LOCATER, and thus this work

may serve as a roadmap for future efforts.

Our work also demonstrates that genealogy based methods such as LOCATER show considerable

promise for increasing the power of genetic association studies. LOCATER's ability to combine

multiple signals resulted in more significant p-values over SMT at 8.5% of genome-wide significant

associations and for 10.6% of loci, and the difference in p-value exceeded an order of magnitude

difference in 7 of these associations at 5 loci. The fact that such notable power gains are observed in

the Finnish population – one of the least diverse human populations studied to date – suggests that

our results are likely to be an underestimate of the performance improvements possible in more

diverse populations that harbor more causal alleles per locus. LOCATER may be especially valuable

for multi-ethnic studies, where allelic heterogeneity is greatest, and where standard association

methods have shown poor performance.

Relatively few of the 30 association signals for which LOCATER provided a power boost are likely to

have been captured by other methods. None of these signals were captured by STAAR using a

window-based screening approach that has been employed previously for rare variant association

studies (although we note that STAAR is not explicitly designed nor typically used for non-coding

studies). Moreover, although two recently developed methods (Link et al. 2023; Gunnarsson et al.

2024; Zhu et al. 2024) have some similarities with LOCATER, they rely on a quadratic form test for

global tree association, whereas LOCATER uses Stable Distillation (SD) in addition to QForm. We have

previously shown via simulation-based studies that SD and Qform have complementary strengths and

weaknesses: QForm excels when the causal variants are more common and reside further up in the

tree, and SD excels at combining ultra-rare variants residing in small clades at the bottom of the tree

(Christ et al. 2025; Wang 2024). LOCATER tests SD and QForm sequentially, such that QForm is at a

disadvantage for detecting signals. Nonetheless, given the complementary nature of the two tests, it is

interesting to note that for the 21 non-redundant trait associations (accounting for correlated traits)

where LOCATER obtained more significant results than SMT alone, 15 were boosted by SD and 6 by

QForm. This, along with our in-depth analysis of ten loci, suggests that the SD test unique to

LOCATER is providing substantial value beyond QForm by efficiently combining association signals

across many clades. We expect the relative value of SD to increase as allelic heterogeneity increases,

as in more diverse populations or for traits under negative selection. Despite these promising results,

global tree association remains a difficult statistical problem, and we expect that future work in this

area will continue to yield significant power improvements.

Tree-based trait association also presents unique challenges relative to SMT and gene-based testing.

Perhaps the most difficult aspect of this study was the detailed work required to optimize haplotype

inference and to control for cryptic confounders, both of which are important practical considerations

for future studies. First, it is well known that the performance of the LS model HMMs is sensitive to the

mutation and recombination penalty parameters, and prior studies have used different approaches for

selecting them. We developed a novel tuning approach that optimizes regional trait association power

at a distance of 0.05 cM rather than local variant imputation as in Relate (Speidel et al. 2019), and we

explored a broad range of potential parameters to optimize haplotype inference for this specific

population and dataset. Optimizing for trait association power rather than imputation ensures that the

resulting haplotype representations used carry long-range information required to combine

independent signals at loci with allelic heterogeneity.

Second, we found that genealogy-based methods such as LOCATER are extremely sensitive to

cryptic confounders, much more so than standard SMT, and that special measures are required to

control for these effects. We studied this issue in detail and devised two new approaches to control

for type I error: permuted rank matching of phenotype data to simulated Gaussian random variables to

produce independent Gaussian phenotypes with minimal confounding, and a more general type of

genomic control that fits both a slope and an intercept. In combination, these measures led to a well

calibrated analysis in our study and are likely to be applicable to future genealogy based screens as

well. Interestingly, the confounding effect of cryptic confounders was only apparent in our LOCATER

analysis, whereas SMT appeared to be well calibrated after standard PCA-based measures. This

result suggests that unadjusted confounders may plague SMT results to a larger extent than predicted

from the body of QQ plots alone. We hypothesize that LOCATER is more sensitive to confounders

than SMT because of the high correlation between proximal inferred genealogies along the genome.

For intuition, consider the simple case where there is a small sub-population within a dataset that has

some environmental exposure that affects the phenotype of interest. There will be variants that tag

that sub-population throughout the genome. Every local ancestral tree inferred near those confounded

variants will have a clade marking that sub-population and thus have inflated test statistics. Thus, any

potential confounders will affect LOCATER at many more markers than SMT, making the resulting

inflation obvious in Q-Q plots.

Although there is more work to be done before these methods are mature, the work presented here –

in combination with our prior simulation based results (Christ et al. 2025) and recent work from others

(Link et al. 2023; Gunnarsson et al. 2024; Zhu et al. 2024) – suggests that genealogy-based trait

association methods such as LOCATER are finally ready to fulfill their long-promised potential as

practical tools for genome-wide association studies.

METHODS

The METSIM study

METSIM is a single-site study investigating cardiometabolic disorders and related traits in 10,197 men

randomly selected from the population register of Kuopio, Eastern Finland, aged 45 to 73 years at

initial examination from 2005 to 2010 (Laakso et al. 2017). All participants provided informed consent.

The phenotype data used for the work described here were adapted from Locke et al. (Locke et al.

2019), in which the authors accounted for different factors (including trait specific background

covariates) during linear regression of the raw phenotypes, and used rank-based inverse normal

transformation.

Whole-genome sequencing, data processing, and variant calling

DNA samples were extracted from blood. We constructed DNA libraries with automated Kapa Hyper

PCR free, automated TruSeq PCR free, Kapa Hyper PCR free, or TruSeq PCR free kit, with target

insert size varying from 260 to 475. The libraries were sequenced with Illumina HiSeq 2000, 2500, X10,

or NovaSeq 6000, generating 2 x 151-bp paired-end sequencing data.

We performed alignment and data processing using the "functional equivalence" pipeline (Regier et al.

2018). Briefly, we aligned reads to the GRCh38 human reference genome using bwa-mem (v.0.7.15)

and used Picard MarkDuplicates (v.2.4.1; http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard) to remove duplicate

reads. We excluded samples that had estimated contamination >5% or that were likely to represent

sample swaps (verifyBamID v.1.1.3). We also required a discordant rate of <5%, haploid coverage

≥19.5X, inter-chromosomal rate of <5%, and first-of-pair mismatch rate of <5%.

We performed variant calling with HaplotypeCaller in GATK (v.3.5) and concatenated the output into

full single sample GVCFs (Picard MergeVcfs, v2.4.1). Since standard joint genotyping with GATK

GenotypeGVCFs function could not scale to our CCDG callset, we used ReblockGVCFs (GATK

v.4.2.2.0) to decrease GVCF file sizes for future joint analysis in Hail. We used the ValidateVariants

function to ensure the quality of the reblocking process. We then used the VariantDatasetCombiner

function in Hail (v.0.2.78) to combine GVCFs from each sample into multi-sample VariantDataset (VDS)

files before running GnarlyGenotyper (unpublished version from Docker image gcr.io/broad-dsde-

methods/gnarly_genotyper:hail_ukbb_300K, image hash ID: 7cc8cfa6e9af; created April 2020;

received August 2021) for joint genotyping and VQSR to annotate variant quality. Finally, we converted

VDS files into MatrixTable (MT) files (Hail v.0.2.97) and decomposed multi-allelic variants into bi-allelic

variants.

To QC the variant callset, we excluded samples that had a low het/hom ratio (<5 MADs less than the

median), low sequencing depth (number of bases with depth >10 is <20 MADs less than the median),

or excessive number of singleton variants (>20 MADs more than the median), where each of these

criteria was applied separately to each self-reported ancestry group. We also removed samples with

fewer than 580,000 insertions or deletions in joint variant calling, genetic-phenotypic sex mismatches,

withdrawal of consent, sample swaps, or inheritance inconsistencies and other sample identity issues.

The maximal independent set of these samples was calculated in Hail using

`hl.maximal_independent_set` and individuals up to second-degree related were removed. For variant

level QC, we flagged genotype calls with genotype quality (GQ) < 20, depth (DP) < 10, and

heterozygous calls with allele balance (AB) ≤ 0.2 or ≥ 0.8 as low quality, and filtered out variants that

had AS_VQSLOD < 0 or that had a high proportion (>95%) of missing or low quality genotypes.

Phasing and variant annotation

We performed a more stringent variant quality control for phasing. After exporting Hail MT files to

VCFs (Hail 0.2.95), we selected PASS and non-singleton variants and filtered out sites with high quality

genotype call rate < 90% or Hardy-Weinberg $p < 10^{-7}$ (one-sided p-value for excess heterozygotes).

METSIM samples were phased with other WashU CCDG samples without a reference panel with

Eagle2 (v.2.4.1). Due to memory restraints, we divided chromosomes into 20 Mb chunks with 2 Mb

overlaps on both ends. Phasing was done with default options except for a bigger `Kpbwt` value (200k)

for better phasing accuracy. Missing genotypes were imputed during phasing.

Ancestral allele encoding

The Speidel version of the LS model (Speidel et al. 2019) assumes the ancestral allele is known for all

variants and uses that information in its ancestry inference. For this study, we used ancestral allele

calls obtained via a 10-way EPO alignment of primates from Ensembl v106 (The 1000 Genomes

Project Consortium et al. 2015). With `bcftools`, we updated the REF and ALT alleles and the genotype

fields in VCF files to make the REF allele the ancestral allele. Encoding VCFs with the ancestral allele in

large-scale data requires ancestral allele calls in FASTA format. Explicitly, we downloaded the human

ancestral genome FASTA from 10-way EPO alignment of primates from Ensembl v106 available at

https://ftp.ensembl.org/pub/release-

106/fasta/ancestral_alleles/homo_sapiens_ancestor_GRCh38.tar.gz created on March 19, 2022. In the

FASTA file, lowercase indicates lower quality. For simplicity, all lowercase letters were converted to

uppercase. Since the conversion works best when multiallelic variants are merged, we merged them

with `bcftools norm -m +any` (bcftools v1.9). We then used `bcftools norm --check-ref s --fasta-ref

{fasta_file}` (bcftools v1.9) to edit the REF allele in VCF files to be the ancestral allele, which

automatically updated the genotype field. The files also went through `bcftools +fill-tags` (bcftools

v1.16) to make sure the AC tag of the INFO column in VCF files is correct. Finally, we split multiallelic

sites into biallelic variants with `bcftools norm -m -any` (bcftools v1.16).

The LOCATER pipeline

We performed ancestry-based association testing using the LOCATER pipeline, which is described in

detail elsewhere, including methodological details and an in-depth evaluation of simulated data (Christ

et al. 2025). The detailed description of the real data pipeline of this study is described here:

https://github.com/Xinxin-Wang-0128/LOCATER_real_data_vignette. Briefly, the first step is to run

local ancestry inference at each genetic marker included in the study. For this we used the newest

version (v2) of our local ancestry inference engine, kalis (Aslett and Christ 2024), which is an optimized

implementation of the Speidel version of the LS model (Speidel et al. 2019). Notably, unlike other LS

model implementations, kalis v2 uses an optimal checkpointing algorithm which allows it to be run on

arbitrarily large sequences (e.g., whole chromosomes). Here, in the interests of computational

efficiency, we only performed local ancestry inference on genomic segments that contained one or

more single markers with a promising p-value ($P < 10^{-3}$ in this study). In total, this included 5.7% of the

genome. This step produces an N x N matrix (where N is the number of haplotypes; 13,590 in this

case) of genomic distances at each genetic marker.

The second step is to identify small clades, which we refer to as "sprigs". LOCATER includes a sprig

calling algorithm that uses a multithreaded partial sorting algorithm to cluster the genomic distances

into level sets separately for each haplotype, followed by a greedy clique finding procedure to rapidly

call sprigs.

Then, at each genetic marker, LOCATER performs three types of association tests: (1) a standard SMT

to measure the contribution of that specific marker; (2) Stable Distillation (SD) to measure the

contribution of the inferred small clades; and (3) a quadratic-form based test to measure the

contribution of remaining ancestral relationships present at deeper portions of the tree (Christ et al.

2025). Steps 2 and 3 use a residualized phenotype vector from the prior step. This, combined with the

independence guarantees of SD, ensures that the resulting three p-values at a given site are mutually

independent under the null hypothesis. We then combine the three p-values using an adapted version

of Fisher's method that we call Maximizing over Subsets of Summed Exponentials (MSSE) (Christ et

al. 2025).

Rank matching and selection

The SD procedure used in LOCATER requires that all phenotypes have a Gaussian distribution. As we

show in Figures S2, S3 and S4, since the quadratic form testing procedure is downstream of SD,

violating this assumption can affect the null distribution of both SD and QForm. We ensured the

Gaussianity of our phenotype vector by rank-matching our phenotypes to a vector of simulated

independent Gaussian random variables.

During preliminary analyses, we repeated this rank-matching process for the same phenotype several

times, yielding a set of vectors, each a subtly different perturbation of the original phenotype. When

we ran LOCATER across these different perturbations, the amount of inflation observed via the Q-Q

plot of genome-wide LOCATER p-values differed moderately across perturbations (see examples in

Figures S2, S3, and S4). We believe this variation reflects the fact that, by chance, different

perturbations can have stronger or weaker correlations with confounding processes such as

population structure. Note that genome-wide SMT p-values are consistently well-calibrated for all

perturbations; thus, no adjustments were needed for SMT. Based on this observation, we simulated

100 perturbations of each phenotype and selected the perturbation that minimized the deviation from

the expected tail distribution under the null hypothesis. Explicitly, for all perturbations of each

phenotype, we ran LOCATER across evenly spaced variants (~30,000 variants) along the genome, and

after plotting the Q-Q inflation plot for -$\log_{10}p$ of SD and QForm in LOCATER, we fitted a least-squares

line over the $x \in$ [2,2.5] domain of the resulting Q-Q inflation plot. This corresponds to fitting the tail of

the null distribution based on all p-values in [0.01,0.0032]. We then used the parameters of each least

square line (the slope and intercept) to select the perturbation that was closest to the expected null

distribution. More explicitly, let the slopes of SD and QForm Q-Q plots be m_{SD} and m_Q, while intercepts

are b_{SD} and b_Q, respectively. First, we selected all perturbations satisfying the following boolean

expression $m_{SD} \in$ [0.8, 1.1] AND $b_{SD} \in$ [-0.1, 0.1] AND (($m_Q \in$ [0.7, 1.2] AND $b_Q \in$ [-0.1, 0.1]) OR ($m_Q \in$

[0.6, 0.8] AND $b_Q \in$ [0, 0.4])). If multiple perturbations met this requirement, the perturbation with the

largest $min(m_{SD}, m_Q)$ was chosen. If no perturbation met this requirement, which happened for 15 of

our 101 phenotypes, the standard rank-based inverse normalized phenotype was used.

After the screening, we adjusted the p-value for each sub-test based on the estimated tail parameters,

m and b, via

$$-log\left(P_{SD\ modified\ GCed}\right) = \frac{-log(P_{SD}) - b_{SD}}{m_{SD}} \quad \text{and} \quad -log\left(P_{Q\ modified\ GCed}\right) = \frac{-log(P_Q) - b_Q}{m_Q}.$$

Since SMT is consistently well-calibrated, no adjustments were applied to SMT p-values. To combine

the resulting SMT, SD, and QForm p-values returned by LOCATER, we used the MSSE method in

Christ et al. (Christ et al. 2025).

Tuning ancestry inference for trait association

The LS model at the heart of the ancestry inference we used in this study, kalis, is a hidden Markov

model (HMM) with two parameters that can be interpreted as tolerance for recombination and

mutation, respectively. As we will delineate below, rather than using expectation-maximization or other

more standard tuning objectives to select our recombination and mutation parameters, we chose

parameters to optimize the propagation of proximal association signals along the genome in order to

maximize LOCATER's power.

In our tuning procedure, we randomly sampled core genomic regions with at least 15,000 variants,

each with flanking regions of 5,000 variants on both sides. These flanking regions served as "burn-in"

regions to ensure accurate ancestry inference along the full length of the core region. We then

selected a variant in the middle of the core region as our target variant and used kalis to perform

ancestry inference at that site.

We then selected a causal variant 0.05 (± 0.005) cM away. In LOCATER, as in all GWAS studies, any

association signals driven by variants that are colinear with the background covariates are assumed to

be attributable to confounding processes. Thus, we only chose causal variants that were not colinear

with the background covariates (multiple r^2 ≤ 0.02). We then simulated a pseudo-phenotype vector

with a strong effect driven by the causal variant. In order to ensure that the strength of this causal

variant's signal (in terms of the observed $-\log_{10}$ p-value) would be roughly consistent across

simulations, we increased the strength of the causal variant's effect as a function of the number of

clades inferred at the target locus: more null clades yield a higher multiple testing burden for the

causal variant to overcome.

Given our pseudo-phenotype vector, we ran LOCATER at our target variant l, yielding two p-values

$p_{SD}{}^l$ and $p_Q{}^l$. We assessed how these two p-values captured the signal at the nearby causal variant

using

$$\frac{-log(p_{SD}^l p_Q^l)}{-log(p_{SMT}^m)}$$

as our relative signal metric. Here p_{SMT}^m is the SMT p-value at the causal variant.

We calculated this relative signal metric for 14 parameter settings (see Table S3) across 144 distinct

core regions sampled from our METSIM dataset. Altogether, this procedure allowed us to select LS

HMM parameters to maximize LOCATER's power in this METSIM study.

Estimating the effective number of independent tests

Our dataset has a huge number of rare variants, and the canonical 5 x 10^{-8} threshold for p-value was

based on 1 million independent tests. This effective number of tests was identified in the array

genotyping era, and a couple of studies (Karczewski et al. 2022; Ishigaki et al. 2020) argued that this

was an overly generous threshold. There are papers describing methods to calculate the effective

number of independent tests (Gao et al. 2008), and they agreed that the gold standard is the

permutation-based method (Hoh et al. 2001). Permutation-based methods permute the phenotype N

times and do the association analysis for those permuted phenotypes. Then the minimum p-value

(p_{min}) was recorded for all these permuted phenotypes. If we want to control the type I error rate to be

0.05, the new threshold should be the 95th percentile of the p_{min} distribution. Here we used N = 1000

permutations and targeted a type I error rate of 0.05 (Gao et al. 2008).

We simulated 1000 normally distributed quantitative traits, ran SMT first, and used the subset of

variants with $p_{SMT} < 10^{-4.5}$ for LOCATER association. Based on the p_{min} distribution, the experiment-

wise significance threshold should be 7.17 x 10^{-9} for p_{SMT} and 1.41 x 10^{-8} for $p_{LOCATER}$ if the type I error

rate is 0.05. To directly compare LOCATER and SMT, the final p-values of LOCATER were

standardized so that its effective number of tests matches that of SMT and both tests use the same

threshold 7.17 x 10^{-9}.

Association Screening

Since the Speidel version of the LS model requires ancestral allele calls (Speidel et al. 2019), we only

included SNPs with ancestral allele calls in the 10-way EPO alignment of primates from Ensembl v106.

Indels were ignored due to their lower quality of phasing and variant calling. After removing

monomorphic sites and singletons, we obtained a final dataset of 18.9 million variants.

Kinship among individuals was calculated and only unrelated individuals were included. For kinship

analysis, we used the Hail function `hl.pc_relate` to compute pairwise kinship coefficients, and

individual pairs with kinship ≥ 0.05 were flagged as related outliers. Principal components (PCs) were

calculated in all Finnish samples, and a sample is considered a PC outlier and later removed if its

score for any of the top 10 PCs falls outside the range of ±8 standard deviations (SD) from the mean

score of that PC. This yielded a final dataset of 101 traits and 6,795 individuals. Background

covariates in this study were the top 10 principal components.

For computational efficiency, we adopted the following three strategies. First, we divided the whole

genome into 4,587 segments, with ± ~6,000 variants of overlap between segments. The 4,587

segment boundaries were defined so that each segment has a relatively similar number of variants, to

ensure similar run times during analysis. Second, while all of our variants were used for ancestry

inference by kalis, we only ran LOCATER on a relatively small subset of target variants. We skipped

variants where the SMT p-values from all phenotypes were greater than 10^{-3} while ensuring that the

recombination distance between consecutive target variants was at most 0.1 cM. Third, we avoided

any expensive eigendecomposition steps in calculating p_Q at our target loci by using the Satterthwaite

approximation to p_Q (Christ et al. 2025) in our first round of screening.

We identified any variant with a LOCATER combined p-value smaller than 7.17 x 10^{-8} in our first round

of screening as putative variants. We then merged putative variants in all the phenotypes to generate

putative loci (see main text) for follow-up. During association follow-up, we only focused on 10 cM

regions centered around putative loci, which doubly ensured reliable ancestry inference. During

LOCATER testing, we used partial eigendecomposition and Chi-square-based approximation (details

in Equation 11 in the Methods of (Christ et al. 2025) on the local relatedness matrix to obtain precise

p_Q.

Because of the stochastic nature of the SD procedure, the p-values p_{SD} and p_Q returned by LOCATER

are a function of the seed of the R environment. Setting the same seed for all segments along the

genome is not recommended, since it will cause additional correlation between variants, which will

cause the p-value distribution to deviate from the expected uniform distribution. Instead, we strongly

suggest setting different seeds for different segments along the genome. However, for reproducibility

or for follow up experiments of the same region or segment, we suggest using the same seed across

experiments for consistent results.

To assess the novelty of the association results we used the GWAS catalog (April 22nd, 2024 version;

https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/home)

Rare variant association experiment with STAAR

We applied STAAR with the sliding window method using default parameters. The window size is 2 kb

and the sliding step length is 1 kb. For each window, we included all rare variants with AF < 0.01 and

removed any window with fewer than two rare variants. We reported the STAAR-O p-value.

Hierarchical clustering and visualization of local distance matrices

At loci with significant LOCATER associations driven by SD, we constructed a local tree based on the

local relatedness matrix obtained by kalis in order to understand the relative placement of the sprigs

driving that SD signal. Following the method used in Speidel et al. (Speidel et al. 2019), we did this

using mean-based hierarchical clustering (UPGMA) implemented in the `fastcluster` R package

(Müllner 2013). For plotting clarity, 95% of haplotypes under insignificant sprigs were pruned from the

displayed dendrograms.

Residual analysis to visualize SD signals

We employed a residual analysis procedure to visualize the association signals that contributed to the

SD signal at a locus. Recall that LOCATER is a three-stage procedure where a phenotype vector is

passed between each step. In order to isolate the signals extracted by SD, we made a local

Manhattan plot regressing the phenotype vector passed to SD (above we refer to the resulting p-value

at a given variant as p_S) and overlaid it with a Manhattan plot regressing the phenotype vector returned

by SD (above we refer to the resulting p-value at a given variant as p_D). We highlighted variants where

$p_S < 1 \times 10^{-3}$ and $p_D > 10 * p_S$.

DATA ACCESS

The code used to perform the analyses in this paper is available on a GitHub page:

https://github.com/Xinxin-Wang-0128/LOCATER_real_data_vignette. The link to the LOCATER

software is: https://ryanchrist.github.io/locater/. METSIM data are available from dbGaP (accession

number for genotype data: phs001579; phenotype data: phs000752).

COMPETING INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no competing interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

RC and XW were supported by NIH grants R01HG013371 and UM1HG008853 to IH. LJMA was

partially supported by the EPSRC research grant "PINCODE", reference EP/X028100/1, and UKRI

grant, "OCEAN", reference EP/Y014650/1. DS was supported by BBSRC research grant

BB/S001824/1. 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.

Author Contributions

XW, RC and IMH conceived and designed the analysis. IMH and NOS designed the sequencing study.

ML created the METSIM cohort. EY, CJK, ID, EABJ generated the variant callset, EY curated the

phenotype data, XW, RC, LJMA and DS contributed analysis tools, and XW performed the analysis.

XW, RC and IMH wrote the paper with input from NOS, DS and LJMA.

894
895
REFERENCES

Abell NS, DeGorter MK, Gloudemans MJ, Greenwald E, Smith KS, He Z, Montgomery SB. 2022. Multiple
causal variants underlie genetic associations in humans. *Science* **375**: 1247–1254.

Aslett LJM, Christ RR. 2024. kalis: a modern implementation of the Li & Stephens model for local
ancestry inference in R. *BMC Bioinformatics* **25**: 86.

Bartolomé N, Arteta B, Martínez MJ, Chico Y, Ochoa B. 2008. Kupffer cell products and interleukin 1beta
directly promote VLDL secretion and apoB mRNA up-regulation in rodent hepatocytes. *Innate
Immun* **14**: 255–266.

Baum LE, Petrie T, Soules G, Weiss N. 1970. A Maximization Technique Occurring in the Statistical
Analysis of Probabilistic Functions of Markov Chains. *aoms* **41**: 164–171.

Chen L, Abel HJ, Das I, Larson DE, Ganel L, Kanchi KL, Regier AA, Young EP, Kang CJ, Scott AJ, et al.
2021. Association of structural variation with cardiometabolic traits in Finns. *Am J Hum Genet* **108**:
583–596.

Christ R, Hall I, Steinsaltz D. 2022. Stable Distillation and High-Dimensional Hypothesis Testing. *arXiv
[statME]*. http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.12539.

Christ R, Wang X, Aslett LJM, Steinsaltz D, Hall I. 2025. Clade distillation for genome-wide association
studies. *Genetics* iyaf158.

Cui A, Fan H, Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Niu D, Liu S, Liu Q, Ma W, Shen Z, Shen L, et al. 2019. Dexamethasone-
induced Krüppel-like factor 9 expression promotes hepatic gluconeogenesis and hyperglycemia. *J
Clin Invest* **129**: 2266–2278.

Davis JP, Huyghe JR, Locke AE, Jackson AU, Sim X, Stringham HM, Teslovich TM, Welch RP,
Fuchsberger C, Narisu N, et al. 2017. Common, low-frequency, and rare genetic variants associated
with lipoprotein subclasses and triglyceride measures in Finnish men from the METSIM study. *PLoS
Genet* **13**: e1007079.

Deng Y, Nielsen R, Song YS. 2024. Robust and accurate Bayesian inference of genome-wide
genealogies for large samples. *bioRxiv* 2024.03.16.585351.
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.03.16.585351v1.abstract (Accessed October 27,
2025).

Devlin B, Roeder K. 1999. Genomic control for association studies. *Biometrics* **55**: 997–1004.

Efron B. 2010. *Large-Scale Inference*. Cambridge University Press.

Ganel L, Chen L, Christ R, Vangipurapu J, Young E, Das I, Kanchi K, Larson D, Regier A, Abel H, et al.
2021. Mitochondrial genome copy number measured by DNA sequencing in human blood is strongly
associated with metabolic traits via cell-type composition differences. *Hum Genomics* **15**: 34.

Gao X, Starmer J, Martin ER. 2008. A multiple testing correction method for genetic association studies
using correlated single nucleotide polymorphisms. *Genet Epidemiol* **32**: 361–369.

GTEx Consortium. 2020. The GTEx Consortium atlas of genetic regulatory effects across human tissues.
Science **369**: 1318–1330.

Gunnarsson ÁF, Zhu J, Zhang BC, Tsangalidou Z, Allmont A, Palamara PF. 2024. A scalable approach for
genome-wide inference of ancestral recombination graphs. *bioRxiv* 2024.08.31.610248.
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.08.31.610248v1.abstract (Accessed September 18,
2024).

Hoh J, Wille A, Ott J. 2001. Trimming, Weighting, and Grouping SNPs in Human Case-Control
Association Studies. *Genome Res* **11**: 2115–2119.

Hormozdiari F, Zhu A, Kichaev G, Ju CJ-T, Segrè AV, Joo JWJ, Won H, Sankararaman S, Pasaniuc B,
Shifman S, et al. 2017. Widespread Allelic Heterogeneity in Complex Traits. *Am J Hum Genet* **100**:
789–802.

Ishida T, Choi S, Kundu RK, Hirata K-I, Rubin EM, Cooper AD, Quertermous T. 2003. Endothelial lipase is
a major determinant of HDL level. *J Clin Invest* **111**: 347–355.

Ishigaki K, Akiyama M, Kanai M, Takahashi A, Kawakami E, Sugishita H, Sakaue S, Matoba N, Low S-K,
Okada Y, et al. 2020. Large-scale genome-wide association study in a Japanese population
identifies novel susceptibility loci across different diseases. *Nat Genet* **52**: 669–679.

Jaye M, Lynch KJ, Krawiec J, Marchadier D, Maugeais C, Doan K, South V, Amin D, Perrone M, Rader
DJ. 1999. A novel endothelial-derived lipase that modulates HDL metabolism. *Nat Genet* **21**: 424–
428.

Jin W, Millar JS, Broedl U, Glick JM, Rader DJ. 2003. Inhibition of endothelial lipase causes increased
HDL cholesterol levels in vivo. *J Clin Invest* **111**: 357–362.

Jin Y, Terhorst J. 2023. The solution surface of the Li-Stephens haplotype copying model. *Algorithms Mol*
Biol **18**: 12.

Karczewski KJ, Solomonson M, Chao KR, Goodrich JK, Tiao G, Lu W, Riley-Gillis BM, Tsai EA, Kim HI,
Zheng X, et al. 2022. Systematic single-variant and gene-based association testing of thousands of
phenotypes in 394,841 UK Biobank exomes. *Cell Genom* **2**: 100168.

Karjalainen MK, Karthikeyan S, Oliver-Williams C, Sliz E, Allara E, Fung WT, Surendran P, Zhang W,
Jousilahti P, Kristiansson K, et al. 2024. Genome-wide characterization of circulating metabolic
biomarkers. *Nature* **628**: 130–138.

Kelleher J, Etheridge AM, McVean G. 2016. Efficient Coalescent Simulation and Genealogical Analysis for
Large Sample Sizes. *PLoS Comput Biol* **12**: e1004842.

Kelleher J, Wong Y, Wohns AW, Fadil C, Albers PK, McVean G. 2019. Inferring whole-genome histories in
large population datasets. *Nat Genet* **51**: 1330–1338.

Laakso M, Kuusisto J, Stančáková A, Kuulasmaa T, Pajukanta P, Lusis AJ, Collins FS, Mohlke KL,
Boehnke M. 2017. The Metabolic Syndrome in Men study: a resource for studies of metabolic and
cardiovascular diseases. *J Lipid Res* **58**: 481–493.

Lee S, Abecasis GR, Boehnke M, Lin X. 2014. Rare-Variant Association Analysis: Study Designs and Statistical Tests. *Am J Hum Genet* **95**: 5–23.

Link V, Schraiber JG, Fan C, Dinh B, Mancuso N, Chiang CWK, Edge MD. 2023. Tree-based QTL mapping with expected local genetic relatedness matrices. *Am J Hum Genet* **110**: 2077–2091.

Li X, Li Z, Zhou H, Gaynor SM, Liu Y, Chen H, Sun R, Dey R, Arnett DK, Aslibekyan S, et al. 2020. Dynamic incorporation of multiple in silico functional annotations empowers rare variant association analysis of large whole-genome sequencing studies at scale. *Nat Genet* **52**: 969–983.

Li Z, Li X, Liu Y, Shen J, Chen H, Zhou H, Morrison AC, Boerwinkle E, Lin X. 2019. Dynamic Scan Procedure for Detecting Rare-Variant Association Regions in Whole-Genome Sequencing Studies. *Am J Hum Genet* **104**: 802–814.

Locke AE, Steinberg KM, Chiang CWK, Service SK, Havulinna AS, Stell L, Pirinen M, Abel HJ, Chiang CC, Fulton RS, et al. 2019. Exome sequencing of Finnish isolates enhances rare-variant association power. *Nature* **572**: 323–328.

Ma K, Cilingiroglu M, Otvos JD, Ballantyne CM, Marian AJ, Chan L. 2003. Endothelial lipase is a major genetic determinant for high-density lipoprotein concentration, structure, and metabolism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **100**: 2748–2753.

Manolio TA, Collins FS, Cox NJ, Goldstein DB, Hindorff LA, Hunter DJ, McCarthy MI, Ramos EM, Cardon LR, Chakravarti A, et al. 2009. Finding the missing heritability of complex diseases. *Nature* **461**: 747–753.

Maurano MT, Humbert R, Rynes E, Thurman RE, Haugen E, Wang H, Reynolds AP, Sandstrom R, Qu H, Brody J, et al. 2012. Systematic localization of common disease-associated variation in regulatory DNA. *Science* **337**: 1190–1195.

Minichiello MJ, Durbin R. 2006. Mapping Trait Loci by Use of Inferred Ancestral Recombination Graphs. *Am J Hum Genet* **79**: 910–922.

Müllner D. 2013. fastcluster: Fast Hierarchical, Agglomerative Clustering Routines forRandPython. *J Stat Softw* **53**. http://dx.doi.org/10.18637/jss.v053.i09.

Povysil G, Petrovski S, Hostyk J, Aggarwal V, Allen AS, Goldstein DB. 2019. Rare-variant collapsing analyses for complex traits: guidelines and applications. *Nat Rev Genet* **20**: 747–759.

Rasmussen MD, Hubisz MJ, Gronau I, Siepel A. 2014. Genome-wide inference of ancestral recombination graphs. *PLoS Genet* **10**: e1004342.

Raulerson CK, Ko A, Kidd JC, Currin KW, Brotman SM, Cannon ME, Wu Y, Spracklen CN, Jackson AU, Stringham HM, et al. 2019. Adipose tissue gene expression associations reveal hundreds of candidate genes for cardiometabolic traits. *Am J Hum Genet* **105**: 773–787.

Regier AA, Farjoun Y, Larson DE, Krasheninina O, Kang HM, Howrigan DP, Chen B-J, Kher M, Banks E, Ames DC, et al. 2018. Functional equivalence of genome sequencing analysis pipelines enables harmonized variant calling across human genetics projects. *Nat Commun* **9**: 4038.

Rentzsch P, Witten D, Cooper GM, Shendure J, Kircher M. 2019. CADD: predicting the deleteriousness of variants throughout the human genome. *Nucleic Acids Res* **47**: D886–D894.

Richardson TG, Leyden GM, Wang Q, Bell JA, Elsworth B, Davey Smith G, Holmes MV. 2022.
Characterising metabolomic signatures of lipid-modifying therapies through drug target mendelian
randomisation. *PLoS Biol* **20**: e3001547.

Sollis E, Mosaku A, Abid A, Buniello A, Cerezo M, Gil L, Groza T, Güneş O, Hall P, Hayhurst J, et al. 2023.
The NHGRI-EBI GWAS Catalog: knowledgebase and deposition resource. *Nucleic Acids Res* **51**:
D977–D985.

Speidel L, Forest M, Shi S, Myers SR. 2019. A method for genome-wide genealogy estimation for
thousands of samples. *Nat Genet* **51**: 1321–1329.

Strauss JG, Zimmermann R, Hrzenjak A, Zhou Y, Kratky D, Levak-Frank S, Kostner GM, Zechner R,
Frank S. 2002. Endothelial cell-derived lipase mediates uptake and binding of high-density
lipoprotein (HDL) particles and the selective uptake of HDL-associated cholesterol esters
independent of its enzymic activity. *Biochem J* **368**: 69–79.

The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium, Auton A, Abecasis GR, Altshuler DM (Co-Chair), Durbin RM (Co-
Chair), Abecasis GR, Bentley DR, Chakravarti A, Clark AG, Donnelly P, et al. 2015. A global reference
for human genetic variation. *Nature* **526**: 68–74.

van Diepen JA, Stienstra R, Vroegrijk IOCM, van den Berg SAA, Salvatori D, Hooiveld GJ, Kersten S,
Tack CJ, Netea MG, Smit JWA, et al. 2013. Caspase-1 deficiency in mice reduces intestinal
triglyceride absorption and hepatic triglyceride secretion. *J Lipid Res* **54**: 448–456.

Wang X. 2024. Development and application of a computational pipeline for genealogy-based trait
association. https://doi.org/10.7936/jbzm-5f51 (Accessed November 3, 2025).

Wong Y, Ignatieva A, Koskela J, Gorjanc G, Wohns AW, Kelleher J. 2024. A general and efficient
representation of ancestral recombination graphs. *Genetics* **228**.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/genetics/iyae100.

Zhang BC, Biddanda A, Gunnarsson ÁF, Cooper F, Palamara PF. 2023. Biobank-scale inference of
ancestral recombination graphs enables genealogical analysis of complex traits. *Nat Genet* **55**: 768–
776.

Zhu J, Kalantzis G, Pazokitoroudi A, Gunnarsson ÁF, Loya H, Chen H, Sankararaman S, Palamara PF.
2024. Fast variance component analysis using large-scale ancestral recombination graphs. *bioRxiv*
2024.08.31.610262. https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.08.31.610262v1.abstract
(Accessed September 18, 2024).

Zöllner S, Pritchard JK. 2005. Coalescent-Based Association Mapping and Fine Mapping of Complex
Trait Loci. *Genetics* **169**: 1071–1092.

1037

(A)

6795 METSIM samples

Whole genome sequencing
18.9 million SNPs with known ancestral allele

101 quantitative traits

kalis (Li & Stephens)

Haplotype tree

LOCATER

Single marker test (SMT) | Stable distillation (SD) | QForm

(B)

351 trait associations (47 loci)

17 (13)

7 (5)

327 (42)

SMT significant

LOCATER significant

(C)

Count of associations

-4   -2   0   2   4

max(-log10(P_LOCATER standardized)) - max(-log10(P_SMT))

Inset:

-4 -2 0 2 4

(D)

351 associations

↓

30 associations min(P_LOCATER standardized) < min(P_SMT)

7 associations min(P_LOCATER standardized) < threshold < min(P_SMT)

23 associations min(P_LOCATER standardized) < min(P_SMT) < threshold

↓

3 associations min(P_LOCATER standardized) < 0.1 * min(P_SMT)

10 highlighted associations

Figure 1. Schematic of our genealogy-based screening procedure, LOCATER, and summary of screening results. (A) Diagram of the experimental design and association testing method. Kalis is an implementation of the Li & Stephens model for local ancestry inference. QForm: quadratic form testing. (B) Venn diagram showing the number of associations and number of loci (in parentheses) with significant SMT and/or significant LOCATER results. Note that a given locus may have distinct associations represented in different parts of the Venn diagram. (C) Distribution of max(-log10($P_{\text{LOCATER standardized}}$)) - max(-log10($P_{\text{SMT}}$)) for all 351 associations. All associations that are genome-wide significant by either SMT or LOCATER are included. (D) Overview of significant associations and highlighted associations. The genome-wide significance threshold is 7.17×10^{-9} for SMT and standardized LOCATER.

Figure 2. Association of triglycerides in medium HDL at LIPG locus. **(A)** Local Manhattan plot of the association signal for "triglycerides in medium HDL" on chr18:49038347-50253146, including results for single marker test (SMT; blue and black), LOCATER (orange) and STAAR (yellow). Note that LOCATER results are only shown for variants with an SMT p-value less than 1×10^{-3}, since for computational efficiency only these variants were tested by LOCATER (see Methods). SMT results from variants tested by LOCATER are shown in blue, and those from variants not tested by LOCATER are shown in black. The black dashed line corresponds to the genome-wide significance threshold for SMT, standardized LOCATER, and standardized STAAR. **(B)** Q-Q inflation plot of -log10(p-values) from all "sprigs" at the lead marker chr18:49653146, where "sprigs" are defined as the smallest possible inferred clades. The gray area corresponds to the 95% confidence interval, and the red line denotes x=y. **(C)** Histogram of phenotype values after projecting out the genotype vector of the LOCATER lead marker (chr18:49653146), thus removing signal that can be accounted for by the SMT sub-test. Connected dots show the phenotype value of individuals assigned to significant sprigs. **(D)** Dendrogram generated from the haplotype-level local distance matrix at the lead marker chr18:49653146. The UPGMA method was used for hierarchical clustering. Orange branches highlight the path of all haplotypes in significant sprigs shown previously in **(C)**. Labels at the bottom show the sprig assignment. For plotting clarity, 95% of haplotypes under insignificant sprigs were pruned.

Figure 3. Association of apolipoprotein A1 at LIPG locus. **(A)** Local Manhattan plot of the association signal for apolipoprotein A1 on chr18:49217040-50417040, shown using the exact same data types and color scheme as Figure 2A. **(B)** Histogram of phenotype values after projecting out the genotype vector of the LOCATER lead marker (chr18:49817040), thus removing signal that can be accounted for by the SMT sub-test. Connected dots show the phenotype value of individuals assigned to significant sprigs.

Figure 4. Association of triglycerides in medium VLDL on chr11. **(A)** Local Manhattan plot of the association signal for "triglycerides in medium VLDL" on chr11:104727888-105927888, shown using the exact same data types and color scheme as Figure 2A.**(B)** Local Manhattan plot of "triglycerides in medium VLDL" at chr11:104727888-105927888, showing modified genomic controlled $-\log_{10}(P)$ for the 3 LOCATER sub-tests. **(C)** Q-Q inflation plot of -log10(p-values) from all "sprigs" at the lead marker chr11:105327888, where "sprigs" are defined as the smallest possible inferred clades. The gray area corresponds to the 95% confidence interval, and the red line denotes x=y. **(D)** Histogram of phenotype values after projecting out the genotype vector of the LOCATER lead marker (chr11:105327888), thus removing signal that can be accounted for by the SMT sub-test. Connected dots show the phenotype value of individuals assigned to significant sprigs. **(E)** Dendrogram generated from the haplotype-level local distance matrix at the lead marker chr11:105327888. The UPGMA method was used for hierarchical clustering. Orange branches highlight the path of all haplotypes in significant sprigs shown previously in part **(D)**. Labels at the right show the sprig assignment. For plotting clarity, 95% of haplotypes under insignificant sprigs were pruned.

Figure 5. Association of remnant cholesterol at APOE cluster. **(A)** Local Manhattan plot of the association signal for remnant cholesterol on chr19:44308684-45809149, shown using the exact same data types and color scheme as Figure 2A. **(B)** Local Manhattan plot showing modified genomic controlled $-\log_{10}(P)$ for the 3 LOCATER sub-tests. **(C)** LocusZoom plot of SMT results. Variants are colored based on their r^2 with

the SMT lead marker chr19:44922203 (purple diamond), where LD is calculated in the studied samples. The black line shows the recombination rate in Finns (See Methods). Gene annotations are from GENCODE v45. **(D)** Zoomed in LocusZoom plots showing the original association at top, followed by the results from stepwise conditional analysis. Results were zoomed in based on the shaded region in **(C)**. Variants are colored based on their r^2 with the SMT lead marker of each experiment (purple diamond). Black arrows point to the most significant variant from the GWAS catalog. The black dashed line corresponds to the genome-wide significance threshold (7.17×10^{-9}) in the top panel, and the conditional analysis threshold (3.52×10^{-5}) for the rest.

Variant ID	Mapped Gene	Trait	LOCATER P (modified GCed)	LOCATER lead marker MAF	Variant ID of SMT lead marker	SMT P	SMT lead marker MAF	Known hit in GWAS catalog	SMT Lead marker LD w/ GWAS catalog marker
Chr7-73440219-C-T	*FZD9, BAZ1B*	MUFA	1.57E-09	0.096	Chr7-73440219-C-T*	2.52E-08	0.096	Yes	0.701
Chr7-73482065-A-C	*BAZ1B*	Triglycerides in VLDL	1.64E-11	0.12	Chr7-73467477-C-T	1.11E-09	0.12	Yes	0.852
Chr7-73643687-A-G	*VPS37D, MLXIPL*	Concentration of large VLDL particles	2.82E-09	0.12	Chr7-73641131-A-C	3.40E-08	0.12	Yes - related trait	0.933
Chr11-61843278-G-A	*FADS2*	HDL2-C	6.58E-09	0.43	Chr11-61798436-T-C	1.65E-08	0.45	Yes - related trait	0.871
Chr11-105327888-G-C	*CARD18*	Triglycerides in medium VLDL	2.31E-09	0.43	Chr11-105331384-A-T	1.05E-05	0.43	No	NA
Chr18-49653146-G-A	*ACAA2, SMUG1P1*	Triglycerides in medium HDL	1.68E-09	0.15	Chr18-49642278-G-A	4.71E-07	0.16	Yes	0.864
Chr18-49817040-T-A	*SNHG22*	ApoA1	6.51E-09	0.0041	Chr18-49817040-T-A*	2.15E-08	0.0041	Yes	1
Chr19-44922203-A-G	*APOC1, APOC1P1*	Remnant-C	7.53E-11	0.29	Chr19-44922203-A-G*	1.40E-09	0.29	Yes	0.0783
Chr20-45906012-G-A	*PLTP*	Triglycerides in small HDL	1.80E-11	0.23	Chr20-45923216-T-C	3.10E-10	0.18	Yes	1
Chr21-16318536-C-T	*MIR99AHG*	HDL3-C	3.87E-09	0.090	Chr21-16318536-C-T*	1.77E-08	0.090	No	NA

Table 1: Summary of highlighted associations. Chromosome positions are based on GRCh38. See Table S1 for trait descriptors, see Table S2 for full results. The genome-wide significance threshold is 7.17 x 10^{-9}. To allow for a straightforward comparison, the LOCATER p-value was standardized to match the effective number of independent tests for single marker association.
* denotes the associations that SMT lead marker is the same as LOCATER lead marker.