Genetic architecture of Multiple Sclerosis patients in the French national OFSEP-HD cohort

Julien Paris[1], Nayane S.B. Silva[1], Igor Faddeenkov[1], Martin Morin[1], Léo Boussamet[1], Stanislas Demuth[1,6], Mitra Barzine[1], Anna Serova-Erard[1,4], François Cornelis[1,4,5], Sonia Bourguiba-Hachemi[1], Sophie Limou[1], Romain Casey[2], Bertrand Fontaine[7], Sandra Vukusic[2], Laureline Berthelot[1], David Laplaud[1], Nicolas Vince*[1], Pierre-Antoine Gourraud[1,3]

[1] *Nantes Université, CHU Nantes, INSERM, Centre de recherche en Transplantation et Immunologie Translationnelle, UMR 1064, F-44000, Nantes, France.*

[2] *Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, F-69000 Lyon, France; Hospices Civils de Lyon, Service de Neurologie, sclérose en plaques, pathologies de la myéline et neuro-inflammation, F-69677 Bron, France ; Observatoire Français de la Sclérose en Plaques, Centre de Recherche en Neurosciences de Lyon, INSERM 1028 et CNRS UMR 5292, F-69003 Lyon, France EUGENE DEVIC EDMUS Foundation against multiple sclerosis, state-approved foundation, F-69677 Bron, France*

[3] *Nantes Université, CHU Nantes, Pôle Hospitalo-Universitaire 11: Santé Publique, Clinique des données, INSERM CIC 1413, F-44000, Nantes.*

[4] *CHU Clermont-Ferrand, Génétique – Oncogénétique Adulte – Prévention (GENOAP), Clermont-Ferrand.*

[5] *Université Clermont Auvergne, UFR de Médecine et des professions paramédicales, Clermont-Ferrand.*

[6] *INSERM CIC 1434, Clinical Investigation Center, University Hospital of Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France.*

[7] *From the Sorbonne Université - Institut du Cerveau - Paris Brain Institute - ICM, Inserm, CNRS, APHP, Hôpital Pitié Salpétrière Univ. Hosp., DMU Neuroscience 6; Inst. of Cardiometabolism and Nutrition, Sorbonne-universités-Upmc 06, INSERM, CNRS; Laboratoire des Signaux et Systèmes (L2S), CNRS-CentraleSupélec, Université Paris-Saclay; Sorbonne Université (B.S.), Institut du Cerveau - Paris Brain Institute - ICM, Inserm, CNRS, APHP, Hôpital St. Antoine-HUEP; and INSERM (B.F.), SU, AP-HP, Centre de recherche en Myologie-UMR974 and Service of Neuro-Myology, Institute of Myology, University hospital Pitié-Salpêtriere.*

Correspondence: Nicolas Vince: nicolas.vince@univ-nantes.fr

N.V and PA.G contributed equally to this work

Abstract

Multiple Sclerosis (MS) is a central nervous system (CNS) autoimmune inflammatory disease targeting the myelin sheath and affecting 2.8 million patients worldwide, mostly in economically advanced countries. The OFSEP-HD (French Multiple Sclerosis Registry - High Definition) multi-centric cohort comprises 2,667 genetic samples of patients with MS including 5 years of clinical, biological and imaging follow up. Here we described the genetic background of the cohort using data generated from the Affymetrix Precision Medicine Research Array (PMRA) genotyping chips to collect 888,799 genomic variants, and up to 8.5 million variants after imputation. Our analysis focused on genetic ancestry, admixture analysis and Human Leukocyte Antigen (HLA) including haplotypes inference. Principal Components Analysis (PCA) clustering identified seven ancestral clusters with 2177 patients (85.6 %) from clearly defined

European ancestry. We observed 232 MS patients from North-African genetic ancestry while

120 of those patients (51.7%) did not self-report North-African origins, highlighting once again

the limitations of self-assessed population descriptors. To promote data sharing we

implemented the generation of a realistic and anonymous synthetic dataset using an

adaptation of a known synthetic data generation methodology. This work unveils the genetic

landscape and heterogeneous profiles of the OFSEP-HD cohort and proposes an open

synthetic genetic dataset for further analyses.

Keywords: Multiple sclerosis, France, OFSEP-HD, genetics, genomics, ancestry analysis,

genomic proportions, bioinformatics, population genetics, Human Leukocyte Antigens, HLA

haplotypes, HLA alleles.

Introduction

Multiple Sclerosis (MS) is a complex autoimmune disorder characterized by the

demyelination of nerve fibers in the central nervous system (CNS) yielding to heterogeneous

symptomatology including cognitive dysfunction, muscle-related problems, mental health

issues, vertigo, vision and sexual problems as well as bladder and bowel dysfunctions. The

number of MS patients worldwide was estimated to 2.8 million with a prevalence of 35.9 per

100,000 inhabitants[1,2]. MS predominantly affects women, accounting for approximately 70%

of cases demonstrating the significant gender disparity in susceptibility[1,3]. MS is highly

prevalent in most economically advanced countries including France, with a prevalence of

197.6 per 100,000 inhabitants, which is more than five times greater than the worldwide

average prevalence[4]. This highlights the substantial disease burden to the public health

regarding healthcare quality and financial costs[5].

MS pathogenesis is caused by the interplay between both environmental and genetical

components. The well-known latitude gradient of MS demonstrates lowest prevalence regions

near the equator and high prevalence regions outside of the tropics especially in North-

Western countries[1]. A South-West to North-East increasing latitude gradient is also observable

in metropolitan France, demonstrating the impact of the gradient even at a lower regional

scale[4]. This gradient is thought to be primarily driven by the lack of sun exposure and vitamin

D deficiency, more prominent as we get further from the equator[6]. Moreover, Epstein-Barr

Virus (EBV) and CytoMegaloVirus (CMV) infections during lifetime, smoking and childhood

obesity, contribute significantly to MS onset[6–8]. Nevertheless, this latitude gradient might also

partly result in healthcare disparities across the world, with lowest prevalence regions bearing

fewer data due to a deficit of neurologist and MS specialist, in turn yielding to a systemic bias

towards fewer MS diagnostics in those regions[1].

MS is a polygenic disease, resulting from both previously stated environmental factors

and the cumulative effect of multiple genetic variations that influence susceptibility to the

disease, as opposed to Mendelian diseases, which are mostly caused by a single genetic

mutation. The most recent GWAS (Genome Wide Association Study) identified a total of 233

MS Single Nucleotide Polymorphism (SNP) associated to MS susceptibility, with 32 located in

the Major Histocompatibility Complex (MHC) region explaining most of the phenotypic

variance, and 1 located on the X chromosome[9,10]. Recent insights also suggest the role of

genetics on disease severity and progression with one significant variant discovered to date[11].

The French population genetic architecture originates from two major ancestral DNA.

Early Neolithic farmers migrated to South-Eastern France from Anatolia, while steppe

pastoralist arrived from the northern plains of Eurasia. Although Neolithic farmers DNA is

predominant in modern French population, the genomic contribution of steppe pastoralists is

more pronounced in Northern parts of France[12]. Over centuries, historical cultural and political

borders have shaped the genetic architecture of today's French population. Indeed, genetic

clusters in France mostly align with neighboring countries, reflecting shared histories and

interactions[12].

Moreover, France's strategic location on the western edge of Europe has made it a

privileged migration route between the South and North of the continent, further enriching

its genetic diversity. Particularly, the history of migration between North Africa and France is

well-documented, shaped by deep historical, cultural, and economic ties[13]. This gene flow

contributed to human genetic diversity in southern Europe, including France[14].

However, studying genetic ancestry in France is historically sensitive, and faces legal

constraints explaining the few genetic studies conducted on French population with genome

wide data[12,15]. Additionally, most patients in genetic studies focusing on polygenic diseases

like MS are from European genetic ancestry[16,17]. Nevertheless, initiatives like the French

Multiple Sclerosis Registry – High Definition Cohort (OFSEP-HD) and its 2,667 samples with

genetic data, is an opportunity to study MS genetics with high quality nation-wide data

collection[18]. While the OFSEP-HD cohort is instrumental in numerous published MS studies,

its genetic architecture has not been studied yet[19,20]. This study provides the first genetic

analysis of the OFSEP-HD population, highlighting the role of ancestry and MS variants

including MHC variations for future research into genetic factors influencing MS within the

French population.

Materials and methods

Data collection

The OFSEP-HD observational study, totalizing 2,667 genetic samples of MS patients from the historical OFSEP study collected from various centers distributed across France, represents an ongoing cohort study initiated in 2018 with annual high quality follow-up[18,20]. All OFSEP-HD patients fulfilled MacDonald2017+ diagnosis criteria at inclusion[21,22]. OFSEP authorization for collecting clinical data and biological samples was granted by the CNIL (Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés) in 2015 under CPP (Comité de Protection des Personnes) number 914066. Appropriate informed consent was obtained from all OFSEP-HD patients[22]. The cohort includes different types of demographic variables including patients' and parents' reported origins, sex, birthdate, Expanded-Disability-Status-Scale (EDSS) (non-linear discretized scale measuring the level of disability), number of MRI demyelinating lesions, pregnancies, relapses, treatments and typ e of MS course at inclusion in addition to annual MRI and sample biocollection[22–24]. Data oversight and management are under the responsibility of the EDMUS Foundation[22].

Genetic data were acquired through genotyping conducted at the Curie Institute's Genotyping platform in Paris, utilizing the Affymetrix Precision Medicine Research Array (PMRA) chip, representing a total of 888,799 genotyped variants.

The OFSEP-HD cohort was compared to a subset of 2,405 reference individuals from the 1000 Genomes Project population, comprising individuals from East-Asian, South-Asian, American, European, and African ancestries[25]. In addition, a North African reference cohort of

154 non MS individuals from Arauna et al. was utilized to accurately characterize genetic

ancestry in the light of its 486,252 genotyped variants[26,27].

Processing, imputation, and quality controls of genotyping data

Quality control (QC) procedures were applied to OFSEP-HD dataset and North-African

reference dataset. No additional quality control or imputation was performed on the 1000

Genome reference dataset[28]. A technological QC on OFSEP-HD dataset using Axiom Analysis

Suite 2.0 was performed to select high-quality samples and genetic variants. This QC

procedure led to the selection of 869,082 variants (97.8 %).

A second QC filtering procedure was implemented using Python 3.11 in conjunction

with PLINK 1.9/2 and bcftools 1.13 following previously published guidelines[28]. Pre-imputation

filters and thresholds applied to OFSEP-HD genetic samples are listed below:

1. Individual level and variant level missingness (> 2%)

2. Sex-discrepancies (Male: F > 0.8; Female: F ≤ 0.4)

3. Exclusion of X/Y/mitochondrial chromosomes

4. Minor Allele Frequency (MAF < 1%)

5. Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE < $1e^{-10}$)

6. Relatedness ($\hat{p}$ > 0.2)

Details about processing steps of North-African reference dataset are available in Table

S1 and a flowchart of the QC procedures in Figure S1[26].

Pre-imputation quality controls of OFSEP-HD population resulted in 424,132 remaining

SNPs and 2,542 patients. The filters removing most of the variants were the MAF filters and

sexual and mitochondrial chromosome variants exclusion. Imputation of OFSEP-HD genetic

data was then performed using Topmed Michigan Imputation Server

(https://imputation.biodatacataslyst.nhlbi.nih.gov/) to maximize overlap with reference

datasets during ancestry analysis. Post-imputation QCs were also performed on OFSEP-HD

dataset, excluding variants with insufficient imputation quality ($r^2 < 0.5$) or low frequency

(MAF < 10%). Moreover, we filtered again for variants considerably deviating from Hardy-

Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE < $1e^{-10}$).

Ancestry analysis

We performed a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of the 2,542 OFSEP-HD patients

with all reference populations using the Eigensoft software[29]. The analysis considered the

twenty first principal components obtained from the 9,326 common independent SNPs to

OFSEP-HD and reference datasets. A supervised K-Means clustering approach was then

implemented to identify ancestry superpopulation clusters on the PCA[30,31]. We described the

methodology used to define the best number of clusters k in Figure S2.

Demographic and clinical description: self-reported origins of OFSEP-HD patients

We analyzed demographic and clinical variables of the 2542 remaining patients after

quality controls and processing steps providing key insights into the composition of the cohort.

We computed descriptive statistics to better understand the self-reported origins distribution

of OFSEP-HD patients. The origins of participants in the OFSEP-HD study were self-reported

through a Case Report Form (CRF) that included three questions, each asking: "Which

geographical region are you originating from?" The participants answered all questions,

providing information about both their own and their parents' geographical origins.

Reference populations selection and admixture proportions of European, African and East-Asian genome

Admixture analysis was performed using admixture 1.3.0 software. The reference parental populations for admixture analysis were selected from the 1,000 Genome dataset to include the 3 most discretizing ancestries: European, African, and East-Asian, thereby excluding North-African, South-Asian and American admixed ancestries[27,32,33]. More methodological details are available in Supplemental Materials.

Self-reported origins and genetic ancestry: a comparative statistical analysis

Patients' and parents' origins were compared to genetically inferred ancestral backgrounds. Self-reported origins of OFSEP-HD patients and their parents were collected through the previously mentioned CRF. Mapping between ancestry clusters and self-reported origins is reported in Table S2 and the methodology used to select clusters for statistical analyses is discussed in Figures S3 - 4 and Tables S3 – 4. Proportion of discordant pairs and Cohen's kappa score were used as a measure of agreement between patients' self-reported origins and genetic ancestry. Proportion of discordant pairs were calculated as $\frac{b+c}{a+b+c+d} * 100$, with a, b, c and d being respectively the upper left, upper right, lower left and lower right cells of a 2x2 contingency table. Margin of Errors (95%) (MoE$_{95\%}$) were computed as $\pm 1.96 * \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$ with σ the standard deviation and n the sample size[34]. Statistical significance of comparisons were assessed using two-sided statistical association tests from independent data arrangements[35,36]. Additionally, we performed a quantitative statistical analysis comparing European and African genome proportions within genetic clusters regarding patients self-reported origins status. Further details about the methodology are described in Supplemental Materials.

HLA imputation: alleles and haplotypes

Human Leukocytes Antigens (HLA) genotypes were imputed from genotyped SNPs through SNP-HLA Reference Consortium (SHLARC), a widely recognized and extensively used resource for imputing *HLA* alleles from SNP data, employing the HIBAG R package and a large multi-ethnic reference panel[37,38]. Further, we performed individual-level haplotypes imputation using HLA2Haplo tool from Easy-HLA software suite independently for each ancestry cluster using corresponding reference panels (easyhla.univ-nantes.fr)[39]. This tool inferred the phase of imputed HLA alleles for each considered OFSEP-HD individual. Imputed haplotypes include loci *HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-C, HLA-DRB1,* and *HLA-DQB1*.

Polygenic Risk Scores computation

Polygenic Risk Scores (PRS) provides a summary metric measure of genetic susceptibility risk of an individual to a given genetic-related disease. Here we computed PRS designed specifically for MS, in the OFSEP-HD population[40,41]. We had 210 MS susceptibility variants (including 20 in the MHC region) out of a total of 233 known MS associated susceptibility variations available in our dataset after SNP imputation, filtering (MAF < 1%) and *HLA* alleles imputation (Table S5)[9].

We compared a log-additive PRS model to a non-weighted Sum of Risk Alleles Count (SRAC) approach using Pearson's correlation coefficient r^2 computed for the global OFSEP-HD population as well as for specific ancestry clusters[40–42]. Since MS susceptibility variants were mostly found in patients from European genetic ancestry, we compared distributions of SRAC and log-additive models between European and North-African genetic ancestries using Mann-Whitney U tests[9,41,43]. Furthermore, we assessed the phenotypic variance explained by the 20

available MHC region genetic variations compared to the 190 non-MHC SNPs at the whole

cohort level using Genome-wide Complex Trait Analysis (GCTA) software[44].

Synthetic data generation

To promote data sharing and reusability of sensitive genetic data, we provided an

anonymous – synthetic – GDPR-enforced dataset as an open resource using an adaptation of

an already existing "patient-centric" local modelling strategy[45]. The methodology focuses on

addressing privacy risks like singling out, linkability, and inference using metrics such as

Hidden Rate (HR), Local Cloaking (LC), and Distance To Closest synthetic record (DTC). Signal

retention was evaluated using Hellinger distances, correlation differences, and Gower's

distance permutation test[46]. Optimal parameters were identified as k = 2 and 20 principal

components, with regularization for rare modalities. The privacy-fidelity balance was

improved by generating three parallel synthetic datasets and averaging features patient-wise.

Post-generation processing ensured biological constraints and recalculated derived features.

Methodological details are available in Supplemental Materials and the synthetic dataset on

GitHub (https://github.com/jp3142/OFSEP_HD_public_avatar_dataset).

Results

Ancestry analysis: Principal Components Analysis of OFSEP-HD MS patients

Figure 1 shows the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of OFSEP-HD MS patients

compared to the 2 reference populations: 1,000 Genomes and North-African cohort[26]. It

highlights the genetic diversity of the MS French population, with a specific focus on the first

two principal components explaining respectively 49.1% and 29.9% of the variance (79%). The

10 most contributing SNPs for each principal component a

re listed in Table S6. The best clustering of the OFSEP-HD population was obtained

using 7 distinct clusters.

Figure 1: *Principal Component Analysis (PCA) plot of the OFSEP-HD population based on the first two principal components (PC1 and PC2), overlaid with reference datasets. Each data point represents an individual. Semi-transparent data points represent reference individuals and opaque data points represent OFSEP-HD MS patients. Cluster 1: European. Cluster 2: Afro-Caribbean. Cluster 3: North-African. Cluster 4: East-Asian. Cluster 5: African. Cluster 6: South-Asian. Cluster 7: Admixed North-African and European.*

Findings highlight a major proportion of patients with European genetic ancestry

within the OFSEP-HD cohort, totalizing 2,238 MS patients (88 %) assigned to clusters of

European ancestry, clusters 1 (n=2,177) and 7 (n=61). Clusters 2 (n=19), 3 (n=232) and 5 (n=16)

account for 267 MS patients (10.5%) with higher African ancestry. Clusters 4 (n=3) and 6 (n=34)

totalize 37 MS patients (1.4%) with higher Asian ancestral background.

Self-reported origins of OFSEP-HD patients

Table 1 shows 83 % of patients who reported metropole France origins, while only 71%

of fathers and 74% mothers self-reported such origins. Self-reported North-African origins

account for 5% of patients and around 10% of their parents. About 6% of patients reported

other European origins. The least represented origins are French overseas territories, Asian

and Sub-Saharan African origins. Ninety-eight patients did not answer the question or did not

know about their origins, and 15 patients reported to be originating from other parts of the

world. Details about other demographic and clinical data are showed in Tables S7 – 9.

	Origin count	Origin %	Father's origin count	Father's origin %	Mother's origin count	Mother's origin %
France metropole	2,110	83.01	1,812	71.28	1,889	74.31
French Overseas Territories	14	0.55	19	0.75	16	0.63
Europe (besides France)	156	6.14	238	9.36	231	9.09
North-Africa	127	5.00	272	10.70	233	9.17
Sub-Saharan African	10	0.39	23	0.90	20	0.79
Asia	12	0.47	24	0.94	22	0.87
Others	15	0.59	27	1.06	30	1.18
Unknown	98	3.86	127	5.00	101	3.97

Table 1: Self-reported origins of 2,542 remaining OFSEP-HD patients after quality controls and processing steps. Count

variables correspond to number of patients, and the % variables correspond to proportion in the OFSEP-HD population subset.

Admixture proportions of European, African and East-Asian genome in OFSEP-HD

cohort

Figure 2: *Admixture plot showing whole-genome admixture proportions of African (red), East Asian (yellow), and European*

(blue) ancestry for each of the 2,542 OFSEP-HD patients, sorted by African genome proportion. Reference parental populations

are shown on both sides of the OFSEP-HD section. Below the plot, genetic clusters identified through PCA are mapped for each

individual, providing a comprehensive view of genetic diversity within the cohort.

We observed a major European genome proportion in the French MS population with

an average above 93.7 % (Figure 2). There is also a substantial number of OFSEP-HD patients

(12.3 %) exhibiting more than 10% of African genome (Figure 2 and Table S10). Moreover,

most MS patients showing significant African genome ancestry are estimated as part of North-

African (cluster 3; n=232) genetic cluster. Distributions of genome proportions among cluster

3 is composed in majority by European genetic components with an average of 75.5 %

compared to the African genome proportions ranging from 16.7% to 38.9%. Moreover, we

found a non-neglectable East-Asian genome proportion for some MS patients, with 101 (< 4%)

with at least 5% of East-Asian genome ancestry and 2 patients with more than 85% of East-

Asian ancestry (Figure2, Table S10).

An underestimation of North-African self-reported origins among patients from

North-African genetic ancestry

We focused on qualitative analysis of North-African origins as it represents the second

largest genetic group in the OFSEP-HD cohort, after European ancestry. Figure 3 illustrates the

distribution of North-African patients based on their self-reported origins and genetic ancestry

among the OFSEP-HD population.

Figure 3: *Distribution of OFSEP-HD North-African patients by self-reported origins and genetic ancestry. 247 patients self-*

reported North-African origins and 232 of them are from North-African genetic ancestry. The numbers within each section

correspond to the sample size.

Cohen's Kappa metric ($\kappa = 0.598 \pm 0.001$) and the low proportion of discordant pairs

(5.31 %) illustrate a moderate to substantial agreement between self-reported North-African

origins and genetic North-African ancestry (Table S11). Remarkably, among the 127 MS

patients who self-reported North African genetic ancestry, 15 patients (11.8%) have a genome

that does not reveal marked North-African genetic background (Figure 3). Moreover, 51.7%

of patients from North-African genetic ancestry self-identified as from other origins (Figure 3).

Contingency tables as well as further analyses about North-African patients are presented in

Table S11 and Figure S5. Likewise, we detected a strong underestimation of self-reported Sub-

Saharan-African ($p < 0.001$) and Afro-Caribbean origins ($p < 0.05$) compared to their respective

PCA-defined ancestry clusters (Figures S6 – 10; Tables S12 – 15).

North-African patients and admixed genome proportions

Among individuals who do not have North African genetic ancestry, we found no

significant differences in the proportions of African and European genomic components when

comparing those who self-reported North African origins with those who did not report such

origins (Table S16), confirming the consistency between PCA-defined ancestry clusters and

ancestral genomic composition. Thus, we focus here on patients who are not from North-

African genetic ancestry. Figure 4 illustrates African genome proportions of those patients

from other genetic ancestries according to their self-reported North-African origins status.

Figure 4: Violin plots showing distribution of African genome proportion of patients not from North-African genetic ancestry regarding self-reported origins status. Boxplots outer borders within each violin plots represent 25th and 75th percentiles and the red dots represent the means. (****p < 1e-4).

We found that self-reported North-African patients from other genetic ancestry have a statistically significant higher proportion (Mann-Whitney U test: p < 1e-4) of African genome compared to patients who did not report such origins (Figure 4; Table S16). Nevertheless, the high variability associated to African genome proportions ($CI_{95\%}$ [3.01%; 28.65%]) and consequently European genome proportions ($CI_{95\%}$ [70.44%; 95.78%]; Table S17) of self-reported North-African patients from other genetic ancestry demonstrates the admixed nature of this subpopulation. Further details on performed analyses and European genome proportions of OFSEP-HD North-African MS patients are discussed in Figures S11 - 18. Details and analyses of other genetic ancestry clusters and origins are available in Tables S18 – 29.

      Parents' North-African origins: a better proxy of patients' genetic ancestry?

Figure 5: *(A) North-African genetic ancestry status among patients with only the father reported as from North-African origins.*

(B) North-African genetic ancestry status among patients with only the mother reported as from North-African origins. (C)

North-African genetic ancestry status among patients with both parents reported as from North-African origins. (D) Parents'

North-African origins status of patients from North-African genetic ancestry (Both: both parents were reported as from North-

African origins, None: no parents were reported as from North-African origins, Father only: the father is the only parent

reported as from North-African origins, Mother only: the mother is the only parent reported as from North-African origins).

We detected a significant association between parents' origins and children estimated

genetic ancestry (p < 1e-4). However, we found no significant statistical association (p = 0.77)

between parents' North-African origins and their child's genetic ancestry when only one

parent reported North-African origins, demonstrated by high discordance for both fathers

(84.1%) and mothers (86.7%) (Figure 5A and 5B; Table S30). Nevertheless, we observed a

substantial agreement with patients' genetic ancestry when both parents have common

origins (84.7%, Figure 5C) also highlighted by a higher Cohen's Kappa value (κ = 0.64), and a

lower proportion of discordant pairs (3.11%) (Tables S31 – 34), compared to what was

obtained previously with patients' self-reported origins (Figure 3). Additionally, 74.1 % of MS

patients with North-African genetic ancestry reported both parents as from North-African

origins (Figure 5D). Analysis of other parents' origins and genetic ancestries are available in

Tables S35 – 38.

HLA alleles imputation

HLA alleles imputation was performed on classical *HLA* genes *HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-C,*

HLA-DPA1, HLA-DPB1, HLA-DQA1, HLA-DQB1 and *HLA-DRB1* and is particularly good for all

genes. The average imputation post-probabilities ranging from 86.5% for *HLA-DRB1* to 98.9%

for *HLA-DPA1*, indicate trustful results across all considered *HLA* class I and II genes. In

addition, we found 50.3% OFSEP-HD patients presenting at least one *HLA-DRB1*15:01* allele,

which is consistent with the literature[47]. Additional details about imputation quality

distribution statistics are shown in Figure S19 and Table S39.

HLA haplotypes imputation

HLA haplotypes imputation from imputed *HLA* alleles *HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-C, HLA-DRB1* and *HLA-DQB1* achieved very high accuracy with an average post-probability of 82.9 % across all haplotypes collectively. Figure S20 and Table S40 show distribution of post-probabilities by HLA locus. We summarize HLA diversity in the context of OFSEP-HD MS cohort in Table 3.

Rank	Haplotype	Frequency
1	**A*02:01**~B*07:02~C*07:02~**DRB1*15:01**~DQB1*06:02	1.91 %
2	**A*02:01**~**B*44:02**~C*05:01~**DRB1*13:01**~DQB1*06:03	0.43 %
3	**A*02:01**~**B*44:02**~C*05:01~DRB1*04:01~**DQB1*03:01**	0.39 %
4	**A*02:0**1~**B*44:02**~C*05:01~**DRB1*15:01**~DQB1*06:02	0.37 %
5	**A*02:01**~B*15:01~C*03:04~DRB1*04:01~**DQB1*03:02**	0.31 %
6	**A*02:01**~B*08:01~C*07:01~**DRB1*03:01**~DQB1*02:01	0.30 %
7	**A*02:01**~B*18:01~C*07:01~DRB1*11:04~**DQB1*03:01**	0.28 %
8	**A*02:01**~B*18:01~C*05:01~**DRB1*03:01**~DQB1*02:01	0.26 %
9	**A*02:01**~B*40:01~C*03:04~**DRB1*08:01**~DQB1*04:02	0.26 %
10	**A*02:01**~B*40:01~C*03:04~**DRB1*15:01**~DQB1*06:02	0.24 %

Table 3: Description of the 10 most frequent imputed haplotypes including at least one MS associated HLA allele within the OFSEP-HD cohort. Bold alleles within haplotypes represent known MS associated HLA alleles[9,48].

The ten most frequent haplotypes carry HLA alleles associated to MS. Indeed, they present the protective allele *HLA-A*02:01*, but also the well-known *HLA-DRB1*15:01* MS risk allele. The most frequent haplotype is ***A*02:01~B*07:02~C*07:02~DRB1*15:01~DQB1*06:02*** (1.91%) and contain both previously mentioned MS associated HLA alleles.

Computing polygenic risk scores of French MS populations

We found an average log-additive score of 20.29 ± 0.03 for 190 non-MHC SNPs,

representing 201 risk alleles per patient. Including the 20 available MHC variations increased

the score to 23.38 ± 0.05 for 214 risk alleles in average. The log-additive model and SRAC

showed high correlation ($r^2 = 0.91$) for non-MHC SNPs, but correlation decreased substantially

($r^2 = 0.54$) when MHC variants were included (Figure S21). Moreover, MHC variants increased

the log-additive score by 15.23% while only increasing the average number of risk alleles by

6.46%, highlighting their larger effect on MS susceptibility. PRS distributions differed

significantly between MS patients from North-African and European ancestries for all PRS

models ($p < 1e-6$). PRS scores distribution statistic details are available in Table S41 and Figure

S22.

Open-access synthetic data generation: a balance between privacy and fidelity

Using our synthetic data generation process, we created a highly anonymized dataset

as indicated by key metrics following recommended thresholds: HR = 99.49% (> 90%); median

LC = 50 (> 5), with DTC = 1.8 (> 0.2) and CDR = 0.99 (> 0.3)[45]. Signal retention metrics also show

high synthetic dataset fidelity to original data with Hellinger distance distributions difference

of 0.04 (< 0.1) and distribution correlation difference of 1.92% (< 10%). Univariate statistical

analysis of generated and original datasets indicated four features (rs58394161, rs11809700,

rs11578655, rs10801908) out of the 82 generated features where distributions in synthetic

data were significantly deviating from original data distributions after Bonferroni correction

for multiple testing ($p < 0.05$). Gower's distance permutation test showed no statistically

significant differences from what would be expected by chance between generated and

original datasets (p = 0.38)[49,50]. Figure 6 shows datasets overlap on the two first dimensions

of the reduced original Euclidean space.

Figure 6: Comparative projection of original and synthetic dataset structures in original Euclidean space from Octopize's
library automatic report generation.

Discussion

The OFSEP-HD study provides valuable insights into the genetic landscape of the

French MS population, revealing significant variations of ancestral origins of MS patients in

France. We highlighted a significant proportion (232 patients; 9.1%) of MS French patients

from North-African genetic ancestry, illustrating the substantial North-African ancestral

background of the French population.

Ancestry analysis and clustering exclusively focused on the two first components of

the PCA omitting 21% of the total variance. However, we believe the proportion of variance

explained by these components is adequate to reveal the key structure of the OFSEP-HD

cohort genetic background.

We treated cluster 7 associated with an admixed North-African – European population

as part of the European cluster during statistical analyses due to its closer proximity with

European reference population and to its lower average African genome proportion compared

to North-African cluster (Tables S3 - 4 and Figures S3 - 4).

The study reveals differences between self-reported origins and genetic ancestry of

French North-African MS patients. Only half North-African genetic ancestry patient self-

identified as such, highlighting the significance of cultural affiliation over ancestral

backgrounds for patients born in France. This disparity may reflect broader social dynamics,

including potential reluctance to acknowledge North-African origins due to historical and

ongoing discrimination. Approximately 10% of these patients reported "unknown" or "other"

origins, indicating complexities in identity and societal perceptions within multicultural

societies (Figure S10)[51].

In addition, and maybe most importantly, the way questions on origins are framed may

also introduce ambiguities. The phrasing of OFSEP-HD survey question, "From which

geographical region are you originating from?", may lead to diverse interpretations, such as

reflecting on patients' birthplace, or where they grew up[52]. Other common biases should also

be considered, such as errors that may have occurred in form completion, or practitioners

misinterpretation and misrecording of information[53]. With this example of MS French

population from North-African origins, we highlight the misuse of population descriptors such

as self-reported origins that perpetuate inaccurate presuppositions regarding genetic

ancestral background. Therefore, we recommend against using such population descriptors

alone as proxies for genetic ancestry. Although the use of geographical origins and ethnicity

as population descriptors is contentious, we suggest to not fully dismiss them in genetics and

genomics research since such descriptors offer additional insights to better characterize

groups that have historically experienced health and healthcare disparities, including

inequities in genomic healthcare access[54].

Additionally, we showed a stronger alignment between parents reported North-

African origins and patients' genetic ancestry when both parents had the same origins.

Discrepancies arose when patients reported different parents' origins. Using shared parental

origins as a proxy for genetic ancestry should be done cautiously, as it may not fully represent

the child's genetic background, especially if only one parent is of North-African origin. Among

patients from other genetic clusters, self-reporting North-African origins showed a

significantly higher (p < 1e-4) proportion of African genomic ancestry (15.83% ± 12.82%)

compared to patients reporting other origins (2.54% ± 0.36%). However, the high variability in

African genomic ancestry proportion ($MoE_{95\%}$ = 12.82 %) suggests diverse reasons for self-

reporting North-African origins.

The use of log-additive models to compute PRS does not show considerable

advantages compared to a simpler SRAC approach when considering solely non-MHC

autosomal SNPs, illustrated by the high correlation between both methods (Figure S21). This

is due to the very similar effect sizes associated to non-MHC MS SNPs, yielding to nearly

identical impacts of these SNPs on PRS calculation (0R ≈ 1)[9,48]. However, log-additive models

seem more suitable when considering MHC variants since it accounts for larger effect sizes

associated MHC region variations, as opposed to SRAC method in which all variants have the

same impact on score calculation (Figure S21). Although computed for the entire OFSEP-HD

cohort, most MS variants were found in European populations and may not fully capture

genetic risk for patients from other genetic ancestral backgrounds[41,43]. Indeed, we showed a

significant difference in score distributions between North-African and European genetic

ancestries, which is more probably due to the lack of MS variants found specifically in North-

African MS populations than to a real lower susceptibility of North-African patients to MS

compared to European patients. These results indicate that relying on current PRS in clinical

use might perpetuate healthcare disparities, highlighting the need for more inclusive models

that reflect diverse genetic backgrounds[55].

Finally, our customized adapted methodology of the Avatar algorithm showed

considerable improvement regarding fidelity and privacy compared to single generation of

synthetic avatar data[45]. Indeed, averaging parallel synthetic data generation in a patient-wise

fashion conducted in considerably higher fidelity as well as increased data privacy due to the

combination of multiple avatar patients to create the synthetic patient for each original

patient. All privacy and signal metrics values for our synthetic data generation pipeline meet

all standard thresholds criteria[45]. This approach underscores the flexibility of the synthetic

data generation methodology in producing high-fidelity synthetic datasets that meet stringent

privacy standards (GDPR), making it a viable tool for future research applications. However, in

this study we performed only univariate comparisons between original and synthetic datasets.

It is equally important to verify that multivariate dependencies are preserved—for example,

by confirming that all significant associations between features, as well as between patients

and variants, are maintained.

Conclusion

In this study, we characterized the genetic landscape of the French OFSEP-HD MS

cohort into seven genetic ancestral clusters. We found that self-reported origins significantly

underestimate North-African ancestry, highlighting their limitations as proxies for genetic

ancestry; parental origins proved more reliable. In addition, French MS patients from North-

African genetic ancestry exhibited admixture profiles closer to European than to sub-Saharan

African populations. We also imputed HLA alleles/haplotypes and computed MS PRS,

revealing a greater contribution of MHC region variants to PRS values. However, our findings

demonstrate that current MS susceptibility variants are ill-suited for calculating PRS in non-

European ancestries. This work establishes the first comprehensive framework for analyzing

genetic diversity in the French OFSEP-HD cohort and propose a first open synthetic and GDPR-

enforced and privacy-aware genetic dataset for this population. This paves the way for

improvement of current synthetic data generation methodologies and the development of

new methods specifically designed for the sensitivity and complexity of genetic data. Overall,

this study lays the foundation for future MS research in France in the French national context

of limited genetic ancestral studies due to cultural and ethical considerations.

Disclosure of interests

J.P, N.S.B, M.M, I.F, S.D, M.B, S.L, L.B, A.S-E, S.B-H, F.C, R.C, L.B, N.V, declare that they

have no competing interest.

Prof. PA. Gourraud is the founder of Methodomics (2008) and the co-founder of Big

data Santé (2018). He consults for major pharmaceutical companies, all of which are handled

through academic pipelines (AstraZeneca, Biogen, Boston Scientific, Cook, Edimark, Ellipses,

Elsevier, Methodomics, Merck, Mérieux, Sanofi-Genzyme, Octopize). PA Gourraud is a

volunteer board member at AXA non-for-profit mutual insurance company (2021). He has no

prescription activity with either drugs or devices.

Dr. D. Laplaud has participated in advisory boards for Alexion, Merck, Novartis, and

Roche in the last 3 years.

Pr. S Vukusiç has received lecturing fees, travel grants, and research support from

Biogen, Janssen, Merck, Novartis, Roche, Sandoz, Sanofi-Genzyme, and Teva.

Acknowledgments

We thank OFSEP for providing source data. Indeed, data collection has been supported

by a grant provided by the French State and handled by the "Agence Nationale de la

Recherche," within the framework of the "France 2030" program, under the reference ANR-

10-COHO-002, Observatoire Français de la Sclérose en Plaques (OFSEP) - Eugène Devic EDMUS

Foundation against multiple sclerosis. I also wish to thank the Marie-Curie institute (Paris,

France) for genotyping the samples. In addition, we thank the historical contributors of

REFGENSEP, Lena Guillot-Noël and Isabelle Rebeix.

This work has been supported by the PRIMUS project (Projection in Multiple Sclerosis),

part of a government grant managed by the French National Research Agency (Agence

Nationale de la Recherche, ANR) as its 3rd PIA, integrated into the "France 2030" plan under

reference [ANR-21-RHUS-0014]. This work was supported by Nantes Métropole, Région des

Pays de la Loire and European Union (FEDER) via the Programme d'investissements d'Avenir

(NExT, SHLARC Project, Nantes Université).

Moreover, insights and encouragement from following collaborators were

instrumental in the completion of this work. I am grateful to CR2TI for providing the necessary

facilities and technical support, and Dr. Vincent Mauduit for his assistance with data analysis.

We thank the Curie genomic platforms for technical support and GWAS genotyping.

We are also grateful to the Bioinformatics Core Facility BiRD, member of Biogenouest and

Institut Français de Bioinformatique (IFB) (ANR-11-INBS-0013) for the use of their resources

and their technical support.

Authors' contribution

Data Curation: M.M. performed the initial quality control using the Axiom Analysis Tool from

Thermofisher, following standardized protocols. J.P. curated the final dataset from the original

data.

Formal Analysis: N.S.B.S. conducted the HLA imputation using the HIBAG R tool and data

reference from SNP-HLA Reference Consortium. L.B imputed HLA haplotypes and phase using

HLA2Haplo interface.

Investigation J.P performed all other analyses and experiments related to the study.

Data Anonymization and Synthetic Data Generation: J.P. generated anonymized synthetic

data using the Avatarization method from Octopize in the purpose of data sharing.

Conceptualization: J.P. with input from P.A.G. and N.V, as well as M.M and I.F.

Supervision: P.A.G., N.V.

Writing – Original Draft: J.P.

Writing – Review & Editing: P.A.G. and N.V. as well as I.F, L.B, and S.D contributed to

discussions and validated the final manuscript.

Web ressources

Bcftools 1.13: https://samtools.github.io/bcftools/

Plink 1.9 and 2: https://www.cog-genomics.org/plink/

Admixture 1.3.0: https://dalexander.github.io/admixture/

TopMed: https://imputation.biodatacataslyst.nhlbi.nih.gov/

Eigensoft - smartpca: https://github.com/chrchang/eigensoft

HLA2Haplo: https://easyhla.univ-nantes.fr/

Avatar: https://github.com/octopize/avatar-python

Genome-wide Complex Trait Analysis (GCTA) 1v.94.1 Linux:

https://yanglab.westlake.edu.cn/software/gcta/#Overview

Data and code availability

Avatar dataset and pipeline scripts are available on github (https://github.com/jp3142).

Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing

During the preparation of this work the authors used OpenAI's GPT-4 and 3.5, as well

as Mistral's model "LeChat" in order to assist with language refining and rephrasing of certain

sections. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed

and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

References

1. Walton, C. *et al.* Rising prevalence of multiple sclerosis worldwide: Insights from the Atlas of MS, third edition. *Mult Scler* **26**, 1816–1821 (2020).

2. Nelson, L. M. *et al.* A new way to estimate neurologic disease prevalence in the United States. *Neurology* **92**, 469–480 (2019).

3. McGinley, M. P., Goldschmidt, C. H. & Rae-Grant, A. D. Diagnosis and Treatment of Multiple Sclerosis: A Review. *JAMA* **325**, 765–779 (2021).

4. Pierret, C., Mainguy, M. & Leray, E. Prevalence of multiple sclerosis in France in 2021: Data from the French health insurance database. *Revue Neurologique* **180**, 429–437 (2024).

5. Sawad, A. B., Seoane-Vazquez, E., Rodriguez-Monguio, R. & Turkistani, F. Cost-effectiveness of different strategies for treatment relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *J Comp Eff Res* **6**, 97–108 (2017).

6. Simpson, S. *et al.* Sun Exposure across the Life Course Significantly Modulates Early Multiple Sclerosis Clinical Course. *Front Neurol* **9**, 16 (2018).

7. Ascherio, A. Environmental factors in multiple sclerosis. *Expert Rev Neurother* **13**, 3–9 (2013).

8. Lanz, T. V. *et al.* Clonally expanded B cells in multiple sclerosis bind EBV EBNA1 and GlialCAM. *Nature* **603**, 321–327 (2022).

9. INTERNATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS GENETICS CONSORTIUM. Multiple sclerosis genomic map implicates peripheral immune cells and microglia in susceptibility. *Science* **365**, eaav7188 (2019).

10. Hollenbach, J. A. & Oksenberg, J. R. The immunogenetics of multiple sclerosis: A comprehensive review. *J Autoimmun* **64**, 13–25 (2015).

11. Harroud, A. *et al.* Locus for severity implicates CNS resilience in progression of multiple sclerosis. *Nature* 1–9 (2023) doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06250-x.

12. Saint Pierre, A. *et al.* The genetic history of France. *Eur J Hum Genet* **28**, 853–865 (2020).

13. Kassar, H. *et al.* Emigration flows from North Africa to Europe. *European Journal of Public Health* **24**, 2–5 (2014).

14. Botigué, L. R. *et al.* Gene flow from North Africa contributes to differential human genetic diversity in southern Europe. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**, 11791–11796 (2013).

15. Stoeklé, H. *et al.* French-style genetics v. 2.0: The "e-CohortE" project. *Clin Genet* **96**, 330–340 (2019).

16. Pfennig, A., Petersen, L. N., Kachambwa, P. & Lachance, J. Evolutionary Genetics and Admixture in African Populations. *Genome Biology and Evolution* **15**, evad054 (2023).

17. Fatumo, S. *et al.* Diversity in Genomic Studies: A Roadmap to Address the Imbalance. *Nat Med* **28**, 243–250 (2022).

18.   Vukusic, S. *et al.* Observatoire Français de la Sclérose en Plaques (OFSEP): A unique
multimodal nationwide MS registry in France. *Mult Scler* **26**, 118–122 (2020).

19.   Gauthier, A. *et al.* Comparison of SimoaTM and EllaTM to assess serum neurofilament-light
chain in multiple sclerosis. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol* **8**, 1141–1150 (2021).

20.   Francis, G. *et al.* Prognostic factors of disability progression in multiple sclerosis in real life:
the OFSEP-high definition (OFSEP-HD) prospective cohort in France. *Open access*.

21.   Thompson, A. J. *et al.* Diagnosis of multiple sclerosis: 2017 revisions of the McDonald criteria.
Lancet Neurol **17**, 162–173 (2018).

22.   EDMUS, a European database for multiple sclerosis - PubMed. https://pubmed-ncbi-nlm-nih-
gov.proxy.insermbiblio.inist.fr/1527537/.

23.   Kurtzke, J. F. Rating neurologic impairment in multiple sclerosis: an expanded disability status
scale (EDSS). *Neurology* **33**, 1444–1452 (1983).

24.   Lublin, F. D. *et al.* Defining the clinical course of multiple sclerosis. *Neurology* **83**, 278–286
(2014).

25.   1000 Genomes Project Consortium *et al.* A global reference for human genetic variation.
Nature **526**, 68–74 (2015).

26.   Arauna, L. R. *et al.* Recent Historical Migrations Have Shaped the Gene Pool of Arabs and
Berbers in North Africa. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **34**, 318–329 (2017).

27.   Henn, B. M. *et al.* Genomic Ancestry of North Africans Supports Back-to-Africa Migrations.
PLOS Genetics **8**, e1002397 (2012).

28.   Marees, A. T. *et al.* A tutorial on conducting genome-wide association studies: Quality control
and statistical analysis. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res* **27**, e1608 (2018).

29.   Jordan, I. K., Sharma, S., Nagar, S. D., Valderrama-Aguirre, A. & Mariño-Ramírez, L. Correction
to: Genetic Ancestry Inference for Pharmacogenomics. *Methods Mol Biol* **2547**, C1 (2022).

30.   Ikotun, A. M., Ezugwu, A. E., Abualigah, L., Abuhaija, B. & Heming, J. K-means clustering
algorithms: A comprehensive review, variants analysis, and advances in the era of big data.
Information Sciences **622**, 178–210 (2023).

31.   Yuan, C. & Yang, H. Research on K-Value Selection Method of K-Means Clustering Algorithm.
J **2**, 226–235 (2019).

32.   Guarino-Vignon, P., Marchi, N., Bendezu-Sarmiento, J., Heyer, E. & Bon, C. Genetic continuity
of Indo-Iranian speakers since the Iron Age in southern Central Asia. *Sci Rep* **12**, 733 (2022).

33.   Mendes, M., Alvim, I., Borda, V. & Tarazona-Santos, E. The history behind the mosaic of the
Americas. *Curr Opin Genet Dev* **62**, 72–77 (2020).

34.   Hazra, A. Using the confidence interval confidently. *J Thorac Dis* **9**, 4125–4130 (2017).

35.   McHugh, M. L. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)* **22**, 276–282
(2012).

36.   A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales - Jacob Cohen, 1960.
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/001316446002000104.

37.   Vince, N. *et al.* SNP-HLA Reference Consortium (SHLARC): HLA and SNP data sharing for
promoting MHC-centric analyses in genomics. *Genet Epidemiol* **44**, 733–740 (2020).

38.   Zheng, X. *et al.* HIBAG--HLA genotype imputation with attribute bagging. *Pharmacogenomics*
J **14**, 192–200 (2014).

39.   Geffard, E. *et al.* Easy-HLA: a validated web application suite to reveal the full details of HLA
typing. *Bioinformatics* **36**, 2157–2164 (2020).

40.   Isobe, N. *et al.* Genetic burden in multiple sclerosis families. *Genes Immun* **14**, 434–440
(2013).

41.   Gourraud, P.-A. *et al.* Aggregation of multiple sclerosis genetic risk variants in multiple and
single case families. *Ann Neurol.* **69**, 65–74 (2011).

42.   Akoglu, H. User's guide to correlation coefficients. *Turk J Emerg Med* **18**, 91–93 (2018).

43.   Duncan, L. *et al.* Analysis of polygenic risk score usage and performance in diverse human
populations. *Nat Commun* **10**, 3328 (2019).

44.   Yang, J., Lee, S. H., Goddard, M. E. & Visscher, P. M. GCTA: a tool for genome-wide complex
trait analysis. *Am J Hum Genet* **88**, 76–82 (2011).

45.   Guillaudeux, M. *et al.* Patient-centric synthetic data generation, no reason to risk re-
identification in biomedical data analysis. *npj Digit. Med.* **6**, 37 (2023).

46.   Gower, J. C. A General Coefficient of Similarity and Some of Its Properties. *Biometrics* **27**,
857–871 (1971).

47.   DeLuca, G. C. *et al.* An extremes of outcome strategy provides evidence that multiple
sclerosis severity is determined by alleles at the HLA-DRB1 locus. *Proceedings of the National*
Academy of Sciences **104**, 20896–20901 (2007).

48.   Moutsianas, L. *et al.* Class II HLA interactions modulate genetic risk for multiple sclerosis. *Nat*
Genet **47**, 1107–1113 (2015).

49.   Bonferroni, C. E. *Teoria statistica delle classi e calcolo delle probabilità*. (Seeber, 1936).

50.   Armstrong, R. A. When to use the Bonferroni correction. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* **34**, 502–508
(2014).

51.   Pereira, J. L. *et al.* Genetic Ancestry and Self-Reported "Skin Color/Race" in the Urban
Admixed Population of São Paulo City, Brazil. *Genes* **15**, 917 (2024).

52.   Gotlieb, R. *et al.* Accuracy in Patient Understanding of Common Medical Phrases. *JAMA*
Network Open **5**, e2242972 (2022).

53.   Goldberg, S. I., Niemierko, A. & Turchin, A. Analysis of Data Errors in Clinical Research
Databases. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc* **2008**, 242–246 (2008).

54.   Feero, W. G. *et al.* Guidance on use of race, ethnicity, and geographic origin as proxies for
genetic ancestry groups in biomedical publications. *The American Journal of Human Genetics* **111**,
621–623 (2024).

55.   Martin, A. R. *et al.* Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health
disparities. *Nat Genet* **51**, 584–591 (2019).