Getting to GRIPS with MR-Egger: modelling directional pleiotropy independently of allele coding

Frank Dudbridge (1), Bethany Voller (2), Ruby M Woodward (1), Timothy M Frayling (2, 3), Luke C Pilling (2), Jack Bowden (2, 4).

(1) Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Leicester, UK
(2) Department of Clinical and Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Exeter, UK
(3) Department of Genetic Medicine and Development, Faculty of Medicine, CMU, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
(4) Novo Nordisk Genetics Centre of Excellence, Oxford, UK

Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK

frank.dudbridge@leicester.ac.uk

Abstract

Mendelian Randomisation Egger regression (MR-Egger) is a popular method for causal inference using single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) as instrumental variables. It allows all SNPs to have direct pleiotropic effects on the outcome, provided that those effects are independent of the effects on the exposure, known as the InSIDE assumption. However, the results of MR-Egger, and the InSIDE assumption itself, are sensitive to which allele is coded as the effect allele for each SNP. A pragmatic convention is to code the alleles with positive effects on the exposure, which has some advantages in interpretation but also some statistical limitations. Here we show that if the InSIDE assumption holds under all-positive coding of the exposure effects, it cannot hold under all-positive coding of the pleiotropic effects, and argue that this undermines the soundness of MR-Egger. We propose a modification that has the Genotype Recoding Invariance Property (GRIP), achieving the main aim of MR-Egger without the difficulties of allele coding. Our approach, MR-GRIP, is valid under a "Variance independent of covariance explained" assumption (VICE), which amounts to an inverse relationship between exposure effects and pleiotropic effects. Examples and simulations suggest that MR-GRIP can reconcile differences between MR-Egger and alternative methods.

Introduction

In two-sample Mendelian randomisation (MR) using multiple single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), the standard estimator of the causal effect is the inverse-variance weighted (IVW) mean of ratio estimates (1-3). This is usually supplemented with sensitivity analyses that relax the instrumental variable (IV) assumptions in various ways. Mendelian Randomisation Egger regression (MR-Egger) is often performed as a method that allows all SNPs to have direct pleiotropic effects on the outcome, not acting via the exposure (4). The IVW estimate assumes "balanced pleiotropy", by which such pleiotropic effects have mean zero. MR-Egger allows a non-zero mean, called "directional pleiotropy". Both IVW and MR-Egger require the InSIDE assumption (Instrument Strength Independent of Direct Effect) under which the pleiotropic effects are independent of the SNP-exposure effects. This intuitively corresponds to independence of the corresponding biological pathways.

This terminology is somewhat careless, as the effects refer to genotypes, not SNPs. Thus, in discussing directional pleiotropy, one must specify a numerical coding for each of the three genotypes of each SNP. An additive model is usually assumed, which only requires specifying which of the two alleles is the effect allele for each SNP. Depending on this *allele coding*, directional pleiotropy may or may not be present, and the InSIDE assumption may or may not hold (5). This is rather discomfiting, as our assumptions and inferences ought to reflect some state of nature rather than the data coding. However, MR-Egger can be very sensitive to the allele coding, while IVW is invariant to it. The convention is to code the alleles with positive effects on the exposure, with the InSIDE assumption then expressed relative to that coding (6). This may be problematic if, in truth, the InSIDE assumption only holds under some other coding (5).

The concept of an allele coding itself needs refining since each SNP has different alleles. If the choice of effect allele is considered random, then there is little reason not to assume balanced pleiotropy, as pleiotropic effects are as likely to be positive as negative (7). For directional pleiotropy to have meaning, there must be a systematic way to code SNPs irrespective of their alleles. All-positive coding is one such scheme, although it was introduced only to standardise MR-Egger, not from biological considerations. Nevertheless, the existence of such a coding admits the possibility of directional pleiotropy, which could then be accommodated by MR-Egger.

In this paper we review the problem of defining the effect alleles, and how this can affect MR assumptions and results. We present a new argument to suggest that the all-positive coding of MR-Egger is logically problematic. We propose an alternative formulation of directional pleiotropy, MR-GRIP, which is invariant to allele coding. Using data examples and simulations, we show that this approach has promise as a sensitivity analysis for MR that achieves the main aim of MR-Egger while avoiding some of its difficulties.

Methods

Preliminaries

Assume the setting of a MR analysis, with the following data generating model for the continuous exposure X, outcome Y and confounder U for subject i out of n, with SNP genotypes $G_{ij}, j = 1, \cdots, m$:

$$U_i | G_{i.} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \phi_j G_{ij} + \epsilon_i^U \tag{1}$$

$$X_i | U_i, G_{i.} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \gamma_j G_{ij} + U_i + \epsilon_i^X \tag{2}$$

$$Y_i | X_i, U_i, G_{i.} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_j G_{ij} + \beta X_i + \delta U_i + \epsilon_i^Y \tag{3}$$

Assume that the errors ϵ_i^U, ϵ_i^X and ϵ_i^Y are independent of all other variables in the above model,



which is represented graphically in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Directed acyclic graph showing causal relations between gene G_j, exposure X, confounder U and outcome Y. Lines are labelled with parameters from equations 1, 2 and 3. Dashed lines are absent under the standard instrumental variable assumptions.

This model is simplistic, and ignores many of the features that are present in real MR studies, such as binary outcomes, case/control sampling, non-additive effects and so on. Nevertheless, it serves as the basis for motivating many commonly used MR methods.

In MR the standard instrumental variable assumptions are usually stated as: G associated with X (IV1); G independent of U (IV2); Y independent of G given X and U (IV3). Assumptions IV1-IV3 are represented by the solid lines in Figure 1. The dashed lines represent examples of violations of these assumptions, as represented by the parameters ϕ_j and α_j in equations 1 and 3. As written, IV2 is violated for variant j when $\phi_j \neq 0$ and IV3 is violated when $\alpha_j \neq 0$. In what follows we assume that $\phi_j = 0$ for all j, so that IV2 is always satisfied.

Summary data MR

Often, only summary data estimates of genetic associations with the exposure and outcome are available for MR analysis. In this setting, a causal effect estimate may be obtained from each variant

in turn via the ratio (or Wald) method, and the estimates may then be averaged by taking a (weighted) mean, median or mode. Marginalising over the confounder U in equation 2 and over U and X in equation 3, equivalent models for $X|G_j$ and $Y|G_j$ (assuming all $\phi_j = 0$) are

$$X_i|G_{ij} = \gamma_j G_{ij} + \epsilon_i'^X \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i|G_{ij} &= (\alpha_j + \beta\gamma_j)G_{ij} + \epsilon_i'^Y \\ &= \Gamma_j G_{ij} + \epsilon_i'^Y \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Equations 4 and 5 are known as the "reduced form" equations in the econometrics literature. They furnish a ratio estimate for each variant j as

$$\hat{\beta}_j = \frac{E(Y|G_j)}{E(X|G_j)} = \frac{\hat{\Gamma}_j}{\hat{\gamma}_j} = \frac{(\widehat{\alpha + \beta\gamma})_j}{\hat{\gamma}_j} \tag{6}$$

Let σ_{Xj}^2, σ_{Yj}^2 denote the sampling variances of $\hat{\gamma}_j$, $\hat{\Gamma}_j$ respectively, assumed known. For simplicity assume further that the SNPs are uncorrelated, although the development can be extended to correlated SNPs.

Summary data MR is most easily motivated by assuming that the standard error of the SNP-exposure association estimate is negligible ($\sigma_{Xj}^2 = 0$ for all j, so $\hat{\gamma}_j = \gamma_j$). This is tantamount to saying that each SNP is an infinitely strong instrument, and is called the NO Measurement Error (NOME) assumption because of the connection between the bias induced by weak instruments in MR and the general phenomenon of regression dilution bias. It also makes life easier if the SNP-exposure and SNP-outcome data are obtained from independent samples, so that $\epsilon_i'^X$ is independent of $\epsilon_i'^Y$ but the population is assumed to be homogeneous. This framework is called a two-sample MR analysis (8). We begin by assuming the two-sample setting with NOME, relaxing these assumptions later.

IVW and MR-Egger

The IVW approach to summary data MR obtains an overall estimate for the causal effect from the weighted mean of the individual ratio estimates (equation 6). Thus, it assumes that all SNPs are valid IVs, $\phi_j = \alpha_j = 0$ for all j. If so, the following simplified model holds:

$$\hat{\Gamma}_j = \beta\hat{\gamma}_j + \epsilon_{Yj}, \qquad \epsilon_{Yj} \sim N(0, \sigma_{Yj}^2) \tag{7}$$

This is a linear regression model with the intercept constrained to be zero. With inverse variance weights σ_{Yj}^{-2}, the least squares estimate for the causal effect β is

$$\hat{\beta}_{IVW} = \frac{\sum \sigma_{Yj}^{-2}\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_j}{\sum \sigma_{Yj}^{-2}\hat{\gamma}_j^2} = \frac{\sum w_j\hat{\beta}_j}{\sum w_j} \tag{8}$$

where $w_j = \hat{\gamma}_j^2 \sigma_{Y_j}^{-2}$ is the inverse variance of $\hat{\beta}_j$ under the NOME assumption. Under the IV and NOME assumptions, the IVW estimate is unbiased for β.

The IVW estimate is also unbiased for β under pleiotropic effects α_j such that $E(\alpha_j|\gamma_j) = 0$, since equation (7) now becomes

$$\hat{\Gamma}_j = \beta\hat{\gamma}_j + \alpha_j + \epsilon_{Yj} \tag{9}$$

and in fitting the regression the unobserved α_j are absorbed into the errors. The zero-mean assumption on α_j is known as balanced pleiotropy. The regression residuals must be independent of the exposure variable: that is, $\alpha_j + \epsilon_{Y_j}$ is independent of $\hat{\gamma}_j$, thus (in the two-sample design under NOME) we require independence of α_j and γ_j, known as the InSIDE assumption.

Under InSIDE we have $E(\alpha_j|\gamma_j) = E(\alpha_j)$. This expectation may be conceived as over the fixed effects of the specific SNPs in the analysis ("perfect" InSIDE (8)), or more usually, over a hypothetical sample space of random pleiotropic effects, whose variance contributes to the residual variance in the regression ("general" or "weak" InSIDE (8, 9)). Balanced pleiotropy is more easily justified under the random effects conception.

MR-Egger regression has been proposed as an extension to the IVW method without the constraint that the intercept equals zero (4). It can, in theory, provide an unbiased estimate for the causal effect if, across variants, the pleiotropic effects α_j have non-zero expectation, "directional pleiotropy". The model in equation (9) is under-identified, as not all of its $(m+1)$ parameters can be estimated simultaneously. MR-Egger regression resolves this by instead fitting the two-parameter model

$$\hat{\Gamma}_j = \alpha_0 + \beta\hat{\gamma}_j + \epsilon_{Yj} \tag{10}$$

Similar to the IVW method, the j-th term of this regression is usually weighted by $\sigma_{Y_j}^{-2}$ to improve efficiency, although this would only yield the correct standard error if all $\alpha_j = \alpha_0$. Two alternative approaches that impose a different identifying condition on equation (9) are the Weighted Median (WM) (10) and Mode-Based Estimator (MBE) (11). They both assume that some of the instruments are not pleiotropic at all. In essence, this amounts to the condition that $median(\alpha_j) = 0$ in the case of the WM or that $mode(\alpha_j) = 0$ in the case of the MBE.

Gene Recoding Invariance Property (GRIP)

When conducting summary data MR, the SNPs are usually coded with an additive model to represent the number of exposure increasing alleles (0, 1 or 2). Therefore $\hat{\gamma}_j \geq 0$ for all j, which we call *all-positive coding*. However, the alternative allele could be coded instead, in which case $\hat{\gamma}_j$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_j$ both change sign. The coding is unimportant for the IVW estimate (equation 8), since the sign cancels in each ratio $\hat{\beta}_j$ (equation 6) and the weights w_j are always positive. We say that the IVW estimate has the Gene Recoding Invariance Property (GRIP); this property also applies to WM and MBE, and indeed to any method that works directly on the ratios $\hat{\beta}_j$.

A useful graphical interpretation of summary data MR is a scatter plot of the SNP-outcome association estimates $\hat{\Gamma}_j$ versus the SNP-exposure association estimates $\hat{\gamma}_j$. The ratio estimate $\hat{\beta}_j$ obtained from variant j can then be interpreted as the slope of the line linking the data point

$(\hat{\Gamma}_j, \hat{\gamma}_j)$ to the origin. A line from the origin with slope $\hat{\beta}_{IVW}$ promotes its interpretation as a weighted average of the individual ratio estimates or slopes, obtained from the no-intercept regression model (equation 7).

To illustrate this, Figure 2(a) shows a hypothetical scatter plot of 14 SNP-exposure and SNP-outcome association estimates. The black dots represent the original associations of, say, the minor alleles. Five of the $\hat{\gamma}_j$'s happen to be negative; the hollow dots show the transformation to all-positive coding, which is equivalent to a reflection of the negative values on the line $\hat{\Gamma} = -\hat{\gamma}$.



Figure 2. Scatter plots of SNP-exposure association estimates $\hat{\gamma}$ and SNP-outcome association estimates $\hat{\Gamma}$ with original coding (solid dots) and all-positive coding (hollow dots).

The IVW estimate, represented as the slope of the red line, is identical under either coding, since $\hat{\beta}_{IVW}$ has GRIP. However, the scatter plot and regression interpretations only make sense under all-positive coding. This is clarified in Figure 2(b), which shows a hypothetical scatter plot of four SNP-exposure and SNP-outcome associations using the same conventions. Two of the variants yield negative ratio estimates and two yield positive ratio estimates that perfectly cancel, giving an IVW estimate of zero. The corresponding slope perfectly intersects the four data points under all-positive coding, but not under the original coding. Therefore we may say that the IVW estimate has GRIP, but its scatter plot interpretation does not.

MR-Egger was originally proposed for all-positive coding, but the estimator does not have GRIP. In figure 3, the solid red line is the IVW estimate, whereas the solid and dashed blue lines show the MR-Egger regression slope fitted to the original and all-positive coded data respectively. Inferences from the two MR-Egger estimates are markedly different: all-positive coding suggests negative directional pleiotropy and a causal effect greater than $\hat{\beta}_{IVW}$, whereas the original coding suggests positive directional pleiotropy and a causal effect less than $\hat{\beta}_{IVW}$. Indeed, each of the possible 2^{14} codings may lead to a different estimate of the causal effect.



Figure 3. Scatter plot of SNP-exposure association estimates $\hat{\gamma}$ and SNP-outcome association estimates $\hat{\Gamma}$ with original coding (solid dots) and all-positive coding (hollow dots). MR-Egger slope for original data (solid blue line) and recoded data (dashed blue line). IVW slope for both (red line).

This is surprising, because an equivalent statement of equation (9) is

$$-\hat{\Gamma}_j = \beta(-\hat{\gamma}_j) + (-\alpha_j) + (-\epsilon_{Yj})$$

so MR-Egger ought to estimate the same causal effect under all codings. The intercept, however, does depend on the coding, and thus any statement about directional or balanced pleiotropy is coding specific.

One reason for the lack of GRIP is the least-squares estimation of β. The weighted least-squares estimate in MR-Egger is

$$\frac{\sum \sigma_{Y_j}^{-2}\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_j - \sum \sigma_{Y_j}^{-2}\hat{\Gamma}_j \sum \sigma_{Y_j}^{-2}\hat{\gamma}_j}{\sum \sigma_{Y_j}^{-2}\hat{\gamma}_j^2 - \left(\sum \sigma_{Y_j}^{-2}\hat{\gamma}_j\right)^2}$$

where the second terms in both numerator and denominator change under allele recoding. A more serious possibility, however, is that the InSIDE assumption itself does not have GRIP, and so MR-Egger is unbiased under some codings but not others. Figure 4 shows a hypothetical scatter plot of 14 pleiotropic effects versus the SNP-exposure estimates. Under the original coding, α and $\hat{\gamma}$ are independent, satisfying InSIDE, whereas under all-positive coding a correlation is introduced and the assumption is violated.



Figure 4. Scatter plot of SNP-exposure association estimates $\hat{\gamma}$ and direct pleiotropic effects α with original coding (solid dots) and all-positive coding (hollow dots). Regression lines for original data (solid blue line) and recoded data (dashed blue line).

It is common to test whether the intercept in MR-Egger is zero. Rejection of this hypothesis suggests that the IVW model may be inappropriate owing to directional pleiotropy. While the intercept generally depends on allele coding, the null hypothesis does have GRIP, because if $E(\alpha_j) = 0$ when $\gamma_i < 0$ then recoding also results in $E(-\alpha_j) = 0$. If there is a coding under which the null hypothesis $\alpha_0 = 0$ is true, it will remain true under any recoding (such as all-positive) that does not depend on α. Therefore, the intercept test is valid in the sense of having the correct type-1 error, but if the null hypothesis is rejected then the causal effect estimate requires the InSIDE assumption specifically under all-positive coding.

An alternative representation of summary data MR is the Radial plot (12). This plots the standardised estimates $\hat{\beta}_j/se(\hat{\beta}_j)$ against the inverse standard errors $1/se(\hat{\beta}_j)$, allowing easier identification of outliers: the slope of the corresponding regression (with zero intercept) is the IVW estimate and the distance from the slope to each SNP's data point corresponds to its residual on a common scale. This may be extended to a Radial version of MR-Egger, via the regression model

$$\hat{\beta}_j\sqrt{w_j} = \alpha_0 + \beta\sqrt{w_j} + \epsilon_{Yj}$$

where $\sqrt{w_j} = 1/se(\hat{\beta}_j)$. Because the standard error is naturally positive, and $\hat{\beta}_j$ is coding invariant, Radial MR-Egger ostensibly has GRIP. However, $se(\hat{\beta}_j) = \sqrt{var(\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sqrt{\hat{\gamma}_j^2/\sigma_{Y_j}^2} = |\hat{\gamma}_j|/|\sigma_{Y_j}|$, showing that the Radial model implicitly imposes all-positive coding. Extensive analyses have confirmed that results from all-positive MR-Egger and Radial MR-Egger are very similar (5).

Pros and cons of all-positive coding

As a default for MR-Egger, all-positive coding has some good motivations. It allows an interpretation that all SNPs proxy the same intervention on the exposure. It reflects what might be done if a polygenic score is used as a single instrument, as it is natural to use all-positive coding in the score

(3, 13). Furthermore, as noted above, the scatter plot interpretation makes most sense under all-positive coding.

One limitation is that the coding is based on sample estimates $\hat{\gamma}_j$ and if NOME is violated, some estimates may have different sign to the true γ_j. This should not be a problem when using SNPs strongly associated with the exposure, but it can lead to bias when many weak instruments are used (14). To have any grounding in biology, the InSIDE assumption should apply to the true effects, but it may then be violated under all-positive coding of the sample estimates.

Another issue is that, by forcing all $\hat{\gamma}_j$ to be positive, their variance will be reduced compared to when some are negative. As a result, the estimator from all-positive coding will have greater standard error than those from other codings, since it is inversely proportional to the variability in $\hat{\gamma}_j$ (5, 9); thus this default is, in a sense, the least efficient approach among those possible.

A more fundamental limitation of all-positive coding is that the InSIDE assumption may not be symmetric in α and γ. That is, if α_j and γ_j are independent when $\gamma_j \geq 0$, they may not be independent under the coding with $\alpha_j \geq 0$. To see this, suppose that, under all-positive coding of γ, $\alpha < 0$ with probability π and $\alpha \geq 0$ with probability $(1-\pi)$. Let $\alpha' = -\alpha$ and $\gamma' = -\gamma$ when $\alpha < 0$; $\alpha' = \alpha$ and $\gamma' = \gamma$ when $\alpha \geq 0$. Then (suppressing subscript for clarity)

$$\begin{aligned} cov(\alpha', \gamma') &= \pi E(\alpha'\gamma'|\alpha < 0) + (1-\pi)E(\alpha'\gamma'|\alpha \geq 0) \\ &\quad - [\pi E(\alpha'|\alpha < 0) + (1-\pi)E(\alpha'|\alpha \geq 0)][\pi E(\gamma'|\alpha < 0) + (1-\pi)E(\gamma'|\alpha \geq 0)] \\ &= \pi E(\alpha\gamma|\alpha < 0) + (1-\pi)E(\alpha\gamma|\alpha \geq 0) \\ &\quad - [-\pi E(\alpha|\alpha < 0) + (1-\pi)E(\alpha|\alpha \geq 0)][-\pi E(\gamma|\alpha < 0) + (1-\pi)E(\gamma|\alpha \geq 0)] \\ &= E(\alpha\gamma) - [E(\alpha) - 2\pi E(\alpha|\alpha < 0)][E(\gamma) - 2\pi E(\gamma|\alpha < 0)] \\ &= cov(\alpha, \gamma) + 2\pi[E(\alpha|\alpha < 0)E(\gamma) + E(\alpha)E(\gamma|\alpha < 0)] - 4\pi^2 E(\alpha|\alpha < 0)E(\gamma|\alpha < 0) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in general, $cov(\alpha', \gamma') \neq cov(\alpha, \gamma)$ and they cannot both be zero. An important exception is balanced pleiotropy with $E(\alpha) = 0$ and $\pi = \frac{1}{2}$. In figure 4, α and γ are independent under all-positive coding of α but not under all-positive coding of γ.

This asymmetry is disturbing because, in figure 1, the only logical distinction between α and γ is that X has a causal effect on Y but not *vice versa*. But the presence of this causal effect is just what we wish to infer. The all-positive InSIDE assumption bestows a status on X which is not given to Y, but nature is presumably agnostic to what causal inferences we perform: there is no reason to expect that, if the all-positive InSIDE assumption does hold, it is in the same direction as the causal inference of our interest. Similarly, a given set of SNPs can only be valid instruments for MR-Egger in one direction, despite satisfying assumptions IV1 and IV2 in both directions.

Notwithstanding the adage that all models are wrong, their assumptions should be justifiable by an argument from nature. For example, one could argue for balanced pleiotropy on the grounds that, if direct effects on Y are indeed independent of those on X, they are equally likely to be positive or negative, and we have seen that InSIDE is symmetric in this case. Under directional pleiotropy, however, our view is that the all-positive InSIDE assumption is logically problematic owing to its structural asymmetry. Together with the statistical aspects noted above, this limitation severely undermines MR-Egger as the most natural generalisation of IVW.

MR-GRIP and the VICE assumption

The issues related to all-positive coding are known, but they have been tolerated for want of a practical alternative. The prevailing view is that "Until a better solution appears, we should be cautious when applying MR-Egger" (5). We now propose a simple modification that achieves the main aim of MR-Egger, estimating a mean of $\hat{\beta}_j$ with unbalanced pleiotropy, while retaining GRIP.

Recall equation (9)

$$\hat{\Gamma}_j = \beta\hat{\gamma}_j + \alpha_j + \epsilon_{Yj}$$

Then trivially, multiplying through by $\hat{\gamma}_j$,

$$\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_j = \beta\hat{\gamma}_j^2 + \alpha_j\hat{\gamma}_j + \epsilon_{Yj}\hat{\gamma}_j \tag{11}$$

Our proposal, called MR-GRIP, is to estimate β from the regression of $\hat{\Gamma}\hat{\gamma}$ on $\hat{\gamma}^2$. Clearly this regression has GRIP since recoding SNP j changes the sign of both $\hat{\Gamma}_j$ and $\hat{\gamma}_j$ while $\hat{\gamma}_j^2$ is unchanged. The regression's mean model is

$$E\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_j|\hat{\gamma}_j^2\right) = \alpha_0 + \beta\hat{\gamma}_j^2 \tag{12}$$

where the intercept is now $\alpha_0 = E(\alpha_j\hat{\gamma}_j)$ and may be zero ("balanced") or non-zero ("directional"). Still assuming NOME, the $\hat{\gamma}_j$ may be treated as fixed, in which case the variance of $\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_j$ is $\hat{\gamma}_j^2\sigma_{Yj}^2$ and the regression may be fitted with inverse variance weighting as before. Indeed, if the intercept is fixed to zero then the least-squares estimate is

$$\frac{\sum \hat{\gamma}_j^{-2}\sigma_{Yj}^{-2}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_j\right)\left(\hat{\gamma}_j^2\right)}{\sum \hat{\gamma}_j^{-2}\sigma_{Yj}^{-2}\left(\hat{\gamma}_j^2\right)^2} = \frac{\sum \sigma_{Yj}^{-2}\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_j}{\sum \sigma_{Yj}^{-2}\hat{\gamma}_j^2}$$

identical to the IVW estimate. Thus, MR-GRIP can be seen as a generalisation of IVW that allows $E\left(\alpha_j\gamma_j|\gamma_j^2\right) \neq 0$.

Under this model the counterpart to the InSIDE assumption is that $\alpha_j\gamma_j$ is independent of γ_j^2; clearly this too has GRIP. Although the converse assumption, independence of $\alpha_j\gamma_j$ and α_j^2, is not guaranteed, neither is it excluded by construction as it is for MR-Egger. While the parameters α_j and γ_j are natural in the linear model for a single SNP (equations 4 and 5), for inference across multiple SNPs we suggest that the canonical parameters are in fact the GRIP terms $\alpha_j\gamma_j$ and γ_j^2. These represent contributions to the direct genetic covariance of X and Y and the variance explained in X, and are assumed to be independent in MR-GRIP. We call this the VICE assumption (Variance Independent of Covariance Explained).

Suppose that InSIDE holds under some allele coding. Then

$$\begin{aligned} cov(\alpha\gamma, \gamma^2) &= E(\alpha\gamma^3) - E(\alpha\gamma)E(\gamma^2) \\ &= E(\alpha)[E(\gamma^3) - E(\gamma)E(\gamma^2)] \\ &= E(\alpha)cov(\gamma, \gamma^2) \end{aligned}$$

So the VICE assumption holds if $E(\alpha) = 0$, the balanced pleiotropy assumed by IVW. However, under directional pleiotropy the covariance will be non-zero under all-positive coding of γ; thus, excepting balanced pleiotropy, the assumptions of MR-Egger and MR-GRIP are incompatible.

Because VICE holds under the IVW assumptions, the intercept test in MR-GRIP is a valid test of the IVW model. Similar to MR-Egger, the intercept test with null hypothesis $\alpha_0 = 0$ may be used to infer directional pleiotropy, with rejection suggesting that MR-GRIP is a better fit to the data than the IVW model.

If, however, α and γ are not assumed to be independent, then under VICE we can only allow the following relationship:

$$\alpha = \frac{(\alpha\gamma)}{\sqrt{(\gamma^2)}}$$

If $\alpha\gamma$ is constant, as in equation 12, then α varies with γ^{-1}. This may be plausible if stronger effects on exposure X are more specific to X, as might be the case for example if X is a protein with strong instruments comprised of *cis* variants and weaker instruments from more dispersed *trans* signals (15).

Weak instruments

When NOME is violated, we have $\hat{\gamma}_j = \gamma_j + \epsilon_{Xj}$ where we assume $\epsilon_{Xj} \sim N(0, \sigma_{Xj}^2)$. In two-sample MR, large values of σ_{Xj}^2 create weak instrument bias towards the null. Similar to previous work for IVW models (14, 16), we propose a bias adjusted estimator for β by expressing the unobserved estimator under NOME in terms of the observed quantities $\hat{\gamma}_j$ and σ_{Xj}^2. For fixed weights w_j, assumed independent of γ_j,

$$\hat{\beta}_{NOME} = \frac{\sum w_j \sum w_j \hat{\Gamma}_j \gamma_j^3 - \sum w_j \hat{\Gamma}_j \gamma_j \sum w_j \gamma_j^2}{\sum w_j \sum w_j \gamma_j^4 - \left(\sum w_j \gamma_j^2\right)^2}$$

where in the numerator

$$\sum w_j \hat{\Gamma}_j \gamma_j^3 \approx \sum w_j \hat{\Gamma}_j \hat{\gamma}\left(\hat{\gamma}_j^2 - 3\sigma_{Xj}^2\right)$$

$$\sum w_j \hat{\Gamma}_j \gamma_j \approx \sum w_j \hat{\Gamma}_j \hat{\gamma}_j$$

$$\sum w_j \gamma_j^2 \approx \sum w_j \left(\hat{\gamma}_j^2 - \sigma_{Xj}^2\right)$$

and in the denominator

$$\sum w_j \gamma_j^4 \approx \sum w_j \left(\hat{\gamma}_j^4 - 6\hat{\gamma}_j^2 \sigma_{X_j}^2 + 3\sigma_{Xj}^4\right)$$

A derivation, including standard error, is provided in the supplementary material. Note that the odd powers of γ_j in $\hat{\beta}_{NOME}$ appear in products with $\hat{\Gamma}_j$ so that the estimator still has GRIP. However, the inverse variance weights $\hat{\gamma}_j^{-2}\sigma_{Yj}^{-2}$ are not independent of γ_j and cannot be used with this approximation. Instead we suggest taking $w_j = \sigma_{Yj}^{-2}$ as in standard IVW and MR-Egger, sacrificing some efficiency in estimating β.

Variations

Here we show how the GRIP principle can be applied to some variants of MR-Egger. Firstly, recall the Radial model in which $\hat{\beta}_j\sqrt{w_j}$ is regressed on $\sqrt{w_j}$, where $\hat{\beta}_j = \hat{\Gamma}_j/\hat{\gamma}_j$ and $w_j = \hat{\gamma}_j^2/\sigma_{Yj}^2$, imposing all-positive coding if positive square roots are taken. A GRIP version may be defined as the regression of $\hat{\beta}_j w_j$ on w_j, which could be extended to higher-order weights (12). However, the graphical interpretation of the Radial plot, useful for identifying outlying $\hat{\beta}_j$, would not apply here and it is not clear what advantage a Radial MR-GRIP would otherwise have.

Secondly, consider multivariable MR for k exposures $X_1, \cdots, X_k$ (17). The summary statistic model for SNP j is

$$\hat{\Gamma}_j = \beta_1\hat{\gamma}_{1j} + \beta_2\hat{\gamma}_{2j} + \cdots + \beta_k\hat{\gamma}_{kj} + \alpha_j + \epsilon_{Yj}$$

Therefore

$$\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_{1j} = \beta_1\hat{\gamma}_{1j}^2 + \beta_2\hat{\gamma}_{2j}\hat{\gamma}_{1j} + \cdots + \beta_k\hat{\gamma}_{kj}\hat{\gamma}_{1j} + \alpha_j\hat{\gamma}_{1j} + \epsilon_{Yj}\hat{\gamma}_{1j}$$

and we may estimate the causal effects from the multiple regression of $\hat{\Gamma}_j\hat{\gamma}_{1j}$ on $\hat{\gamma}_{1j}^2, \hat{\gamma}_{2j}\hat{\gamma}_{1j}, \cdots, \hat{\gamma}_{kj}\hat{\gamma}_{1j}$. The VICE assumption will be that $\alpha_j\gamma_{1j}$ is independent of γ_{1j}^2, $\gamma_{1j}\gamma_{2j}, \cdots, \gamma_{1j}\gamma_{kj}$ for each j. Here we have arbitrarily multiplied through by $\hat{\gamma}_{1j}$, but any of the $\hat{\gamma}_{2j}, \cdots, \hat{\gamma}_{kj}$ could be used, with each yielding a different estimate with corresponding VICE assumption. These estimates could be combined, with further assumptions, or perhaps more usefully, inspected individually as an element of sensitivity analysis.

Next, the collider-correction framework allows two-sample MR methods to be applied to the one-sample design (18). First regress Y on both X and G_j giving coefficient estimates $\hat{\beta}^*$ and $\hat{\alpha}_j^*$ respectively. The estimated causal effect is then $\hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}^* + \hat{\delta}$ where $\hat{\delta}$ is obtained from the linear regression of $\hat{\alpha}_j^*$ on $\hat{\gamma}_j$. A GRIP version of collider-correction obtains $\hat{\delta}$ from the regression of $\hat{\alpha}_j^*\hat{\gamma}_j$ on $\hat{\gamma}_j^2$.

Finally, MR methods have been applied to reduce selection bias in GWAS (14). In the notation of Figure 1, the aim is to estimate α_j when the given data are the $\hat{\gamma}_j$ and the SNP associations with Y conditional on X, denoted $\hat{\Gamma}_j^*$. Index effect regression gives the estimator $\hat{\alpha}_j = \hat{\Gamma}_j^* - \hat{b}\hat{\gamma}_j$ where $\hat{b}$ is obtained from the linear regression of $\hat{\Gamma}_j^*$ on $\hat{\gamma}_j$. A GRIP version of index effect regression instead obtains $\hat{b}$ from the regression of $\hat{\Gamma}_j^*\hat{\gamma}_j$ on $\hat{\gamma}_j^2$.

Data examples

We illustrate MR-GRIP on some examples that have previously been used to compare MR methods. Firstly, the effect of plasma urate on coronary heart disease (CHD) was historically used to elucidate MR-Egger. Similarly to Burgess and Thompson (6), 31 SNPs were used as instruments with effects on urate taken from the UCLEB consortium (19) and on CHD from the CARDIoGRAMplusC4D consortium (20) (supplementary table 1). Secondly, the effect of body mass index (BMI) on coronary artery disease (CAD) has been used to compare different approaches to pleiotropy in MR (21). Following those authors, 97 SNPs were chosen as instruments with effects on BMI taken from the GIANT consortium (22). Effects on CAD were available from the CARDIoGRAMplusC4D consortium (20) for 96 of these SNPs (supplementary table 2).

In both examples we calculated point estimates, standard errors and P-values. MR-GRIP, with and without weak instrument correction, was compared to the IVW, MR-Egger with all-positive and original coding, WM and MBE approaches.

Finally, the effects of low-density lipoprotein (LDL), high-density lipoprotein (HDL) and triglycerides have been considered in multivariate MR with CHD as the outcome (17). Following those authors, 185 SNPs were used as instruments with effects on the three exposures taken from the Global Lipids Genetics Consortium (23). Effects on CHD were again taken from CARDIoGRAMplusC4D (20) with data available for 182 SNPs (supplementary table 3). We calculated point estimates, standard errors and P-values for each exposure, using multivariate IVW, multivariate MR-Egger and multivariate MR-GRIP. We performed multivariate MR-Egger with all-positive coding of each exposure in turn. We performed multivariate MR-GRIP multiplying equation (9) by SNP-exposure effects for each exposure in turn.

Simulations

We compared MR-GRIP, with and without weak instrument correction, to the IVW, MR-Egger, WM and MBE methods, using simulations based on the data examples above. The ADEMP framework for the simulations was as follows:

Aims: to compare the bias and precision of MR-GRIP to its nearest competitors under their respective assumptions.

Data-generation: to obtain realistic distributions of SNP-exposure effects, we used the point estimates for urate in the data example, and then repeated the simulation using the estimates for BMI. We simulated pleiotropic effects based on the same point estimates, under four scenarios described below, and used the standard errors from the two data examples to generate summary association statistics.

Estimands: the average causal effect of a unit shift intervention in X on the outcome Y, ie. $\beta = E[Y(X = x)] - E[Y(X = x - 1)]$, and the standard error of its estimator.

Methods: In fitting a mean model, IVW and MR-Egger have the same aim as MR-GRIP, and in that sense are the direct competitors. WM and MBE methods are often performed alongside MR-Egger as sensitivity analyses for IVW, and are complementary in taking the different kinds of average. Many other MR methods can be interpreted as a form of mean, median or mode. As more advanced mean models could in principle include our GRIP approach, our interest is in comparing only the most basic methods.

Performance measures: empirical bias and standard deviation of the estimated causal effect. We also assessed analytic standard errors by comparison to empirical standard deviations of the point estimates.

In each simulation, estimates $\hat{\gamma}_j$ were simulated from $N(\gamma_j, \sigma_{Xj}^2)$ where γ_j were point estimates in the data examples and σ_{Xj}^2 the corresponding squared standard errors. A proportion $p \in \{0.3, 1\}$ of the SNPs were invalid instruments. We set the causal effect to $\beta = 0.2$ but obtained qualitatively similar results, not shown, with other values of β including the null.

Scenario 1: balanced pleiotropy, InSIDE satisfied. Invalid instruments have pleiotropic effects α sampled with replacement from $\{\pm\gamma_1, \cdots, \pm\gamma_m\}$ and scaled by 0.1. The marginal SNP effects on outcome Y are $\Gamma_j = \beta\gamma_j + \alpha_j$. All methods are expected to be unbiased.

Scenario 2: directional pleiotropy, InSIDE satisfied under all-positive coding. As for Scenario 1 except that $\Gamma_j = \beta\gamma_j + \alpha_j + \alpha_0$ where $\alpha_0 = 0.02$. MR-Egger is expected to be unbiased, as are the weighted median and mode for $p = 0.3$.

Scenario 3: directional pleiotropy, InSIDE satisfied under other coding. As for Scenario 2 except that the $\hat{\gamma}_j$ are oriented in the (apparently random) direction in the original publications. All methods are expected to be biased, except for the weighted median and mode for $p = 0.3$.

Scenario 4: directional pleiotropy, VICE satisfied. For invalid instruments, products $(\alpha_j\gamma_j)$ are sampled with replacement from $\{\gamma_1^2, \gamma_1\gamma_2, \cdots, \gamma_1\gamma_m, \gamma_2\gamma_1, \gamma_2^2, \cdots, \gamma_2\gamma_m, \cdots, \gamma_m\gamma_1, \gamma_m\gamma_2, \cdots, \gamma_m^2\}$ and scaled by 0.1. The marginal SNP effects are $\Gamma_j = \beta\gamma_j + (\alpha_j\gamma_j + a_0^2)/\gamma_j$ where $a_0 = 0.02$ as in Scenario 2. MR-GRIP is expected to be unbiased, as are the weighted median and mode for $p = 0.3$.

Figure 5 shows the relationship between the effects on exposure γ_j and the pleiotropic effects α_j in each scenario.



Figure 5. Relationship between SNP effects on exposure γ and direct pleiotropic effects α in one simulation based on the BMI example. a) Scenario 1; b) Scenario 2; c) Scenario 3; d) Scenario 4.

In all scenarios we simulated estimates $\hat{\Gamma}_j$ from $N(\Gamma_j, \sigma_{Yj}^2)$ where σ_{Yj}^2 were the squared standard errors in the data examples. For both the urate and the BMI settings, we performed 10,000 simulations for $p \in \{0.3, 1\}$ in each scenario, and performed IVW, MR-Egger, WM and MBE calculations using default settings in the TwoSampleMR package (24).

Results

Data examples

For the urate example, the mean SNP F-statistic was 250.6, therefore we expected little bias due to weak instruments. Cochran's Q for heterogeneity was 89.3 on 30 d.f., suggesting substantial pleiotropy (25). Estimated causal effects are shown in Table 1. IVW gives a statistically significant estimate whereas MR-Egger gives a null estimate with a statistically significant intercept test ($P = 0.008$). With the original coding, MR-Egger is similar to IVW. The other methods, including MR-GRIP, give similar intermediate estimates that are not nominally significant. The intercept in MR-GRIP was statistically significant ($P = 0.0006$), so it seems to reconcile the IVW with the WM and MBE results. The standard error of MR-GRIP is greater than IVW, WM and MBE, but lower than MR-Egger with all-positive coding. Overall, these results do not provide robust evidence for a causal effect of urate on CHD.

	$\exp(\hat{\beta})$ (95%CI)	$se(\hat{\beta})$	P
IVW	1.11 (1.03 – 1.20)	0.0401	0.00962
MR-Egger	1.00 (0.90 – 1.10)	0.0515	0.980
MR-Egger original	1.12 (1.03 – 1.21)	0.0395	0.00901
MR-GRIP	1.04 (0.96 – 1.13)	0.0417	0.345
MR-GRIP weak	1.03 (0.95 – 1.12)	0.0421	0.444
Weighted median	1.05 (0.99 – 1.11)	0.0294	0.108
Mode based estimator	1.05 (1.00 – 1.11)	0.0284	0.0776

Table 1. Estimated causal effects of plasma urate on coronary heart disease. $\exp(\hat{\beta})$, estimated odds ratio per 1-sd increase in urate. $se(\hat{\beta})$, standard error of log odds ratio.

Figure 6(a) shows a scatter plot of the urate data, with all-positive coding of $\hat{\gamma}$ and the fitted models for IVW, MR-Egger and MR-GRIP. While the MR-GRIP model is linear in $\hat{\gamma}^2$, it is non-linear in $\hat{\gamma}$ since equation (12) implies

$$E(\hat{\Gamma}_j | \hat{\gamma}_j) = \alpha_0 \hat{\gamma}_j^{-1} + \beta \hat{\gamma}_j$$

While, by definition, this model is a better fit than IVW with $\alpha_0 = 0$, the graphical interpretation is less clear. For IVW and MR-Egger, the causal effect is the slope of the fitted line, whereas for MR-GRIP the causal effect is not apparent from the fitted curve. If the slope is interpreted as the causal effect, then it seems to vary with $\hat{\gamma}$. In fact, the non-linear shape comes from the model for pleiotropic effects, which is added to the linear causal effect.

To allow a similar graphical interpretation to other MR methods, we suggest plotting a straight line on the scatter plot with slope set to the causal estimate from MR-GRIP, and intercept then estimated by weighted least squares. This gives a line that may be compared to the other methods, while appearing to fit the data. Similarly to the MR-Egger line, the slope is the estimated causal effect, but it is not an average of slopes for each point. Figure 6(b) shows our proposed scatter plot for the urate data.



a)



b)

Figure 6. Scatter plots of the urate data with fitted models. a) non-linear MR-GRIP model. b) MR-GRIP represented by a straight line with slope equal to its causal estimate.

For the BMI example, the mean F-statistic was 56.7, therefore we again expected little bias due to weak instruments. Cochran's Q for heterogeneity was 238.4 on 95 d.f., again suggesting substantial pleiotropy. Estimated causal effects are shown in Table 2. Here, MR-Egger gives a higher point estimate than IVW, but with reduced significance owing to its greater standard error. The intercept test gives weak evidence for directional pleiotropy ($P = 0.053$). Again, with the original coding MR-Egger is similar to IVW. MR-GRIP gives an intermediate estimate, consistent with the other methods, but there is no evidence for directional pleiotropy (intercept $P = 0.4$). MR-GRIP again has greater standard error than IVW, WM and MBE, but lower than MR-Egger. Weak instrument adjustment slightly increases the MR-GRIP estimate, but with increased standard error such that the evidence for causality is substantially weakened. As weak instrument bias is not expected, the adjustment seems unnecessarily imprecise. Overall the results suggest consistent evidence for a causal effect of BMI on CAD.

	$\exp(\hat{\beta})$ (95% CI)	$se(\hat{\beta})$	P
IVW	1.44 (1.26 – 1.63)	0.0648	2.5e-8
MR-Egger	1.61 (1.18 – 2.20)	0.158	0.00323
MR-Egger original	1.42 (1.26 – 1.61)	0.0640	3.1e-7
MR-GRIP	1.54 (1.25 – 1.89)	0.105	8.5e-5
MR-GRIP weak	1.56 (1.07 – 2.26)	0.190	0.0217
Weighted median	1.44 (1.25 – 1.66)	0.0741	8.7e-7
Mode- based estimator	1.45 (1.20 – 1.75)	0.0906	8.3e-5

Table 2. Estimated causal effects of BMI on coronary artery disease. $\exp(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, estimated odds ratio per 1-unit increase in BMI. $se(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, standard error of log odds ratio.

For the multivariate MR example, we give results for triglycerides in Table 3, as these include significant intercept tests for MR-Egger. Results for LDL and HDL are provided in the supplementary material.

	Coding	$\exp(\hat{\beta})$ (95% CI)_	$se(\hat{\beta})$	P	Intercept P
Univariate					
IVW		1.36 (1.21 – 1.53)	0.0600	2.3e-7	
MR-Egger		1.14 (0.98 – 1.32)	0.0743	0.0837	1.5e-4
MR-GRIP		1.36 (1.21 – 1.53)	0.0601	7.2e-7	0.473
Multivariate					
IVW		1.17 (1.05 – 1.31)	0.0549	0.00381	
MR-Egger	LDL	1.20 (1.07 – 1.34)	0.0565	0.00137	0.111
	HDL	1.13 (1.01 – 1.26)	0.0556	0.0325	0.00342
	Triglycerides	1.09 (0.96 – 1.23)	0.0640	0.203	0.0205
MR-GRIP	LDL	1.18 (1.06 – 1.31)	0.0548	0.00318	0.170
	HDL	1.17 (1.05 – 1.31)	0.0552	0.00398	0.970
	Triglycerides	1.17 (1.05 – 1.31)	0.0549	0.00382	0.298

Table 3. Estimated causal effects of triglycerides on coronary heart disease. $\exp(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, estimated odds ratio per 1-sd increase in inverse-normal transformed triglycerides. $se(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, standard error of log odds ratio. Coding, for MR-Egger, all-positive coding with respect to listed trait; for MR-GRIP, equation (9) multiplied by SNP-exposure effects for listed trait.

In univariate analysis, MR-GRIP agrees closely with IVW, with no evidence for directional pleiotropy. MR-Egger gives a reduced estimate with a significant intercept test. In multivariate analysis, the IVW

estimate is attenuated, with MR-GRIP again in close agreement in all three versions. The results for MR-Egger are more problematic, with variation both in point estimates and in intercept tests depending on the trait coded all-positive. The standard guidance is to apply all-positive coding to the trait of primary interest (17), but here we may be led to different conclusions about triglycerides depending on whether it is a primary or secondary analysis. Furthermore, the InSIDE assumption cannot hold under all three codings; thus we must make the dubious assumption that in nature, the InSIDE assumption holds under all-positive coding of the trait of our (and not another person's) primary interest.

These data examples suggest that MR-GRIP can give results that are compatible with those of other MR methods, and can help to resolve discrepancies between them.

Simulations

Mean estimates of the causal effect for the urate-based simulation are shown in Table 4. Qualitatively similar results were observed for the BMI-based simulation; results are provided in the supplementary material. As expected, all methods are unbiased under Scenario 1 (balanced pleiotropy). Under Scenario 2 (all-positive InSIDE), only MR-Egger is unbiased. MR-GRIP shows less bias than IVW, and similar bias to WM and MBE. Under Scenario 3 (InSIDE under original coding), IVW is the least biased, whereas MR-GRIP shows less bias than MR-Egger. Again, MR-GRIP has a similar bias to WM and MBE, which show some bias even with only 30% invalid instruments owing to sampling errors in the summary statistics. Under Scenario 4 (VICE) both IVW and MR-Egger are biased while MR-GRIP is unbiased as expected; WM and MBE appear empirically unbiased. Overall, in terms of bias, MR-GRIP performs similarly to WM and MBE, and of the mean-based estimators it is intermediate between IVW and MR-Egger in each scenario.

Scenario	Proportion invalid	IVW	MR-Egger	MR-GRIP	MR-GRIP weak	Weighted median	Mode-based estimator
1	0.3	0.199	0.198	0.198	0.200	0.200	0.200
	1	0.199	0.198	0.198	0.200	0.200	0.200
2	0.3	0.250	0.198	0.221	0.215	0.218	0.217
	1	0.374	0.198	0.280	0.252	0.274	0.273
3	0.3	0.207	0.218	0.213	0.217	0.214	0.214
	1	0.227	0.271	0.252	0.258	0.253	0.252
4	0.3	0.216	0.188	0.199	0.200	0.202	0.201
	1	0.256	0.162	0.201	0.200	0.207	0.207

Table 4. Mean estimates of $\beta = 0.2$ with 31 SNPs as instruments. SNP-exposure effects as for the urate data example (Supplementary Table 1). Scenarios described in main text. Proportion invalid, proportion of SNPs with direct pleiotropic effects on outcome. MR-GRIP weak, MR-GRIP with adjustment for weak instruments.

Mean analytic standard errors and empirical standard deviations are shown in Table 5. Under Scenario 1, all standard errors are accurately estimated. Under Scenario 2, standard errors appear over-estimated for IVW, and under Scenarios 3 and 4, all methods appear to over-estimate their standard errors. Throughout, and similarly to the bias, the standard error of MR-GRIP is intermediate between IVW and MR-Egger, and similar to WM and MBE.

Scenario	Proportion invalid	Standard error	IVW	MR-Egger	MR-GRIP	MR-GRIP weak	Weighted median	Mode-based estimator
1	0.3	Analytic	0.0259	0.0370	0.0291	0.0338		
		Empirical	0.0257	0.0367	0.0297	0.0338	0.0324	0.0314
	1	Analytic	0.0299	0.0426	0.0343	0.0396		
		Empirical	0.0297	0.0424	0.0341	0.0390	0.0373	0.0360
2	0.3	Analytic	0.0336	0.0462	0.0373	0.0450		
		Empirical	0.0285	0.0454	0.0359	0.0418	0.040	0.038
	1	Analytic	0.0433	0.0427	0.0360	0.0632		
		Empirical	0.0298	0.0422	0.0343	0.0392	0.0371	0.0377
3	0.3	Analytic	0.0346	0.0493	0.0398	0.0457		
		Empirical	0.0320	0.0450	0.0364	0.0414	0.0396	0.0391
	1	Analytic	0.0534	0.0762	0.0615	0.0696		
		Empirical	0.0300	0.0426	0.0351	0.0391	0.0377	0.0377
4	0.3	Analytic	0.0292	0.0413	0.0327	0.0383		
		Empirical	0.0250	0.0351	0.0283	0.0305	0.0292	0.0282
	1	Analytic	0.0403	0.0527	0.0419	0.0541		
		Empirical	0.0295	0.0391	0.0313	0.0311	0.0298	0.0283

Table 5. Mean analytic standard errors, and empirical standard deviations of point estimates in simulations of Table 4.

The intercept tests of MR-Egger and MR-GRIP performed similarly, with their P-values having correlation of approximately 0.9 in each simulation and neither test dominating the other. Thus the MR-GRIP intercept appears just as suitable as the MR-Egger intercept for detecting violations of the IVW assumptions.

We repeated the simulations, introducing weak instrument bias by multiplying the standard errors of the SNP-exposure effects by 5. This is equivalent to a 96% reduction in sample size and led to a mean F-statistic of 10 for the urate example and 2.27 for the BMI example. Mean point estimates are shown in Table 6; we only show scenario 1, where all methods would be unbiased with strong instruments. As expected, weak instruments bias the estimates towards the null, with MR-GRIP showing a similar level of bias to IVW. The weak instrument adjusted MR-GRIP showed much reduced bias. Weak instrument bias was greater in the BMI simulation, and the adjusted MR-GRIP showed numerical instability (supplementary figures 1 and 2) with some extreme outliers. The median of the adjusted MR-GRIP was 0.211, less biased than the mean, but the interquartile range (0.238) was large.

Simulation	Proportion invalid	IVW	MR-Egger	MR-GRIP	MR-GRIP weak	Weighted median	Mode-based estimator
Urate	1	0.178	0.180	0.177	0.204	0.190	0.179
BMI	1	0.138	0.108	0.137	0.263	0.107	0.0956

Table 6. Mean estimates of $\beta = 0.2$ under balanced pleiotropy. Weak instruments simulated by multiplying the standard errors σ_{X_j} of SNP-exposure effects $\hat{\gamma}_j$ by 5.

Discussion

MR-Egger was introduced to relax the balanced pleiotropy assumption of IVW. Since its inception it has been known that its results are sensitive to allele coding, complicating the interpretation of directional pleiotropy. More recently it been realised that the InSIDE assumption itself depends on

allele coding. All-positive coding was introduced to standardise MR-Egger, with the InSIDE assumption applying specifically to that coding.

While InSIDE under all-positive coding could exist in nature, it is more nuanced than the concept of independent biological pathways from SNP to exposure and to outcome. We have noted some limitations of all-positive coding, including inferring effect alleles from estimated effects, and performing multivariable MR. In addition, we have shown that under directional pleiotropy, InSIDE cannot hold simultaneously for all-positive coding of γ and for all-positive coding of α. Since, without knowledge of the causal direction, there is no logical distinction between these effects, we argue that this severely undermines the soundness of MR-Egger.

It could be held that for SNPs specifically chosen for an MR analysis, there is indeed a logical distinction between γ and α, such that γ is expected to be larger in magnitude than $\Gamma = \beta\gamma + \alpha$ (26). Then InSIDE under all-positive coding could hold for those SNPs, with no requirement for a symmetric condition, whereas for the reverse MR it could hold for a different set of SNPs. Whether such a scenario is plausible in nature is debatable, but this stance does allow MR-Egger to retain a place among MR methods. However, if faced with a discrepancy between MR-Egger and other methods, it would be bold to claim that the MR-Egger model is the more plausible. Thus, the practical usefulness of MR-Egger seems limited.

We propose MR-GRIP as an alternative model of directional pleiotropy, which does not depend on allele coding. With the intercept fixed to zero it is identical to IVW, so it achieves the same basic goal of MR-Egger – relaxing the balanced pleiotropy assumption in a mean model – without the difficulties raised by allele coding. The corresponding VICE assumption is compatible with InSIDE under balanced pleiotropy, so that the intercept may be tested similarly to MR-Egger, with rejection of the null hypothesis suggesting that MR-GRIP is a better fit to the data than IVW. Under VICE, directional pleiotropy implies that α varies with γ^{-1}, which is plausible if we expect SNPS with strong effects on exposure to be more specific to that exposure, with reduced pleiotropic effects.

In two data examples, MR-GRIP gave estimates that were intermediate between IVW and MR-Egger. In the urate example, the intercept test was statistically significant, and the estimate was in line with WM and MBE. In the BMI example, despite not rejecting a zero intercept, the MR-GRIP estimate differed from IVW, WM and MBE, although confidence intervals overlapped. We have observed similar results in other analyses to be reported elsewhere, although we are still early in our experiences.

In a multivariate MR example, MR-Egger gave estimates and intercept tests that varied according to which trait was coded all-positive. While MR-GRIP can also be implemented with different reference traits, in this example the results were consistent and in agreement with multivariate IVW.

In simulations, too, MR-GRIP had bias and standard error that was intermediate between IVW and MR-Egger, and performed similarly to WM and MBE, especially the former. Our simulations were necessarily limited as we were specifically interested in performance under the assumptions of each method. We did not consider violations such as outlier ratio estimates or correlated pleiotropy, as our aim was not to identify a preferred method over all possible scenarios, but to compare MR-GRIP to IVW and MR-Egger in the situations for which they are designed.

Weak instruments are a potential problem for MR-GRIP. The degree of weak instrument bias appears comparable to IVW, so we may apparently retain the rule of thumb that a mean F-statistic of at least 10 ensures little bias. However, a strong bias may be more difficult to correct. We have proposed a formula to adjust for weak instrument bias, which generally performed well in our

simulations. However, we have not proved that this estimator is unbiased, and when weak instrument bias is greater it appears more prone to numerical instability. An improved adjustment is an important direction for further work. However, approaches based on likelihood (27) would be challenging as the random variables in equation (11) have product distributions.

Our approach of multiplying equation (9) through by $\hat{\gamma}_j$ is not the only possibility. One could, for example, divide through instead, giving β as the intercept in the regression of $\hat{\beta}_j$ on $\hat{\gamma}_j^{-1}$. In preliminary studies, we found this approach to be much less precise than MR-GRIP. Alternatively, one could multiply through by any odd power of $\hat{\gamma}_j$. We have not explored this, other than to note that it would require less intuitive, and perhaps less plausible, counterparts to the VICE assumption.

In summary, MR-GRIP provides a generalisation of IVW that avoids difficult arguments about the InSIDE assumption under all-positive coding. The VICE assumption is compatible with the IVW assumptions and also with an inverse relationship between pleiotropic and exposure effects. MR-GRIP appears to give results that are compatible with other MR methods, and can resolve discrepancies between IVW and MR-Egger. It is easily implemented, and has been added to the TwoSampleMR package (24). We suggest that it can be easily included in the sensitivity analyses that are routinely performed in MR investigations.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Strategic Priority Fund "Tackling multimorbidity at scale" programme (grant number MC/MR/WO14548/1) delivered by the Medical Research Council (MRC) and the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) in partnership with the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and in collaboration with the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC). This is a summary of independent research carried out at the NIHR Leicester Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) and the NIHR Exeter BRC. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the MRC, ESRC, EPSRC, NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. We thank Tom Palmer and Gib Hemani for implementing MR-GRIP in the TwoSampleMR package.

References

1. Burgess S, Davey Smith G, Davies NM, Dudbridge F, Gill D, Glymour MM, et al. Guidelines for performing Mendelian randomization investigations: update for summer 2023. Wellcome Open Res. 2019;4:186.
2. Burgess S, Butterworth A, Thompson SG. Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple genetic variants using summarized data. Genet Epidemiol. 2013;37(7):658-65.
3. Dudbridge F. Polygenic Mendelian Randomization. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med. 2021;11(2).
4. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. Int J Epidemiol. 2015;44(2):512-25.
5. Lin Z, Pan I, Pan W. A practical problem with Egger regression in Mendelian randomization. PLoS Genet. 2022;18(5):e1010166.
6. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Interpreting findings from Mendelian randomization using the MR-Egger method. Eur J Epidemiol. 2017;32(5):377-89.
7. Zhao Q, Chen Y, Wang J, Small DS. Powerful three-sample genome-wide design and robust statistical inference in summary-data Mendelian randomization. Int J Epidemiol. 2019;48(5):1478-92.

8. Bowden J, Del Greco MF, Minelli C, Davey Smith G, Sheehan N, Thompson J. A framework for the investigation of pleiotropy in two-sample summary data Mendelian randomization. Stat Med. 2017;36(11):1783-802.
9. Bowden J, Del Greco MF, Minelli C, Davey Smith G, Sheehan NA, Thompson JR. Assessing the suitability of summary data for two-sample Mendelian randomization analyses using MR-Egger regression: the role of the I2 statistic. Int J Epidemiol. 2016;45(6):1961-74.
10. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. Genet Epidemiol. 2016;40(4):304-14.
11. Hartwig FP, Davey Smith G, Bowden J. Robust inference in summary data Mendelian randomization via the zero modal pleiotropy assumption. Int J Epidemiol. 2017;46(6):1985-98.
12. Bowden J, Spiller W, Del Greco MF, Sheehan N, Thompson J, Minelli C, Davey Smith G. Improving the visualization, interpretation and analysis of two-sample summary data Mendelian randomization via the Radial plot and Radial regression. Int J Epidemiol. 2018;47(4):1264-78.
13. Burgess S, Dudbridge F, Thompson SG. Combining information on multiple instrumental variables in Mendelian randomization: comparison of allele score and summarized data methods. Stat Med. 2016;35(11):1880-906.
14. Cai S, Hartley A, Mahmoud O, Tilling K, Dudbridge F. Adjusting for collider bias in genetic association studies using instrumental variable methods. Genet Epidemiol. 2022;46(5-6):303-16.
15. Schmidt AF, Finan C, Gordillo-Maranon M, Asselbergs FW, Freitag DF, Patel RS, et al. Genetic drug target validation using Mendelian randomisation. Nat Commun. 2020;11(1):3255.
16. Ye T, Shao J, Kang H. Debiased Inverse-Variance Weighted Estimator in Two-Sample Summary-Data Mendelian Randomization. Ann Stat. 2021;49(4):2079-100.
17. Rees JMB, Wood AM, Burgess S. Extending the MR-Egger method for multivariable Mendelian randomization to correct for both measured and unmeasured pleiotropy. Stat Med. 2017;36(29):4705-18.
18. Barry C, Liu J, Richmond R, Rutter MK, Lawlor DA, Dudbridge F, Bowden J. Exploiting collider bias to apply two-sample summary data Mendelian randomization methods to one-sample individual level data. PLoS Genet. 2021;17(8):e1009703.
19. White J, Sofat R, Hemani G, Shah T, Engmann J, Dale C, et al. Plasma urate concentration and risk of coronary heart disease: a Mendelian randomisation analysis. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2016;4(4):327-36.
20. Nikpay M, Goel A, Won HH, Hall LM, Willenborg C, Kanoni S, et al. A comprehensive 1,000 Genomes-based genome-wide association meta-analysis of coronary artery disease. Nat Genet. 2015;47(10):1121-30.
21. Slob EAW, Burgess S. A comparison of robust Mendelian randomization methods using summary data. Genet Epidemiol. 2020;44(4):313-29.
22. Locke AE, Kahali B, Berndt SI, Justice AE, Pers TH, Day FR, et al. Genetic studies of body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. Nature. 2015;518(7538):197-206.
23. Do R, Willer CJ, Schmidt EM, Sengupta S, Gao C, Peloso GM, et al. Common variants associated with plasma triglycerides and risk for coronary artery disease. Nat Genet. 2013;45(11):1345-52.
24. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, Wade KH, Haberland V, Baird D, et al. The MR-Base platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. Elife. 2018;7.
25. Bowden J, Del Greco MF, Minelli C, Zhao Q, Lawlor DA, Sheehan NA, et al. Improving the accuracy of two-sample summary-data Mendelian randomization: moving beyond the NOME assumption. Int J Epidemiol. 2019;48(3):728-42.
26. Hemani G, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Orienting the causal relationship between imprecisely measured traits using GWAS summary data. PLoS Genet. 2017;13(11):e1007081.

27. Zhao Q, Wang J, Hemani G, Bowden J, Small DS. Statistical inference in two-sample summary-data Mendelian randomization using robust adjusted profile score. The Annals of Statistics. 2020;48(3):1742-69.