Title page

A Multi-Polygenic Risk Score Approach Incorporating Physical Activity Genotypes for Predicting Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities: A FinnGen Study

MSc Vettenterä Elina[1], PhD Joensuu Laura[1], PhD Waller Katja[1], FinnGen[2], PhD Sillanpää Elina[1,3*]

[1]Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, FINLAND; [2]FinnGen Authors detailed in the Supplemental Material; [3]Wellbeing Services County of Central Finland, Jyväskylä, FINLAND

Correspondence to:

*Elina Sillanpää, elina.sillanpaa@jyu.fi , +358 40 1429 639, Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä PO Box 35, FI-40014 Jyväskylä, Finland

Running title: Genetic prediction of type 2 diabetes

Manuscript word count: 3098

ABSTRACT

Aims/hypothesis:
Genetic prediction of type 2 diabetes risk has proven difficult using current methods. Recent studies have shown that genetic variants associated with physical activity behavior are linked to type 2 diabetes incidence. This study investigated how a polygenic risk score (PRS) for type 2 diabetes relates to the incidence of type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities and whether incorporating genetic risk from physical activity-related traits and measured lifestyles improves prediction. We hypothesized that adding physical activity genotypes into prediction models would improve predictive accuracy.

Methods: PRSs were calculated for 279,373 Finns in the FinnGen cohort (average age 62 years, 52% women). Cox proportional hazards models were used with follow-up from birth. In addition, we assessed whether predictive ability (concordance index) improved when PRSs for physical activity, sedentary time, cardiorespiratory fitness, muscle strength, and body mass index were included alongside the type 2 diabetes PRS. Finally, we assessed how smoking and body mass index changed the model's predictive ability.

Results: Each standard deviation unit increase in the type 2 diabetes PRS was associated with an 8% higher risk of developing type 2 diabetes. Among individuals with type 2 diabetes, the PRS was linked to higher risks of comorbidities: 4% higher for nephropathy and retinopathy and 5% for severe cardiovascular disease, but not neuropathy. Physical activity-related PRSs were also independently associated with the risk of type 2 diabetes—lower risk for physical activity (7%), cardiorespiratory fitness (6%), and muscle strength (4%) and higher risk for sedentary time (14%) and body mass index (35%). However, physical activity-related PRSs did not significantly improve the model's concordance index (0.644 before vs. 0.672 after adding all other PRSs). In contrast, including body mass index and smoking status increased predictive ability (c-index 0.744).

Conclusions and applicability: PRSs for type 2 diabetes and physical activity-related phenotypes independently predict the incidence of type 2 diabetes and comorbidities. However, adding physical activity-related scores to the model does not significantly improve prediction beyond the type 2 diabetes score. Notably, the PRS for body mass index was better than the PRS for type 2 diabetes in predicting type 2 diabetes incidence. These findings support the hypothesis that genetic pleiotropy may partially explain associations between type 2 diabetes and physical activity behavior.

Keywords: Diabetic comorbidities, polygenic risk scores, type 2 diabetes

Abbreviations:

CRF	Cardiorespiratory fitness
GWAS	Genome-wide association study
PA	Physical activity
PRS	Polygenic risk score
SB	Sedentary behavior

Summary boxes

What is already known about this subject?

- Genetic factors contribute substantially to the risk of type 2 diabetes, but it is primarily a multifactorial condition in which modifiable lifestyle factors—including physical activity—play a critical role in onset and progression.
- Genetic variants related to physical activity behavior have been associated with type 2 diabetes.
- The clinical utility of polygenic risk scores in predicting type 2 diabetes risk remains limited, as they explain only a small proportion of genetic variance and provide minimal improvement in risk prediction beyond established clinical risk factors.

What is the key question?

- Can the risk estimates for type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities be improved by incorporating genetic risk factors associated with physical activity and measured lifestyle behaviors?

What are the new findings?

- Polygenic risk scores for both type 2 diabetes and physical activity-related phenotypes independently predict the incidence of type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities.
- Incorporating physical activity-related polygenic risk scores into the model does not significantly improve predictive accuracy beyond the type 2 diabetes risk score alone.
- The findings support the hypothesis that genetic pleiotropy may partially explain associations between type 2 diabetes and physical activity behavior.

How might this impact on clinical practice in the foreseeable future?

- Although polygenic risk scores for type 2 diabetes may aid in identifying high-risk individuals for targeted prevention, their integration into clinical practice requires further validation.

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes is one of the fastest growing diseases worldwide and is projected to affect 783 million adults by 2045 [1]. This rise is largely driven by 2 diabetes, which accounts for 80–90% of all diabetes cases [2]. Type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities, including cardiovascular disease, stroke, kidney failure, and lower limb amputation, cause considerable human suffering and place a heavy burden on healthcare systems worldwide [1–3]. Globally, the main drivers of this trend are an aging population, sedentary lifestyles, and unhealthy lifestyles associated with obesity [1]. Identifying individuals at high risk of developing type 2 diabetes is thus a key component of population-level prevention strategies.

The etiology of type 2 diabetes is multifaceted, involving complex interactions between genetics, environment, and lifestyle, with effects accumulating over the life course [4]. Twin models suggest that genetics accounts for a considerable amount (30–70%) of the variation in disease risk [5,6]. Recent advancements in genetics and large genome-wide association studies (GWASs) have identified many common genetic variants that increase type 2 diabetes risk [7–9]. These findings have enabled the development of polygenic risk scores (PRSs), which estimate an individual's genetic liability for different diseases [10]. PRSs are regarded as useful tools for predicting genetic susceptibility to complex traits [11], and for type 2 diabetes, they have been validated across populations [12,13]. They also show promise as screening tools for identifying individuals at elevated risk [13], potentially enabling more targeted preventive lifestyle interventions. In addition to identifying disease risk, genetic information may help predict the risk of type 2 diabetes comorbidities and treatment responses, including the likely effects of drug and lifestyle interventions. Because genetic risk estimates can be calculated at the time of birth, they may provide an early marker for identifying individuals at high risk of developing type 2 diabetes.

Despite this promise, the clinical use of PRSs has been limited. Current scores explain only part of the genetic variance and improve risk prediction only marginally compared with standard clinical risk factors [14,15]. Previous studies have shown that combining multiple PRS may improve predictive accuracy for type 2 diabetes and other diseases compared to using a single PRS alone [16,17]. Importantly, type 2 diabetes is fundamentally a multifactorial disease, and modifiable lifestyle factors (e.g., physical activity and obesity) are key drivers of disease development and progression [18,19]. Genetic variants related to physical activity

behavior—such as sedentary behavior (SB) [20]—and traits reflecting physical performance, including grip strength [21,22], cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF) [23], and body mass index (BMI) [24], have been associated with type 2 diabetes and other cardiometabolic diseases [25,26]. These findings suggest that physical activity-related traits are closely intertwined with type 2 diabetes and may further improve genetic prediction.

In light of evidence suggesting potential genetic pleiotropy between type 2 diabetes traits and physical activity behavior [25–27], we propose an expanded approach to genetic prediction. Specifically, we examine whether higher genetic liability for type 2 diabetes is associated with an increased risk of type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities at the population level and whether prediction improves when incorporating physical activity-related genetic liabilities into the model. We hypothesize that including physical activity-related PRSs in addition to the type 2 diabetes PRS will improve the accuracy of predicting type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities.

METHODS

Study cohorts

This retrospective cohort study was conducted using FinnGen as the main cohort. It is a public–private partnership research project launched in 2017 that links genotype and digital health record data from Finnish health registries using unique national personal identification numbers (https://www.finngen.fi/en) [28]. We used the FinnGen data release 12 (R12), which includes 520,210 biobank participants (10% of the Finnish population). A complete case approach was applied, requiring participants to have all necessary information for each endpoint analysis. This resulted in a smaller sample size (n = 279,373) compared to the R12.

Genotyping, quality control, and imputation

The FinnGen individuals were genotyped using Illumina and Affymetrix chip arrays (Illumina Inc., San Diego, and Thermo Fisher Scientific, Santa Clara, CA, USA). Detailed information on genotyping, quality control, and imputation is available in the FinnGen documentation (https://finngen.gitbook.io/documentation/) [28].

Polygenic risk scoring

Based on a literature search, we selected the publicly available genome-wide association study (GWAS) summary statistics previously published by Mahajan et al. [29] as *the base data* for

type 2 diabetes PRS calculation. We selected the most comprehensive publicly available dataset with individuals of European ancestry, as it has been suggested that type 2 diabetes differs in genetic factors and pathophysiology based on ethnicity [30]. The base data included 898,130 genotyped individuals (74,124 type 2 diabetes cases and 824,006 controls) from 32 European ancestry cohorts.

Analysis included several novel, physical activity-related PRSs: physical activity (PA), sedentary behavior (SB), muscular strength (grip), cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF), and body mass index (BMI). All PRSs were based on publicly available GWAS summary statistics from Pan-UK Biobank [32]. With the exception of PA, these PRSs have been previously validated [21,23,33,34]. The PA PRS was validated in this study, with details provided in the Supplemental Material.

Individual genetic scores were calculated using SBayesR, a Bayesian multiple regression approach based on genome-wide summary statistics [35]. SbayesR re-weights summary statistics to account for the linkage disequilibrium between each variant while restricting analyses to HapMap3 SNPs for computational efficiency. All PRSs were genome-wide scores, limited to over 1 million SNPs for computational purposes. The pipeline and code are available elsewhere [21].

Outcomes

The selection of type 2 diabetes comorbidities was based on the conditions causing the highest healthcare costs in Finland [36–38] and were defined using FinnGen endpoint definitions. Selected outcomes and their ICD-10 codes were type 2 diabetes (E11), hard cardiovascular diseases (hereafter severe cardiovascular diseases [CVD]; I20, I21, I22, I23, I24, I25, I61, I63, I64), diabetic nephropathy (N08.3), diabetic neuropathy (E11.4, G63.2), and diabetic retinopathy (H36.00, H36.02, H36.03). The selected endpoints and their FinnGen Labels are provided in the Supplemental Material. Register data were derived from national hospital discharge records available since 1968. Additional descriptive information, such as disease prevalence and age distribution, can be queried using FinnGen labels via the Risteys interface (https://risteys.finngen.fi/).

182 **Covariates**

183 Covariates were selected based on prior literature, but their availability in FinnGen was limited.
184 Variables with the most comprehensive data were prioritized. Individual analyses included the
185 first 10 principal components of ancestry, sex, BMI, and smoking status (self-reported yes or
186 no) [39], and genotyping batch, which accounts for the potential stratification that may occur
187 from the genotyping array and sample. Phenotype data were obtained from the Finnish
188 biobanks (https://www.finngen.fi/en/data_protection/data-protection-statement).

189

190 **Statistical analysis**

191 Cox proportional hazards models were used to assess associations between PRSs and selected
192 endpoints in the FinnGen cohort. Proportional hazard assumptions were evaluated using
193 Schoenfeld residuals. Potential sex interactions for each PRS were investigated for the type 2
194 diabetes endpoint, and significant interactions were observed for sex × type 2 diabetes PRS (p
195 = 6.9e-04), sex × SB PRS (p = 3.0e-04), and sex × BMI PRS (p = 2.6e-04). However, the
196 hazard ratios were statistically significant and directionally consistent in both men and women
197 (see Supplemental Material), so analyses were not disaggregated by sex.

198

199 Follow-up began at birth for type 2 diabetes outcomes, as PRSs are stable from conception.
200 For comorbidity outcomes, follow-up began at type 2 diabetes diagnosis, ensuring that
201 individuals were only at risk for comorbidities after disease onset and avoiding disease-free
202 survival time before diagnosis, during which the outcome could not have occurred [40].
203 Follow-up ended at the first occurrence of the endpoint of interest or the end of follow-up,
204 whichever occurred first.

205

206 Each PRS was first analyzed individually using Cox regression models. Subsequently, each of
207 the five additional PRSs was added separately to a model to assess incremental predictive
208 value. Finally, all six PRSs were included simultaneously in a multivariable model to evaluate
209 whether combining multiple PRSs improves the prediction beyond type 2 diabetes PRS alone.
210 With > 200 cases per endpoint, sufficient statistical power was expected, using the classical
211 definition of 10 cases per predictor variable.

212

213 The concordance index (C-index) was used to evaluate the discriminative ability and
214 performance of the predictive models. The C-index is a measure of a model's ability to
215 distinguish between individuals who will develop the disease and those who will not [41]. A

C-index value of 0.5 indicates no better than random prediction, while a value of 1.0 indicates perfect discrimination.

Standardized PRSs were used in all models; hence, the hazard ratio indicates the risk of incidence per one standard deviation (SD) unit change in the PRS. The significance threshold was set to $p < 0.05$, with no adjustment for multiple testing. All analyses were performed using R (version 4.4.1, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). We used the R *survival* package [42] to estimate hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) between PRSs and incident type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities in the FinnGen cohort.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the main characteristics of the FinnGen participants. A slight majority (52.2%) were women, and the mean age at the end of follow-up was 62.0 years (range: 3.5–107.5). Participants' BMI was 27.4 ± 5.4, and most (73.9%) were non-smokers.

Associations between PRSs and incident type 2 diabetes

One SD increase in type 2 diabetes PRS was associated with an 8% higher risk of incident type 2 diabetes (HR 1.08, [95% CI 1.08–1.08]; Table 2). All physical activity-related PRSs were associated with type 2 diabetes risk. Lower risk was observed for PA 7% (HR 0.93, [95% CI 0.92–0.93]), grip 4% (HR 0.96, [95% CI 0.95–0.96]), and CRF 6% (HR 0.94, [95% CI 0.94–0.95]). Higher risk was observed for SB 14% (HR 1.14, [95% CI 1.13–1.15]) and BMI 35% (HR 1.35, [95% CI 1.34–1.36]). However, these associations were slightly attenuated when the models were adjusted for measured BMI and smoking status (Table 2).

Associations between PRSs and incident type 2 diabetes comorbidities

Diabetic nephropathy. One SD increase in type 2 diabetes PRS was associated with a 4% higher risk of diabetic nephropathy (HR 1.04, [95% CI 1.02–1.06]; Table 3). PA and CRF PRSs were associated with a lower risk of nephropathy, while SB and BMI PRSs were linked to a higher risk.

Diabetic retinopathy. Type 2 diabetes PRS was associated with a 4% higher risk of diabetic retinopathy (HR 1.04, [95% CI 1.03 to 1.06]; Table 3). PA PRS predicted a lower risk of retinopathy, while SB and BMI PRSs predicted a higher risk.

Diabetic neuropathy. The type 2 diabetes PRS was not significantly associated with diabetic neuropathy. SB and BMI PRSs predicted higher risk, while grip PRS was also linked to an increased risk of neuropathy.

Severe CVD. Type 2 diabetes PRS was associated with a 5% higher risk of severe CVD (HR 1.05 [95% CI 1.03 to 1.06]). PA, grip, and CRF PRSs were linked to a modestly reduced risk of CVD (1–3%), whereas SB and BMI PRSs were associated with a higher risk of CVD. After adjusting the model for measured BMI and smoking status, PA PRS was no longer statistically significant.

Prediction of type 2 diabetes and comorbidities with PRSs

Model performance was also evaluated using the concordance index. In the base model, which incorporated only the type 2 diabetes PRS for risk prediction, the C-index was 0.644. Adding other PRSs had little effect, with a maximum increase of 0.028, and the HR for type 2 diabetes PRS remained largely unchanged. In contrast, adding measured BMI and smoking status increased the C-index for type 2 diabetes by 0.1, but not for comorbidities (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to assess how genetic factors, including those related to physical activity, contribute to the risk of developing type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities in the Finnish population. We found that higher genetic liability to type 2 diabetes was associated with a greater risk of developing the disease, consistent with previous studies [12,43]. Among individuals with type 2 diabetes, type 2 diabetes PRS was associated with a higher risk of nephropathy, retinopathy, and severe CVDs, but not with neuropathy. Several physical activity-related PRSs were independently associated with type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities, but their inclusion in the model did not significantly improve prediction, suggesting potential genetic pleiotropy.

279 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to examine whether physical activity-related
280 polygenic scores can improve the prediction of type 2 diabetes. While previous research has
281 examined interactions between lifestyle and genetic risk, no studies have directly combined
282 physical activity-related PRSs with type 2 diabetes PRS in a single predictive framework.
283 Although adding physical activity-related PRSs did not improve predictive accuracy in our
284 study, this approach provides a novel perspective. It may support the hypothesis that shared
285 genetic factors influence both type 2 diabetes susceptibility and physical activity behavior. This
286 aligns with earlier findings suggesting that physical activity is heritable and genetically
287 correlated with several cardiometabolic traits, including type 2 diabetes [25,44]. Grip
288 strength—a proxy for muscle strength—has been associated with improved metabolic health
289 and reduced type 2 diabetes risk, likely through mechanisms involving greater muscle mass
290 and enhanced insulin sensitivity [21,22]. Likewise, genetic predisposition to sedentary
291 behavior is correlated with increased type 2 diabetes risk, supporting the role of prolonged
292 inactivity in disease development [45]. Similarly, BMI is a well-established risk factor, with
293 higher BMI consistently associated with an increased risk of type 2 diabetes [24].
294
295 The limited improvement in prediction, as indicated by the C-index, could be due to
296 overlapping genetic signals between PRSs, their low individual explanatory power, and the
297 complex polygenic architecture of type 2 diabetes and related traits [29,46]. Nevertheless,
298 methodological advances may improve the integration of polygenic scores in the future.
299 Notably, predictive performance improved more clearly when measured lifestyle-related
300 phenotypic variables, such as smoking and BMI, were added to the model (C-index increased
301 from 0.644 to 0.744), compared to the addition of physical activity-related PRSs. This suggests
302 that direct measures of lifestyle factors currently add more predictive value than their polygenic
303 proxies, although methodological development may narrow this gap.
304
305 Although the observed effect sizes were modest, our findings support the potential role of PRSs
306 in preventive strategies for type 2 diabetes. Even modest gains in risk stratification may have
307 clinical significance, especially in terms of early intervention and targeted prevention.
308 Currently, the clinical use of PRSs is largely confined to research and pilot programs, but their
309 potential for disease prevention is increasingly recognized. Traditional risk assessment tools
310 remain essential for population-level screening, yet our findings suggest that PRSs could
311 provide an additional, genetically informed layer of risk evaluation. Recent studies also

312 indicate that PRS-based screening may be cost-effective when focused on high-risk individuals
313 and combined with affordable genotyping technologies [47]. Importantly, observational data
314 show that individuals with high polygenic risk still benefit significantly from healthy lifestyle
315 choices, underscoring the value of early risk identification [48]. Thus, while PRS-based
316 prevention is not yet part of standard care, it may hold promise as a future tool for more
317 personalized and proactive disease prevention strategies.
318
319 Considering the inclusion of multiple validated PRSs in this study, it is noteworthy that while
320 all physical activity-related PRSs predicted T2D risk to some extent, their predictive
321 performance varied. These differences may partly reflect disparities in the underlying GWAS
322 data used to construct the scores. For instance, the PRS for cardiorespiratory fitness was
323 derived from a considerably smaller GWAS sample compared to those for sedentary behavior
324 or BMI, potentially limiting its predictive power due to reduced statistical power and variant
325 discovery. Sedentary behavior and BMI are well-established lifestyle-related risk factors for
326 type 2 diabetes, which may explain their stronger predictive performance. These traits are also
327 likely to have more robust and well-powered GWASs, resulting in more informative PRSs. We
328 found that the BMI PRS outperformed the type 2 diabetes PRS in predicting type 2 diabetes
329 and its comorbidities. This suggests that PRSs for intermediate traits, such as BMI, may
330 outperform disease-specific PRSs in predicting future disease onset. Our findings are consistent
331 with UK Biobank analyses showing that the BMI PRS predicted type 2 diabetes incidence more
332 accurately than the type 2 diabetes PRS, particularly in women [49]. Recent research further
333 supports the utility of PRSs in identifying individuals at elevated genetic risk before the onset
334 of clinical symptoms [50]. Based on the current evidence, PRSs reflecting modifiable risk
335 pathways may capture important biological mechanisms underlying disease development and
336 offer greater utility for screening.
337
338 **Strengths and limitations**
339 This study has several strengths. We applied high-performing, genome-wide methods for
340 genetic scoring. Specifically, we used the SBayesR method to derive type 2 diabetes PRS,
341 which has been shown to outperform other commonly utilized PRS methods. A key strength is
342 the use of GWAS data from Mahajan et al. (2018) [29], which provide the best predictive
343 performance for type 2 diabetes PRSs when combined with advanced Bayesian methods such
344 as SBayesR [31]. Another strength is the inclusion of multiple validated PRSs, including the
345 most up-to-date and best-performing scores for physical activity-related traits, thereby

enhancing the robustness of genetic risk assessment. Furthermore, we leveraged the large-scale FinnGen cohort, which covers approximately 10% of the Finnish adult population, and linked genetic data to comprehensive national health registers. This enabled detailed and reliable phenotyping with near-complete follow-up, which strengthens the reliability of our findings. To the best of our knowledge, FinnGen has not been widely used in previous studies of type 2 diabetes PRSs, making this study a valuable addition to the literature by validating findings in an independent, population-based dataset and broadening the generalizability of PRS research beyond commonly used cohorts.

However, the generalizability of our findings is limited to European populations, as both the underlying GWAS data and the FinnGen cohort are composed of individuals of European descent. Our analyses were also constrained by the lack of detailed covariate data, particularly on lifestyle factors such as diet, physical activity, and socioeconomic status. Nonetheless, the primary aim of this study was to evaluate the independent predictive utility of type 2 diabetes PRSs in early-stage screening, rather than to test their performance when adjusted for lifestyle-related variables. Additionally, FinnGen may overrepresent individuals with a higher disease burden, as participants are primarily recruited from those with healthcare contact, which could influence the generalizability of lifetime risk estimates.

Conclusions

PRSs for type 2 diabetes and physical activity-related phenotypes independently predict the incidence of type 2 diabetes and related comorbidities. However, adding physical activity-related scores to the model did not meaningfully improve prediction. These findings support the hypothesis that genetic pleiotropy may partly explain associations between type 2 diabetes and physical activity behavior.

Acknowledgements

We thank the participants and all those who contributed to the data collection in the FTC and FinnGen cohorts, without whom this study would not have been possible. A detailed list of investigators involved in FinnGen is provided in the Supplemental Material (pages 2–17).

We used AI-assisted tools (DeepL and ChatGPT) for language editing, proofreading, and improving the clarity and structure of the manuscript. All content was reviewed and verified by the authors.

Sources of Funding

This work was funded by Research Council of Finland (grants 341750, 346509, and 361981), Juho Vainio Foundation, Päivikki and Sakari Sohlberg Foundation, all to ES. The FinnGen project is funded by Business Finland and 13 international pharmaceutical industry partners: AbbVie, AstraZeneca, Biogen, Boehringer Ingelheim, Celgene/Bristol–Myers Scibb, Genentech (a member of the Roche Group), GSK, Janssen, Maze Therapeutics, MSD/Merck, Novartis, Pfizer, and Sanofi. The funders did not affect this study in any way.

Disclosures

Competing interests. The authors declare no competing interests.

Data availability. Data are available upon reasonable request. Researchers can apply to use the FinnGen resource and access the data used. The Finnish biobank data can be accessed through the Fingenious services (https://site.fingenious.fi/en/) managed by FINBB (Finnish Biobank Cooperative – FINBB | Finnish Biobank Cooperative – FINBB). The FTC subsample data are taken from the Biobank of the National Institute for Health and Welfare. Data are available for qualified researchers through a standardized application procedure (see details Data and services - THL).

Contributorship. EV, LJ, KW, and ES conceptualized the research question, study design, and statistical analysis. EV and LJ preprocessed the polygenic score data and implemented the scores to the FinnGen study cohort. EV performed the statistical modelling under the supervision of LJ and ES. EV drafted the first version of the manuscript, and all authors contributed significantly to the writing, critical interpretation of the findings, and revision of the manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

402 **References**

403 1. International Diabetes Federation; (2021); IDF Diabetes Atlas; Available from
404 https://diabetesatlas.org; Accessed 26 July 2024.

405 2. International Diabetes Federation (2024) Available from: https://idf.org/about-
406 diabetes/type-2-diabetes. Accessed 26 July 2024.

407 3. Ong KL, Stafford LK, McLaughlin SA, et al. (2023) Global, regional, and national
408 burden of diabetes from 1990 to 2021, with projections of prevalence to 2050: a
409 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. The Lancet. 2023 Jul
410 15;402(10397):203–34. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(23)01301-6.

411 4. Cole JB, Florez JC. (2020) Genetics of diabetes mellitus and diabetes complications. Nat
412 Rev Nephrol. 2020 Jul;16(7):377–90. doi: 10.1038/s41581-020-0278-5.

413 5. Almgren P, Lehtovirta M, Isomaa B, et al. (2011) Heritability and familiality of type 2
414 diabetes and related quantitative traits in the Botnia Study. Diabetologia. 2011 Nov
415 1;54(11):2811–9. doi: 10.1007/s00125-011-2267-5.

416 6. Willemsen G, Ward KJ, Bell CG, et al. (2015) The concordance and heritability of type 2
417 diabetes in 34,166 twin pairs from international twin registers: the Discordant Twin
418 (DISCOTWIN) Consortium. Twin Res Hum Genet Off J Int Soc Twin Stud. 2015
419 Dec;18(6):762–71. doi: 10.1017/thg.2015.83.

420 7. Pärna K, Snieder H, Läll K, Fischer K, Nolte I. (2020) Validating the doubly weighted
421 genetic risk score for the prediction of type 2 diabetes in the Lifelines and Estonian
422 Biobank cohorts. Genet Epidemiol. 2020 Sep;44(6):589–600. doi: 10.1002/gepi.22327.

423 8. Scott LJ, Mohlke KL, Bonnycastle LL, et al. (2007) A genome-wide association study of
424 type 2 diabetes in Finns detects multiple susceptibility variants. Science. 2007 Jun
425 1;316(5829):1341–5. doi: 10.1126/science.1142382.

426 9. Visscher PM, Wray NR, Zhang Q, et al. (2017) 10 Years of GWAS Discovery: biology,
427 function, and translation. Am J Hum Genet. 2017 Jul 6;101(1):5–22. doi:
428 10.1016/j.ajhg.2017.06.005.

429 10. Wand H, Lambert SA, Tamburro C, et al. (2021) Improving reporting standards for
430 polygenic scores in risk prediction studies. Nature. 2021 Mar;591(7849):211–9. doi:
431 10.1038/s41586-021-03243-6.

432 11. Boyle EA, Li YI, Pritchard JK. (2017) An expanded view of complex traits: from
433 polygenic to omnigenic. Cell. 2017 Jun 15;169(7):1177–86. doi:
434 10.1016/j.cell.2017.05.038.

435 12. Ge T, Irvin MR, Patki A, et al. (2022) Development and validation of a trans-ancestry
436 polygenic risk score for type 2 diabetes in diverse populations. Genome Med. 2022 Jun
437 29;14(1):70. doi: 10.1186/s13073-022-01074-2.

438 13. Liu W, Zhuang Z, Wang W, Huang T, Liu Z. (2021) An improved genome-wide
439 polygenic score model for predicting the risk of type 2 diabetes. Front Genet. 2021 Feb
440 11;12:632385. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2021.632385.

14. DeForest N, Majithia AR. (2022) Genetics of type 2 diabetes: implications from large-scale studies. Curr Diab Rep. 2022 May 1;22(5):227–35. doi: 10.1007/s11892-022-01462-3.

15. Koch S, Schmidtke J, Krawczak M, Caliebe A. (2023) Clinical utility of polygenic risk scores: a critical 2023 appraisal. J Community Genet. 2023 Oct 1;14(5):471–87. doi: 10.1007/s12687-023-00645-z.

16. Albiñana C, Zhu Z, Schork AJ, et al. (2023) Multi-PGS enhances polygenic prediction by combining 937 polygenic scores. Nat Commun. 2023 Aug 5;14(1):4702. doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-40330-w.

17. Klau JH, Maj C, Klinkhammer H, et al. (2023) AI-based multi-PRS models outperform classical single-PRS models. Front Genet. 2023 Jun 27;14. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2023.1217860.

18. Borné Y, Nilsson PM, Melander O, Hedblad B, Engström G. (2015) Multiple anthropometric measures in relation to incidence of diabetes: a Swedish population-based cohort study. Eur J Public Health. 2015 Dec 1;25(6):1100–5. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckv044.

19. Yang W, Wu Y, Chen Y, et al. (2024) Different levels of physical activity and risk of developing type 2 diabetes among adults with prediabetes: a population-based cohort study. Nutr J. 2024 Sep 17;23(1):107. doi: 10.1186/s12937-024-01013-4.

20. Wang Z, Emmerich A, Pillon NJ, et al. (2022) Genome-wide association analyses of physical activity and sedentary behavior provide insights into underlying mechanisms and roles in disease prevention. Nat Genet. 2022 Sep;54(9):1332–44. doi: 10.1038/s41588-022-01165-1.

21. Herranen P, Palviainen T, Rantanen T, et al. (2022) A polygenic risk score for hand grip strength predicts muscle strength and proximal and distal functional outcomes among older women. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2022 Nov;54(11):1889. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002981.

22. Boonpor J, Parra-Soto S, Petermann-Rocha F, et al. (2021) Associations between grip strength and incident type 2 diabetes: findings from the UK Biobank prospective cohort study. BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care. 2021 Aug 5;9(1):e001865. doi: 10.1136/bmjdrc-2020-001865.

23. Joensuu L, Lukander V, Herranen P, et al. (2025) Genetic contribution of cardiorespiratory fitness in morbidity and mortality: a prospective FinnGen and HUNT study. medRxiv p. 2025.06.25.25330268. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2025.06.25.25330268v1. Accessed 21 August 2025.

24. Zhang M, Ward J, Strawbridge RJ, et al. (2025) Genetic predisposition to adiposity, and type 2 diabetes: the role of lifestyle and phenotypic adiposity. Eur J Endocrinol. 2025 May 2;192(5):549–57. doi: 10.1093/ejendo/lvaf084.

25. Sillanpää E, Palviainen T, Ripatti S, Kujala UM, Kaprio J. (2022) Polygenic score for physical activity is associated with multiple common diseases. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2022 Feb 1;54(2):280–7. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002788.

26. Tynkkynen NP, Törmäkangas T, Palviainen T, et al. (2023) Associations of polygenic inheritance of physical activity with aerobic fitness, cardiometabolic risk factors and diseases: the HUNT study. Eur J Epidemiol. 2023 Sep 1;38(9):995–1008. doi: 10.1007/s10654-023-01029-w.

27. Herranen P, Koivunen K, Palviainen T, et al. (2024) Genome-wide polygenic score for muscle strength predicts risk for common diseases and lifespan: a prospective cohort Study. J Gerontol Ser A. 2024 Apr 1;79(4):glae064. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glae064.

28. Kurki MI, Karjalainen J, Palta P, et al. (2023) FinnGen provides genetic insights from a well-phenotyped isolated population. Nature. 2023 Jan;613(7944):508–18. doi: 10.1038/s41586-022-05473-8.

29. Mahajan A, Taliun D, Thurner M, et al. (2018) Fine-mapping type 2 diabetes loci to single-variant resolution using high-density imputation and islet-specific epigenome maps. Nat Genet. 2018 Nov;50(11):1505–13. doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0241-6.

30. Polfus LM, Darst BF, Highland H, et al. (2021) Genetic discovery and risk characterization in type 2 diabetes across diverse populations. Hum Genet Genomics Adv. 2021 Mar 9;2(2):100029. doi: 10.1016/j.xhgg.2021.100029.

31. Brīvība M, Atava I, Pečulis R, et al. (2024) Evaluating the efficacy of Type 2 diabetes polygenic risk scores in an independent European population. Int J Mol Sci. 2024 Jan;25(2):1151. doi: 10.3390/ijms25021151.

32. Pan-UK Biobank (2025) Available from: https://pan.ukbb.broadinstitute.org. Accessed 25 August 2025.

33. Joensuu L, Koivunen K, Tynkkynen NP, et al. (2025) Genetic liability to sedentary behaviour and cardiovascular disease incidence in the FinnGen and HUNT cohorts. Br J Sports Med 2025 May 27;59(11):783-790. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2024-109491.

34. Masip G, Silventoinen K, Keski-Rahkonen A, et al. (2020) The genetic architecture of the association between eating behaviors and obesity: combining genetic twin modeling and polygenic risk scores. Am J Clin Nutr. 2020 Jul 20;112(4):956–66. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqaa181.

35. Lloyd-Jones LR, Zeng J, Sidorenko J, et al. (2019) Improved polygenic prediction by Bayesian multiple regression on summary statistics. Nat Commun. 2019 Nov 8;10(1):5086. doi: 10.1038/s41467-019-12653-0.

36. Einarson TR, Acs A, Ludwig C, Panton UH. (2018) Economic burden of cardiovascular disease in Type 2 diabetes: a systematic review. Value Health. 2018 Jul 1;21(7):881–90. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2017.12.019.

37. Kurkela O, Raitanen J, Tuovinen M, Ilanne-Parikka P, Forma L. (2022) Tyypin 2 diabeteksen lisäsairaudet aiheuttavat merkittävän kustannustaakan. Suom Lääkäril 2022;77:e32697.38.

38. Niskanen L, Partonen T, Auvinen A, Haukka J. Trends and predictors in all-cause and cause-specific mortality in diabetic and reference populations during 21 years of follow-up. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2020 Nov 1;74(11):950–6. doi: 10.1136/jech-2019-213602.

39. Price AL, Patterson NJ, Plenge RM, Weinblatt ME, Shadick NA, Reich D. (2006) Principal components analysis corrects for stratification in genome-wide association studies. Nat Genet. 2006 Aug;38(8):904–9. doi: 10.1038/ng1847.

40. Kolde A, Koitmäe M, Käärik M, Möls M, Fischer K. (2025) Analysis of follow-up data in large biobank cohorts: a review of methodology. Front Genet 2025 Jun 25:16:1534726. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2025.1534726.

41. Gerds TA, Kattan MW, Schumacher M, Yu C. (2013) Estimating a time-dependent concordance index for survival prediction models with covariate dependent censoring. Stat Med. 2013 Jun 15;32(13):2173–84. doi: 10.1002/sim.5681.

42. Therneau T. (2025) Survival: Survival Analysis. Version 3.5-8. Available from https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/survival/index.html. Accessed 12 March 2025.

43. Yun JS, Jung SH, Shivakumar M, et al. (2022) Polygenic risk for type 2 diabetes, lifestyle, metabolic health, and cardiovascular disease: a prospective UK Biobank study. Cardiovasc Diabetol. 2022 Jul 14;21(1):131. doi: 10.1186/s12933-022-01560-2.

44. Kujala UM, Palviainen T, Pesonen P, et al. (2020) Polygenic risk scores and physical activity. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2020 Jul;52(7):1518–24. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002290.

45. Hamilton MT, Hamilton DG, Zderic TW. (2014) Sedentary behavior as a mediator of type 2 diabetes. Med Sport Sci. 2014;60:11–26. doi: 10.1159/000357332

46. Torkamani A, Wineinger NE, Topol EJ. (2018) The personal and clinical utility of polygenic risk scores. Nat Rev Genet. 2018 Sep;19(9):581–90. doi: 10.1038/s41576-018-0018-x.

47. Martikainen J, Lehtimäki AV, Jalkanen K, et al. (2022) Economic evaluation of using polygenic risk score to guide risk screening and interventions for the prevention of type 2 diabetes in individuals with high overall baseline risk. Front Genet. 2022 Sep 15;13:880799. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2022.880799.

48. Lankinen MA, Nuotio P, Kauppinen S, et al. (2024) Effects of genetic risk on incident type 2 diabetes and glycemia: the T2D-GENE Lifestyle Intervention Trial. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2024 Jun 18;110(1):130–8. doi: 10.1210/clinem/dgae422.

49. Moldovan A, Waldman YY, Brandes N, Linial M. (2021) Body mass index and birth weight improve polygenic risk score for type 2 diabetes. J Pers Med. 2021 Jun 21;11(6):582. doi: 10.3390/jpm11060582.

50. German C, Ashenhurst J, Wang W, et al. (2023) A polygenic risk score identifies undiagnosed cases of diabetes. medRxiv 10.31.23297847 (Preprint). Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297847v1. Accessed 18 June 2025.

561 **Tables**

562
563
564 **Table 1. Descriptives of individuals with selected endpoints in the main FinnGen cohort**

Characteristics	All	n	Women	n	Men	n
age (y)	62.0 (17.2)	279,373	59.1 (17.6)	145,794	65.2 (16.2)	133,579
BMI (kg/m^2)	27.4 (5.4)	279,373	27.3 (5.9)	145,794	27.4 (4.7)	133,579
Smoker *n* (%)	73.011 (26.1)	279,373	26.612 (18.3)	145,794	46.399 (34.7)	133,579
Comorbidities						
T2D	50.248 (18.0)	279,373	20.890 (14.3)	145,794	29.358 (22.0)	133,579
CVD severe	10.073 (23.9)	42,225	15.018 (10.3)	145,794	35.812 (26.8)	133,579
Diabetic neuropathy	1.669 (3.4)	49,652	589 (2.8)	20,798	1.410 (4.8)	29,354
Diabetic nephropathy	2.345 (4.7)	49,560	861 (4.1)	20,813	1945 (6.6)	29,377
Diabetic retinopathy	2.115 (4.6)	45,558	984 (5.1)	19,182	1.536 (5.7)	26,945

565 Notes: Values are means and standard deviations (SD) for continuous variables, and n and percentages (%) are
566 given for others; BMI, body mass index; T2D, type 2 diabetes; CVD, cardiovascular disease; age at the end of
567 follow-up.
568
569
570
571 **Table 2. Associations between PRSs and T2D incidence**

T2D	Model 1[a]		Model 2[b]	
	HR (95% CI)	**p Value**	**HR (95% CI)**	**p Value**
PRS				
T2D	1.08 (1.08–1.08)	**0.0e+00**	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**
PA	0.93 (0.92–0.93)	**1.2e-67**	0.95 (0.94–0.96)	**4.4e-30**
SB	1.14 (1.13–1.15)	**4.4e-197**	1.09 (1.08–1.10)	**4.7e-78**
Grip	0.96 (0.95–0.96)	**5.7e-24**	0.96 (0.95–0.96)	**2.6e-24**
CRF	0.94 (0.94–0.95)	1.3e-36	0.96 (0.96–0.97)	7.2e-16
BMI	1.35 (1.34–1.36)	**0.0e+00**	1.13 (1.12–1.14)	**2.5e-144**
T2D + PA	1.08 (1.08–1.08)	**0.0e+00**	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**
T2D + SB	1.08 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**
T2D + Grip	1.08 (1.08–1.08)	**0.0e+00**	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**
T2D + CRF	1.08 (1.08–1.08)	**0.0e+00**	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**
T2D + BMI	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**
All PRSs	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**1.5e-320**	1.07 (1.07–1.08)	**0.0e+00**

572 a. Model 1 adjusted for sex, age, 10 genetic principal components, and genotyping batch.
573 b. Model 2 adjusted for sex, age, 10 genetic principal components, genotyping batch, BMI, and smoking status.
574 PRSs: T2D, Type 2 diabetes; PA, physical activity; Grip, handgrip; CRF cardiorespiratory fitness; BMI, body
575 mass index.
576
577
578 **Table 3. Associations between PRSs and T2D comorbidities**

Disease	PRS	Model 1[a]		Model 2[b]	
		HR (95% CI)	**p Value**	**HR (95% CI)**	**p Value**
Diabetic nephropathy	T2D	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**4.3e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**2.2e-06**
	PA	0.93 (0.89–0.97)	**4.3e-04**	0.94 (0.90–0.98)	**2.33-03**
	SB	1.09 (1.05–1.14)	**2.7e-05**	1.07 (1.02–1.11)	**1.93-03**
	Grip	1.00 (0.96–1.04)	8.8e-01	1.00 (0.96–1.04)	0.990
	CRF	0.95 (0.91–0.99)	**1.4e-02**	0.96 (0.92–0.96)	**0.032**
	BMI	1.32 (1.26–1.37)	**2.1e-39**	1.24 (1.18–1.28)	**2.7e-21**

	T2D + PA	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**8.3e-06**	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**4.0e-06**
	T2D + SB	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**9.4e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**3.9e-06**
	T2D + Grip	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**4.3e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**2.2e-06**
	T2D + CRF	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**4.9e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**2.4e-06**
	T2D + BMI	1.03 (1.01–1.05)	**1.7e-03**	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**2.3e-04**
	All	1.03 (1.01–1.05)	**1.8e-03**	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**2.5e-04**
Diabetic neuropathy	T2D	1.03 (1.00–1.06)	6.9e-02	1.03 (1.00–1.06)	0.061
	PA	0.98 (0.93–1.03)	3.3e-01	0.98 (0.94–1.03)	0.460
	CRF	1.01 (0.96–1.06)	8.2e-01	1.01 (0.96–1.06)	0.690
	SB	1.06 (1.01–1.11)	**2.1e-02**	1.05 (1.00–1.10)	0.076
	Grip	1.07 (1.02–1.12)	**5.9e-03**	1.07 (1.02–1.12)	**5.3e-03**
	CRF	1.01 (0.96–1.06)	8.2e-01	1.01 (0.96–1.06)	0.690
	BMI	1.16 (1.10–1.21)	**6.0e-09**	1.11 (1.06–1.17)	**3.8e-05**
	T2D + PA	1.01 (1.00–1.06)	7.5e-02	1.03 (1.00–1.06)	0.065
	T2D + SB	1.03 (1.00–1.06)	8.6e-02	1.03 (1.00–1.06)	0.072
	T2D + Grip	1.03 (1.00–1.06)	6.3e-02	1.03 (1.00–1.06)	0.056
	T2D + CRF	1.01 (1.00–1.06)	6.9e-02	1.03 (1.00–1.06)	0.060
	T2D + BMI	1.02 (0.99–1.05)	2.5e-01	1.02 (1.00–1.06)	0.160
	All	1.02 (0.99–1.05)	2.4e-01	1.02 (0.99–1.05)	0.160
Diabetic retinopathy	T2D	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**1.0e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**9.7e-07**
	PA	0.94 (0.90–0.98)	**3.8e-03**	0.94 (0.90–0.98)	**4.9e-03**
	SB	1.08 (1.03–1.12)	**7.2e-04**	1.07 (1.03–1.12)	**1.2e-03**
	Grip	0.96 (0.92–1.01)	8.0e-02	0.96 (0.92–1.01)	0.081
	CRF	0.97 (0.93–1.01)	1.2e-01	0.97 (0.93–1.01)	0.140
	BMI	1.25 (1.19–1.30)	**2.1e-23**	1.24 (1.19–1.30)	**2.3e-21**
	T2D + PA	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**2.1e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**2.0e-06**
	T2D + SB	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**2.1e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**1.9e-06**
	T2D + Grip	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**1.4e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**1.3e-06**
	T2D + CRF	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**1.2e-06**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**1.2e-06**
	T2D + BMI	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**2.3e-04**	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**2.2e-04**
	All	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**3.1e-04**	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**2.9e-04**
Severe CVD	T2D	1.05 (1.03–1.06)	**1.1e-15**	1.05 (1.03–1.06)	**3.6e-16**
	PA	0.98 (0.96–1.00)	**2.0e-02**	0.98 (0.96–1.00)	0.0550
	SB	1.05 (1.03–1.08)	**1.4e-07**	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	**2.1e-05**
	Grip	0.97 (0.95–0.99)	**3.9e-03**	0.97 (0.95–0.99)	**3.5e-03**
	CRF	0.99 (0.97–1.01)	5.5e-01	1.00 (0.98–1.01)	0.670
	BMI	1.13 (1.11–1.16)	**6.7e-35**	1.11 (1.09–1.13)	**9.4e-23**
	T2D + PA	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**2.3e-15**	1.05 (1.03–1.06)	**6.6e-16**
	T2D + SB	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**4.7e-15**	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**1.2e-15**
	T2D + Grip	1.04 (1.03–1.06)	**1.1e-15**	1.05 (1.03–1.06)	**3.5e-16**
	T2D + CRF	1.05 (1.03–1.06)	**1.2e-15**	1.05 (1.03–1.06)	**3.7e-16**
	T2D + BMI	1.04 (1.03–1.05)	**4.1e-11**	1.04 (1.03–1.05)	**2.9e-12**
	All	1.04 (1.03–1.05)	**4.4e-11**	1.04 (1.03–1.05)	**3.0e-12**

a. Model 1 adjusted for sex, 10 genetic principal components, and genotyping batch.
b. Model 2 adjusted for sex, 10 genetic principal components, genotyping batch, BMI, and smoking status.

593 **Table 4. PRSs as a Predictor of T2D in FinnGen**

Disease	C-index Model 1[a]	C-index Model 2[b]
T2D		
PRS		
T2D	0.644	0.744
PA	0.635	0.739
SB	0.641	0.74
Grip	0.634	0.739
CRF	0.634	0.739
BMI	0.665	0.741
T2D + PA	0.646	0.744
T2D + SB	0.65	0.745
T2D + Grip	0.645	0.744
T2D + CRF	0.645	0.744
T2D + BMI	0.671	0.745
All PRSs	0.672	0.746
Diabetic nephropathy		
PRS		
T2D	0.639	0.659
PA	0.638	0.658
SB	0.639	0.659
Grip	0.637	0.657
CRF	0.637	0.657
BMI	0.658	0.667
T2D + PA	0.64	0.66
T2D + SB	0.642	0.66
T2D + Grip	0.639	0.659
T2D + CRF	0.64	0.659
T2D + BMI	0.658	0.669
All PRSs	0.658	0.669
Diabetic neuropathy		
PRS		
T2D	0.656	0.664
PA	0.655	0.663
SB	0.656	0.664
Grip	0.656	0.664
CRF	0.655	0.663
BMI	0.661	0.667
T2D + PA	0.656	0.664
T2D + SB	0.657	0.665
T2D + Grip	0.657	0.665
T2D + CRF	0.656	0.664
T2D + BMI	0.662	0.667
All PRSs	0.663	0.668
Diabetic retinopathy		
PRS		
T2D	0.656	0.653
PA	0.653	0.65
SB	0.654	0.651
Grip	0.654	0.651
CRF	0.653	0.65
BMI	0.66	0.659
T2D + PA	0.656	0.653
T2D + SB	0.657	0.654

T2D + Grip	0.657	0.654
T2D + CRF	0.657	0.654
T2D + BMI	0.662	0.661
All PRSs	0.663	0.662
Severe CVD		
PRS		
T2D	0.645	0.651
PA	0.643	0.649
SB	0.644	0.649
Grip	0.643	0.649
CRF	0.643	0.648
BMI	0.649	0.652
T2D + PA	0.645	0.651
T2D + SB	0.646	0.651
T2D + Grip	0.645	0.651
T2D + CRF	0.645	0.65
T2D + BMI	0.651	0.654
All PRSs	0.651	0.654

a. Model 1 adjusted for sex, 10 genetic principal components, and genotyping batch.
b. Model 2 adjusted for sex, 10 genetic principal components, genotyping batch, BMI, and smoking status.