Sex-Specific Genetic Architecture and Comorbidities of Alcohol Use Behaviors

Laura Vilar-Ribó[1], Mariela V Jennings[1], Aisha Sallah[2], Zeal Jinwala[3,4,5], Hayley HA Thorpe[6], Sevim B Bianchi[1], John Meredith[1], Kyra Feuer[3], Lydia Rader[7], Natasia Courchesne-Krak[1], Maria Niarchou[8], Jared Balbona[9, 10], 23andMe Research Team[11], Sarah L Elson[11], Pierre Fontanillas[11], Emma C Johnson[12], Lea K Davis[13,14,15], Alexander S Hatoum[16], Travis T Mallard[17,18], Daniel E Gustavson[7,19], Hang Zhou[20,21], Abraham A Palmer[1,22], Jeanne E Savage[23], Rachel L Kember[3,4], Sandra Sanchez-Roige[1,14,22]*

[1] Department of Psychiatry, University of California San Diego, La Jolla CA, USA

[2] Genetics and Epigenetics Graduate Group, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

[3] Department of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, United States

[4] Crescenz VA Medical Center, Philadelphia, PA 19104, United States

[5] Division of Biology & Biomedical Sciences, Washington University in Saint Louis

[6]Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, ON, Canada

[7] Institute for Behavioral Genetics, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO

[8] Department of Medicine, Division of Genetic Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA

[9] Virginia Institute for Psychiatric and Behavioral Genetics, Richmond, VA, USA

[10] Department of Psychiatry, Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine, Richmond, VA, USA

[11] 23andMe, Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA, USA

[12] Department of Psychiatry, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, MO

[13] Department of Biomedical Informatics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA

[14] Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA

[15] Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA

[16] Washington University School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, St. Louis MO

[17] Center for Precision Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

[18] Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

[19] Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, United States

[20] Department of Psychiatry, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

[21] Veterans Affairs Connecticut Healthcare System, West Haven, CT, USA

[22] Institute for Genomic Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

[23] Department of Complex Trait Genetics, Center for Neurogenomics and Cognitive Research, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam Neuroscience, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

***Corresponding author:**

Sandra Sanchez-Roige, PhD. Email: sanchezroige@ucsd.edu

ABSTRACT

Sex differences in alcohol use behaviors are well-established: males typically engage in heavier and more frequent drinking and exhibit more externalizing behaviors (e.g., other substance use), while females often transition to dependence more rapidly and present more internalizing psychopathology (e.g., depression). The biological mechanisms underpinning these differences are relatively unknown. In this study, we investigated the sex-differentiated genetic architecture of 11 alcohol use phenotypes pertaining to frequency, quantity and problematic use by leveraging sex-stratified genome-wide association studies (Ns 40,335 to 613,148). Specifically, we compared SNP-based heritability ($\boldsymbol{h^2_{SNP}}$) estimates, individual genetic locus effects, genetic correlations ($\boldsymbol{r_g}$) across sexes, alcohol phenotypes and with comorbid traits from independent GWAS, and polygenic score (**PGS**) associations with medical outcomes from clinical populations. h^2_{SNP} was broadly similar between sexes, except for higher estimates in males for *beer quantity* and *problematic alcohol use* (**PAU**). We identified four sex-differentiated top loci ($p_{sex\text{-}diff} < 5 \times 10^{-8}$), including a female-specific association in *IZUMO1* for *drinking frequency* and *quantity*, and three male-specific associations in *ADH1B*, *KLB* and *FTO* for *beer quantity* and/or *PAU*. Between-sex genetic correlations ranged from 0.68±0.07 to 0.89±0.04, these estimates were lowest for quantity measures and varied by beverage type, indicating partially distinct polygenic architecture. In males, we identified stronger positive genetic correlations with several externalizing traits (e.g., general addiction) compared to females. In females, we identified a specific positive genetic correlation with a single internalizing trait, self-harm. PGS analyses revealed sex-specific medical associations (e.g., bone/musculoskeletal conditions in females; hepatic/respiratory/infectious sequelae in males) that were obscured in sex-combined analyses; however, sex-specific PGS did not outperform combined-sex PGS for predicting alcohol use disorder diagnosis. Sex-aware analyses of alcohol use behaviors can improve our understanding of the genetic etiology of alcohol use and related health outcomes, and future studies should consider cultural variation (e.g., drinking attitudes, social norms) in the relationship between behavior and genetics.

INTRODUCTION

Alcohol use disorder (**AUD**) afflicts over 15 million Americans, costs the US economy $249 billion annually, and kills more than 3 million people a year globally (Witkiewitz et al., 2019; Park & Kim, 2020). AUD develops through a dynamic process, which begins with the initiation of use, continues with the escalation to hazardous drinking, and can lead to compulsive, harmful use that persists despite negative consequences (Sanchez-Roige et al., 2020). AUD often manifests alongside other psychiatric and medical comorbidities, such as liver disease, cardiovascular conditions, pancreatitis, and metabolic disorders (Åberg et al., 2023; Castillo-Carniglia et al., 2019; Hendriks, 2020).

Although males are more likely to be diagnosed with AUD than females, this gap is closing in western countries (Salvatore et al., 2017). The trajectory of AUD development, however, is sex specific. While males are more prone to heavy drinking, females often transition to dependence more quickly (Hernandez-Avila et al., 2004), show more susceptibility to cravings (Boykoff et al., 2010) and relapse (Peltier et al., 2019), and experience aggravated adverse events to AUD medications (Baros et al., 2008). Alcohol-related psychiatric comorbidities are also sex-specific. For example, males are more likely to exhibit externalizing disorders (e.g., other substance use disorders [**SUD**]), whereas females are more likely to manifest internalizing psychopathology (e.g., depression; Dawson et al., 2010; Karpyak et al., 2016). Even at lower consumption levels (Rehm et al., 2017; Szabo, 2018) females are disproportionately affected by medical comorbidities (e.g., liver disease, neurological damage, cardiovascular conditions) (Agabio et al., 2016; Erol & Karpyak, 2015; Mancinelli et al., 2009; Parés et al., 1986). Many factors, both biological (e.g., hormones, body composition, metabolism) and environmental (e.g., cultural norms, social roles, beverage preferences), can shape these trajectories differently across sexes (Maxwell et al., 2022; Salvatore et al., 2017).

Twin studies show that sex-specific AUD trajectories and comorbidities arise in part from genetic factors (Erol & Karpyak, 2015; Prescott, 2002; Salvatore et al., 2017), with some studies reporting slightly lower heritability estimates in females (e.g., 40-45% in females, 50-52% in males). A recent genome-wide association study (**GWAS**) identified potential sex-differentiated genetic variants (i.e., variants that are significantly different in the magnitude or direction of effect between sexes) associated with problematic alcohol use (**PAU**; Zhou et al., 2023). However, this study included substantially fewer females than males ($N_{females}$ = 143,198 vs. N_{males} = 496,548), resulting in power imbalances between sexes. In addition, the genetic architecture of AUD is not identical to that of alcohol consumption (Kember et al., 2023; Kranzler

et al., 2022; Mallard et al., 2022; Sanchez-Roige et al., 2020) and the sex-differentiated genetic architecture across the broader spectrum of alcohol use behaviors has yet to be explored. Identifying sex-differentiated genes and biological pathways underlying alcohol use behaviors and comorbidities may enable personalized AUD treatments and prevention strategies that are tailored to sex and accommodate heterogeneous profiles.

In the present study, we performed a systematic genomic characterization of sex differences across the spectrum of alcohol use behaviors. We leveraged data from previously published sex-stratified GWAS including PAU (Zhou et al., 2023), 9 alcohol use behavior phenotypes from UK Biobank (Savage et al., 2024) ($N_{females}$ = 67,076 - 191,917 vs. N_{males} = 53,332 - 168,772), and a new, unpublished sex-stratified GWAS of Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test (**AUDIT**) total scores from 23andMe Research Institute ($N_{females}$ = 72,444 vs. N_{males} = 40,335). We examined the sex-differentiated genetic architecture of these phenotypes, across both *quantitative* effects (i.e., the magnitude of genetic influence by sex) and *qualitative* effects (i.e., specific genetic variants). Specifically, we compared SNP-based heritability (h^2_{SNP}) estimates, individual genetic locus effects, genetic correlations (r_g) across alcohol phenotypes and with comorbid traits from independent GWAS, and PGS associations with medical outcomes from clinical populations. We had three specific hypotheses. First, that sex-differentiated genetic effects would be more pronounced in alcohol phenotypes influenced by body size (e.g., body mass index [BMI]) and metabolic processes, such as drinking quantity, given that these traits tend to differ between females and males (Mumenthaler et al., 1999). We expected that these differences would be less evident for phenotypes that reflect behavioral or psychiatric components of AUD, such as drinking frequency or problematic alcohol use. Second, that externalizing comorbidities would be more strongly associated in males, whereas internalizing comorbidities would show stronger associations in females based on epidemiologic and twin evidence of sex-differentiated comorbidity profiles (Farhane-Medina et al., 2022; Meyers et al., 2014). Third, although we anticipated that sex-combined PGS, which are trained on pooled datasets with larger sample sizes, would outperform sex-specific PGS in predicting AUD diagnosis (Jinwala et al., 2025; Lai et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2024; Miller et al., 2023), we hypothesized that sex-specific PGS would uncover associations with sex-specific comorbidities that may be masked in sex-agnostic analyses.

METHODS

Sex-stratified GWAS

We included sex-stratified GWAS summary statistics for 11 alcohol use phenotypes across three categories: frequency (*drinking frequency, drinking with meals* and *decreased drinking*), quantity (*drinking quantity, beer quantity, spirit quantity, red wine quantity* and *white wine quantity*) and problematic use (*binge drinking, AUDIT total score* and *PAU*) (**Table 1**).

Phenotypes were selected based on prior evidence of differences in between-sex genetic correlation (r_g < 0.9; Savage et al., 2024). We additionally excluded phenotypes with non-significant or low h^2_{SNP} in the sex-combined sample (h^2_{SNP} < 0.03 and/or Z-score < 10) to ensure reliable results (Lee et al., 2018). The full list of phenotypes excluded based on these criteria is shown in the **Supplemental Material** and in **Figure S1**. All GWAS were restricted to individuals of genetically inferred European ancestry based on reference populations due to the unavailability of adequately powered sex-stratified GWAS in other ancestral populations (National Academies of Sciences & Medicine, 2023; Wilson et al., 2025). Methods used to perform the sex-stratified AUDIT total score GWAS can be found in the **Supplemental Material**. Methods used to perform the sex-stratified GWAS on the remaining datasets can be found in the original publications (Savage et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2023).

Table 1. Summary of the 11 alcohol use phenotypes included in the study, spanning measures of frequency, quantity, and problematic use. Results are presented for sex-combined as well as female- and male-specific GWAS datasets. For continuous phenotypes, mean values and standard errors are reported, while for binary phenotypes the proportion of cases is provided.

Class	Phenotype	Description	Cohort	Sample	N	% Females	mean (sd)	% cases	Reference
Frequency	**Drinking frequency**	Typical number of drinking days per month (Continuous)	UK Biobank	**Combined**	360,728	53.2	10.13 (7.04)	-	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	191,917	-	9.04 (6.99)	-	
				Males	168,772	-	11.38 (6.87)	-	
	Drinking with meals	Typically consume alcohol with meals vs. not (Binary)	UK Biobank	**Combined**	197,760	52.13	-	68.50%	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	103,090	-	-	77.64%	
				Males	94,647	-	-	58.52%	
	Decreased drinking	Drinking has decreased over the past 10 years (Binary)	UK Biobank	**Combined**	303,960	51.37	-	53.80%	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	156,140	-	-	51.15%	
				Males	147,789	-	-	56.64%	
Quantity	**Drinking quantity**	Typical gm ethanol consumed per month (Continuous)	UK Biobank	**Combined**	333,063	51.9	2.45 (1.06)	-	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	172,985	-	2.12 (1.01)	-	
				Males	160,040	-	2.81 (1.00)	-	
	Beer quantity	Typical quantity of beer consumed per month (Continuous)	UK Biobank	**Combined**	303,569	50.6	1.34 (1.48)	-	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	153,606	-	0.47 (0.92)	-	
				Males	149,932	-	2.23 (1.41)	-	
	Spirit quantity	Typical quantity of spirits	UK Biobank	**Combined**	302,588	50.60	0.89 (1.31)	-	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	153,100	-	0.79 (1.22)	-	

		consumed per month (Continuous)		**Males**	149,457	-	1.00 (1.38)	-	
	Red wine quantity	Typical quantity of red wine consumed per month (Continuous)	UK Biobank	**Combined**	303,004	50.63	1.79 (1.51)	-	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	153,399	-	1.65 (1.45)	-	
				Males	149,574	-	1.92 (1.55)	-	
	White wine quantity	Typical quantity of white wine consumed per month (Continuous)	UK Biobank	**Combined**	302,776	50.61	1.39 (1.42)	-	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	153,236	-	1.63 (1.43)	-	
				Males	149,574	-	1.13 (1.37)	-	
Problematic use	**Binge drinking**	Typical number of binge drinking days per month (Continuous)	UK Biobank	**Combined**	120,422	55.7	0.46 (0.71)	-	Savage et al., 2024
				Females	67,076	-	0.32 (0.59)	-	
				Males	53,332	-	0.64 (0.80)	-	
	AUDIT total score	Sum of items 1–10 to assess alcohol use over the past year (Continuous)	23andMe	**Combined**	112,779	64.24			Not published
				Females	72,444	-			
				Males	40,335	-			
	Problematic alcohol use	AUD + AUDIT-P (Binary and continuous)	MVP + FinnGen + UKB + PGC + QIMR + iPSYCH + YP3	**Combined**	903,147	32.11	0.76 (2.02)	12.50%	Zhou et al., 2023
				Females	143,198	-	0.57 (1.79)	21.20%	
				Males	496,548	-	1.01 (2.25)	18.6%	

Note: AUD = alcohol use disorder. AUDIT = Alcohol use disorder identification test

Note: Phenotype inclusion was $h^2_{SNP} > 0.3$ and between sex $r_g < 0.9$. AUDIT-P was excluded because its a subset of the PAU sample

Sex-specific heritability and genetic correlation analyses

We calculated h^2_{SNP} using linkage disequilibrium score regression (**LDSC**; Bulik-Sullivan et al., 2015). SNPs were mapped to HapMap3 data using pre-computed linkage disequilibrium scores included with the software ("eur_w_ld_chr"). For binary phenotypes, we estimated h^2_{SNP} on the liability scale using population prevalences (**Table S1**). We also used LDSC to estimate genetic correlations (r_g) among alcohol use phenotypes, both between and within sexes, as well as with 71 complex traits from published sex-combined GWAS related to alcohol use and AUD based on prior literature, including other substance use, externalizing, internalizing, cognitive, sociodemographic and anthropometric traits (Castillo-Carniglia et al., 2019; Deak et al., 2022; Kranzler et al., 2019; Sanchez-Roige et al., 2019). For each alcohol phenotype, we applied a 5% FDR threshold to account for multiple testing.

Sex-differentiated genetic effects

To identify loci with sex-differentiated genetic effects, we compared SNP effect sizes derived from sex-stratified GWAS of each alcohol use phenotype by calculating Z-scores and corresponding *p*-values across the genome. We focused on loci with genome-wide significant sex-differentiated effects ($p_{sex\text{-}diff} < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) and that reached genome-wide significance in one sex but not in the other. While the most direct approach to identify SNPs with sex-differentiated effects is through genotype-by-sex interaction analyses, it requires access to individual-level data. A widely used alternative, which is statistically similar when covariate interactions and variance differences are equivalent in the two sexes, is to compare effect sizes from sex-stratified GWAS using a Z-score-based difference test (Khramtsova et al., 2023).

Polygenic score phenome-wide association analyses (PheWAS)

To investigate sex-specific medical associations, we conducted PheWAS of both sex-specific and sex-combined alcohol use PGS against thousands of medical outcomes in two clinical cohorts (described below). PheWAS were meta-analyzed across sites using fixed effects in METAL v0.99.6.1 (Willer et al., 2010). We examined the association between sex-specific PGS in sex-stratified samples and sex-combined PGS in the total sample for each alcohol use phenotype. Medical outcomes were derived by mapping ICD-9 and ICD-10 codes to 1,817 "phecodes", as described and validated by the Phecode Map 1.2b (Carroll et al., 2014). Phecodes use a standardized vocabulary and denote diseases, traits, or symptoms

(http://phewascatalog.org). We excluded phecodes with less than 100 cases and phecodes that were sex-specific (i.e., unique to one sex, such as endometriosis).

Vanderbilt University Medical Center biobank (BioVU). The BioVU cohort was composed of 66,914 unrelated individuals (females = 37,239; males = 29,675) who provided electronic health records (**EHR**) to the Vanderbilt University Medical Center (VUMC; IRB #160302, #172020, #190418) (Roden et al., 2008). Genotyping used the Illumina MEGA_ex platform, with imputation via the Michigan Imputation Server (Das et al., 2016). SNPs with imputation quality (R^2 > 0.3) were converted to hard genotype calls. We applied an IBD filter of 0.2 to exclude cryptic relatedness. Genetic ancestral groups were determined based on principal component analysis (**PCA**) and comparison to known ancestries in the 1000 Genomes Project Phase 3 (1000 Genomes Project Consortium et al., 2015) reference panel; we restricted the analyses to individuals most genetically similar to European reference populations. We also applied a minor allele frequency (**MAF**) filter of 0.05. Details on genotyping and quality control are available for VUMC (Dennis et al., 2021).

Penn Medicine BioBank (PMBB). PMBB is an EHR-linked biobank at the University of Pennsylvania (Penn Medicine) with 44,297 participants. PMBB samples were genotyped by the GSA genotyping array. Quality control removed SNPs with marker call rate <95% and sample call rate <90%, and individuals with sex discrepancies. Genotype phasing and imputation was performed on the TOPMed Imputation server (Das et al., 2016). The phasing was done using EAGLE (v2.4.1) (Loh et al., 2016) and imputation was performed using MINIMAC software (Das et al., 2016). IBD analysis was used to check for relatedness among imputed samples using PLINK v.1.9 (Chang et al., 2015). We randomly removed one individual from each pair of related individuals (pihat <0.25). SNPs with an INFO score <0.3, MAF <0.01, a genotype call rate <0.95 or an HWE p<1.00E-6 were removed and restricted the analyses to individuals most genetically similar to European reference populations (N = 29,160; females = 12,998; males = 16,162). To estimate genetic ancestry, principal components (**PC**) were calculated based on common SNPs between PMBB and the 1000 Genomes Project phase 3 (1000 Genomes Project Consortium et al., 2015) using the smartpca module of the Eigensoft package (Price et al., 2006). Participants were assigned to an ancestry based on the distance of 10 PCs from the 1000 Genomes reference populations.

We computed PGS using PRS-Continuous shrinkage software (**PRS-CS**; Ge et al., 2019) using default “auto” settings to estimate shrinkage parameters and random seed fixed for

reproducibility. Logistic models were fitted for each of the phecodes using the PheWAS v0.12 R package (Carroll et al., 2014) adjusting for sex when appropriate, median age of longitudinal EHR, and the first 10 PCs of genotype. To quantify the variance in AUD explained by each PGS, the adjusted partial Nagelkerke pseudo-R^2 was computed using the rsq.partial() function from the *rsq* R package v.2.7 (D. Zhang, 2024). The weighted average Nagelkerke R^2 across sites was calculated with the formula Nagelkerke-$R^2_{WA} = \sum w_i * R_i^2 / \sum w_i$. For each alcohol phenotype, we used a 5% false discovery rate (**FDR**) threshold to correct for multiple testing within each phenotype.

Statistical tests to estimate sex differences

Sex differences were quantified following best practices (Khramtsova et al., 2023) by computing a Z-score of the test statistics: $Z = (X_F - X_M)/\text{sqrt}(se_F^2 + se_M^2)$, where X represents h^2_{SNP}, SNP effect sizes, r_g or odds ratio (OR) and se represents the standard error, for females and males, respectively. This test is the standard approach for assessing differences between independent parameters with known standard errors and under the assumption that the estimates are normally distributed, a condition typically met in GWAS due to large sample sizes (Pasaniuc & Price, 2017). A two-tailed test was performed to obtain the associated $p_{sex\text{-}diff}$ value. We applied a 5% FDR threshold to account for multiple testing for all tests, except for the sex-differentiated effect sizes, where genome-wide significance was defined as $p_{sex\text{-}diff} < 5 \times 10^{-8}$.

RESULTS

SNP-based heritability

All 11 alcohol use phenotypes had significant h^2_{SNP} estimates, ranging from 0.031 ± 0.003 to 0.128 ± 0.007 (**Figure S2**; **Table S2**). Only two phenotypes showed statistically significantly greater h^2_{SNP} estimates in males compared to females: *beer quantity* (male h^2_{SNP} = 0.097 ± 0.006, female h^2_{SNP} = 0.031 ± 0.003, $p_{sex\text{-}diff}$ = 3.83e-23*)* and *PAU* (male h^2_{SNP} = 0.083 ± 0.004, female h^2_{SNP} = 0.045 ± 0.005, $p_{sex\text{-}diff}$ = 3.94e-09). The remaining alcohol use phenotypes showed similar h^2_{SNP} estimates across sexes (**Table S2**).

Sex-differentiated genetic effects

Figure 1A shows the number of independent genome-wide significant loci in females (range = 1-23) and males (range = 0-40). While the magnitude of effect across variants was largely similar across sexes (**Figure S3 and S4**), we identified four independent loci with

significant sex-differentiated effects ($p_{sex\text{-}diff} < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) that reached genome-wide significance in one sex but not in the other across four alcohol traits (**Figure 1B**, **Table S3**). One locus (lead SNP rs838147 in *IZUMO1*) showed female-specific effects for both *drinking frequency* (OR_F = 0.87 [0.83, 0.91]) and *drinking quantity* (OR_F = 0.98 [0.97, 0.99]; **Figure S5A-B**). Two loci (lead SNPs rs1229984 in *ADH1B*, rs28712821 in *KLB)* showed male-specific effects for *beer quantity* (OR_M = 0.81 [0.77, 0.84] and OR_M = 0.96 [0.95, 0.97], respectively) and one locus (lead SNP rs1421085 in *FTO*) showed male-specific effects for *PAU* (OR_M = 1.02 [1.02, 1.03]; **Figure S5C-E**). Two of these loci (rs838147 and rs1421085) showed decreased risk in females but increased risk in males (**Figure 1C**). The other two loci (rs1229984 and rs28712821) showed decreased risk in both sexes, but with significantly larger magnitudes in males.



Figure 1. Number of genome-wide significant loci and loci with sex-differentiated genetic effects. **A.** Bar plot with the number of independent genome-wide significant loci for each alcohol use phenotype in females (amber) and in males (blue) **B.** Miami plot displaying the 11 sex-stratified GWAS overlaid on top of each other in females (top, in amber) and in males (bottom, in blue). Sex-differentiated loci reaching genome-wide significance are annotated with the nearest gene and colored by alcohol use phenotype: *drinking frequency* (dark purple), *drinking quantity* (turquoise), *beer quantity* (green), and *PAU* (violet). Miami plots for all alcohol use phenotypes can be found in **Figure S3. C.** Forest plot showing odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals for the lead SNPs for the four loci with sex-differentiated effects. ORs are shown separately for females (amber diamonds) and males (blue squares), illustrating the direction and magnitude of association in each sex. The nearest gene is shown in parentheses.

Between-sex genetic correlations

Genetic correlations between sexes ranged from 0.68 ± 0.07 to 0.89 ± 0.04 (**Figure 2A**, **Table S4**). Consistent with our first hypothesis, drinking quantity phenotypes showed the lowest between-sex r_g average (mean r_g = 0.78 ± 0.06) compared to frequency (mean r_g = 0.87 ± 0.06) or problematic use (mean r_g = 0.85 ± 0.08). Of note, r_g values across drinking quantity phenotypes varied widely depending on the beverage types (from 0.70 ± 0.06 for *beer quantity* to 0.89 ± 0.04 for *red wine quantity*).

Genetic correlations among alcohol phenotypes

To test whether r_g patterns across alcohol use phenotypes differed by sex, we computed cross-trait r_g separately in males (r_{gM}) and females (r_{gF}). A total of 24 out of 55 (43.6%) trait-pair comparisons showed significant differences between sexes (**Figure 2B**, **Table S5**).

Thirteen significant pairs of traits showed consistent direction in r_g estimates in females and males but were of larger magnitude in one of the sexes. The greatest differences in r_g estimates were for *drinking quantity*/*white wine quantity*, which were stronger in females (r_{gF} = 0.68 vs. r_{gM} = 0.23) and *drinking quantity*/*beer quantity*, which were stronger in males (r_{gF} = 0.30 vs. r_{gM} = 0.72; **Figure 2B**, **Table S5**).

Two pairs of traits showed opposite direction in r_g estimates by sex: *drinking quantity*/*drinking with meals* were negatively genetically correlated in males but positively in females (r_{gF} = 0.17 vs. r_{gM} = -0.30), and *spirit quantity*/*red wine quantity* were positively genetically correlated in males but negatively in females (r_{gF} = -0.14 vs. r_{gM} = 0.13; **Figure 2B**, **Table S5**).

Nine pairs of traits showed significant r_g estimates in only one sex. For example, *white wine quantity*/*PAU* were positively genetically correlated in females but not in males (r_{gF} = 0.38 vs. r_{gM} = -0.08) and *drinking quantity*/*spirit quantity* were positively genetically correlated in males but not in females (r_{gF} = 0.07 vs. r_{gM} = 0.31; **Figure 2B**, **Table S5**).



Figure 2. Genetic correlation (r_g) estimates between sexes and among alcohol use phenotypes in females and males. **A.** Forest plot of between-sex r_g with 95% CI across the 11 alcohol use phenotypes. Alcohol use phenotypes are grouped by category: frequency, quantity, and problematic use. **B.** Network plot of cross-trait genetic correlations in females (upper) and males (lower) for trait pairs with statistically significant sex differences in r_g estimates. Edges represent pairwise genetic correlations: red edges indicate positive correlations, blue edges indicate negative correlations, and edge thickness reflects the absolute magnitude of r_g. Faint (lighter) edges denote correlations that were not statistically significant within the respective sex. 10 pairs of traits showed stronger r_g estimates in females and 12 pairs of traits showed stronger r_g estimates in males.

Genetic correlations with other complex traits

We calculated r_gs between alcohol use phenotypes in females and males and 71 other complex traits (**Table S6**). Of the r_g estimates that were significant in either sex, 18.6% showed significant sex differences. Of these, 50.4% were concordant (i.e., same direction) across sexes, 6% were discordant (i.e., opposite directions), 21.7% were significant only in females (i.e., female-specific), and 21.7% were significant only in males (i.e., male-specific; **Figure 3A**). Quantity phenotypes showed greater sex differences in r_g estimates compared to frequency or problematic use phenotypes (**Figure 3A**).



Figure 3. Genetic correlations (r_g) between alcohol use phenotypes in females and males and 71 traits from other published sex-combined GWAS. **A.** Bar plot summarizing the number of traits showing significant sex differences in the r_g estimates with each alcohol use phenotype. Results are categorized as: concordant (green) if significant in both sexes, with effects in the same direction; discordant (red) if significant in both sexes, but with effects in opposite directions; female-specific (amber) if significant only in females; and male-specific (blue) if significant only in males. No significant sex differences in r_g were observed for *drinking frequency*, *decreased drinking* or *binge drinking*. **B**. Heatmap displaying r_g estimates for 15 selected traits with significant sex differences (FDR corrected $p_{sex\text{-}diff} < 0.05$). Traits are grouped into four categories: externalizing, internalizing, cognitive and anthropometric (Anthro). Only values for statistically significant r_g estimates in each sex are shown. Cell color indicates the magnitude and direction of the correlation, ranging from blue (negative r_g) to white (null) to red (positive r_g). Cell outline indicates concordance, discordance, or sex-specificity as in panel A. ADHD: attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder.

Figure 3B shows a heatmap of r_g for selected traits with significant sex differences (FDR corrected $p_{sex\text{-}diff} < 0.05$). We observed similar r_g patterns for overall *drinking quantity* and *PAU*; but identified greater variability in r_g patterns when examining specific beverage types.

<u>*Substance use and externalizing traits*</u>

Our results were consistent with our second hypothesis, showing that r_g*s* with externalizing traits are greater in males than in females. Among males we observed consistently stronger positive r_g*s* between alcohol phenotypes and substance use traits compared to females. For example, *drinking quantity* was more strongly positively genetically correlated in males with general addiction (a genetically derived trait capturing shared liability to SUDs; r_{gF} = 0.44 vs. r_{gM} = 0.56), tobacco use disorder (r_{gF} = 0.14 vs. r_{gM} = 0.31), and cannabis use disorder (r_{gF} = 0.16 vs. r_{gM} = 0.34), and *PAU* was more strongly positively genetically correlated in males with tobacco use disorder (r_{gF} = 0.40 vs. r_{gM} = 0.59) and opioid use disorder (r_{gF} = 0.39 vs. r_{gM} = 0.76). The r_g*s* with externalizing traits were also stronger in males. For example, *drinking quantity* was more strongly positively genetically correlated in males with externalizing psychopathology (r_{gF} = 0.27 vs. r_{gM} = 0.36), attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (**ADHD**; r_{gM} = 0.09 ± 0.03 vs. -0.12 ± 0.03, p = 8.41e-05), and antisocial behavior (r_{gF} = -0.12 vs. r_{gM} = 0.25), and *PAU* was more strongly positively genetically correlated in males with delay discounting (r_{gF} = -0.1 vs. r_{gM} = 0.20). In contrast, we observed sex-specific *negative* r_g*s* with externalizing traits for *drinking quantity* (e.g., delay discounting r_{gF} = -0.20 vs. r_{gM} = 0.001) in females.

For specific beverages, *beer quantity* was the only beverage in males that showed positive r_g*s* with externalizing (e.g., general addiction (r_{gF} = 0.42 vs. r_{gM} = 0.58) and extraversion (r_{gF} = -0.9 vs. r_{gM} = 0.12)). On the contrary, *red wine quantity* (e.g., general addiction r_{gF} = 0.01 vs. r_{gM} = -0.15) and *white wine quantity* showed negative r_g*s* with externalizing traits in males (e.g., general addiction r_{gF} = 0.25 vs. r_{gM} = -0.2). In contrast, all r_g*s* with externalizing traits were positive in females, particularly for *spirit quantity* (e.g., tobacco use disorder r_{gF} = 0.39 vs. r_{gM} = 0.24) and for *white wine quantity* (e.g. general addiction r_{gF} = 0.25 vs. r_{gM} = -0.20).

<u>*Internalizing traits*</u>

Results for internalizing traits were broadly consistent with our second hypothesis of stronger associations in females, but the evidence was modest. We observed female-specific r_g*s* across only three traits. For *drinking quantity,* we observed female-specific negative r_g*s* with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD; r_{gF} = -0.13 vs. r_{gM} 0.01) and loneliness (r_{gF} = -0.18 vs. r_{gM}

= -0.06). However, for specific beverage types, particularly for *beer quantity,* we observed a female-specific positive r_g with ever self-harmed (r_{gF} = 0.39 vs. r_{gM} = 0.07).

Cognitive traits

For cognitive traits, r_g patterns were divergent across sexes for *drinking quantity* and *PAU*. We observed male-specific negative r_gs with cognitive traits for *drinking quantity* (e.g., executive function r_{gF} = 0.05 vs. r_{gM} = -0.08) and for *PAU* (e.g., educational attainment r_{gF} = -0.03 vs. r_{gM} = -0.23). In contrast, we observed female-specific positive r_gs with cognitive and socioeconomic traits for *drinking quantity* (e.g., educational attainment r_{gF} = 0.28 vs. r_{gM} = -0.03).

Sex differences in r_g patterns across cognitive traits varied across beverage types. In males, we observed stronger negative r_g for *beer quantity* and educational attainment (r_{gF} = -0.20 vs. r_{gM} = -0.46) and executive function (r_{gF} = -0.07 vs. r_{gM} = -0.23), but stronger positive r_gs for *red wine quantity* and executive function (r_{gF} = 0.09 vs. r_{gM} = 0.24) and for *white wine quantity* and educational attainment (r_{gF} = 0.49 vs. r_{gM} = 0.67). In contrast, in females, we observed stronger negative r_gs for *spirit quantity* and educational attainment (r_{gF} = -0.50 vs. r_{gM} = -0.15).

Anthropometric traits

In females, we observed a stronger negative r_g for *drinking quantity* and BMI than in males (r_{gF} = -0.18 vs. r_{gM} = -0.07). However, when looking at the r_g for specific beverage types, the r_g with BMI became positive for *spirit quantity* in females (r_{gF} = 0.37 vs. r_{gM} = 0.26), and for *beer quantity* in males (r_{gF} = -0.05 vs. r_{gM} = 0.09).

Phenome-wide association studies

To test our third hypothesis that sex-specific PGS would uncover associations with sex-specific comorbidities that may be masked in sex-agnostic analyses, we investigated sex differences in comorbidity patterns between alcohol PGSs and other medical outcomes (**Table S7**). Specifically, we tested female PGSs in the female sample, and male PGSs in the male sample and benchmarked the results against the sex-combined PGSs in the full sample. Out of the 1,112 traits tested, up to 487 traits were significantly associated with at least one alcohol use PGS in at least one sex. Of these, 97 (19.9%) PGS-trait comparisons showed statistically significant sex differences (**Figure 4A**): 41 (8.42%) were significant in females as well as in the sex-combined samples (i.e., female specific); 15 (3.1%) were significant only in females (i.e.,

female unique); 32 (6.6%) were significant in males as well as in the sex-combined samples (i.e., male specific); 6 (1.2%) were significant only in males (i.e., male unique); and 5 (1%) were concordant across sexes but showed stronger associations in males. No concordant trait associations were stronger in females. **Figure 4B** shows the PGS associations for selected traits with significant sex differences (FDR corrected $p_{sex\text{-}diff} < 0.05$).



Figure 4. Phenome-wide association study (PheWAS) meta-analysis in BioVU and PMBB. **A.** Bar plot summarizing the number of traits showing significant sex differences between the female-specific and the male-specific polygenic scores (PGSs) associations across all alcohol use phenotypes. Results are categorized as: female-specific (amber) if significant in the female-specific and sex-combined PGS analyses; female-unique (dark amber) if significant only in the female-specific PGS analyses; male-specific (blue) if significant in the male-specific and sex-combined PGS analyses; male-unique (dark blue) if significant only in the male-specific PGS analyses; and concordant (green) if significant in both sexes, but with stronger effects in males. *Drinking quantity* and *AUDIT total* PGSs exhibited the most female-specific associations (15 and 14, respectively), while *beer quantity* and *PAU* exhibited the most male-specific associations (19 and 6, respectively). No significant sex differences in r_g were observed for *drinking with meals* and *binge drinking*. **B.** Associations between alcohol use phenotypes PGSs and

selected medical conditions across disease categories. PheWAS results are displayed for female PGS in the female target sample (left), and male PGS in the male target sample (middle) PGSs. Odds ratios (OR) are shown for selected phenotypes exhibiting sex-differentiated effects. Triangle direction indicates the direction of the association (upward for OR > 1, downward for OR < 1), and triangle color corresponds to the alcohol use phenotype used to construct the PGS. Filled triangles represent FDR-corrected significant associations, while empty triangles indicate non-significant associations. Asterisks mark female and male PGS associations that were not significant in the sex-combined PGS analyses (i.e., female-unique and male-unique associations). The right panel displays the number of cases in each medical condition for males (blue circles) and females (amber diamonds).

In the female PGS analyses, 14 (26%) of the sex-specific associations were positive (i.e., linked to increased risk for medical conditions), particularly for *drinking quantity* (n = 5) and *spirit quantity* (n = 6) PGSs (**Figure 4A**). These included associations with higher risk for other SUDs (e.g., tobacco use disorder (**TUD**; OR_F = 1.17 [1.13, 2.21])), musculoskeletal conditions (e.g., osteoarthritis (OR_F = 1.07 [1.03, 1.11])), dermatologic conditions (e.g., degenerative skin conditions (OR_F = 1.12 [1.06, 1.18])), genitourinary conditions (e.g., end stage renal disease (OR_F = 1.16 [1.08, 1.24])), and circulatory conditions (e.g., heart failure (OR_F = 1.08 [1.04, 1.11]); **Figure 4B**). Four of these associations were not significant in the sex-combined PGS analyses (**Table S7**).

In females, we also observed 40 (74%) negative associations (i.e., linked to reduced risk for medical conditions), particularly for *drinking frequency* (n = 9)*, drinking quantity* (n = 14) and *AUDIT total* (n = 14) PGS (**Figure 4A**). These included associations with lower risk for digestive diseases (e.g., chronic liver disease and cirrhosis (OR_F = 0.91 [0.85, 0.97])), neurological (e.g., sleep apnea (OR_F = 0.88 [0.84, 0.92])), endocrine (e.g., type 2 diabetes (OR_F = 0.87 [0.83, 0.91])), circulatory conditions (e.g., ischemic heart disease (OR_F = 0.92 [0.88, 0.96])), dermatologic conditions (e.g., psoriatic arthropathy (OR_F = 0.77 [0.61, 0.93])), genitourinary (e.g., renal failure (OR_F = 0.95 [0.93, 0.97])), and hematopoietic conditions (e.g., diseases of white blood cells (OR_F = 0.92 [0.86, 0.98]); **Figure 4B**, **Table S7**). Eleven of these associations were not significant in the sex-combined PGS analyses (**Table S7**), reflecting the importance of conducting sex-specific analyses.

In the male PGS analyses, 31 (81.6%) of the sex-specific associations were positive, particularly for *beer quantity* (n = 19) and *PAU* (n = 6) PGSs (**Figure 4A**). These included associations with higher risk for SUDs (e.g., TUD (OR_M = 1.21 [1.15, 1.27])), mental conditions (e.g., anxiety (OR_M = 1.12 [1.08, 1.16]), as well as medical comorbidities that result from substance use, such as digestive conditions (e.g., alcoholic liver damage (OR_M = 1.59 [1.43, 1.75])), genitourinary conditions (e.g., renal failure (OR_M = 1.09 [1.05, 1.13])), hematopoietic

conditions (e.g., thrombocytopenia (OR_M = 1.16 [1.08, 1.24])), infectious diseases (e.g., viral hepatitis C (OR_M = 1.37 [1.25, 1.49])), neoplasm diseases (e.g., liver cancer (OR_M = 1.31 [1.15, 1.47])), and respiratory diseases (e.g., chronic airway obstruction (OR_M = 1.14 [1.08, 1.2]); **Figure 4B**, **Table S7**). Four of these associations were not significant in the sex-combined PGS analyses (**Table S7**).

In males, only seven (18.4%) sex-specific associations were negative, including associations with lower risk for digestive diseases (i.e., celiac disease (OR_M = 0.66 [0.5, 0.82])) and endocrine and metabolic conditions (i.e., type 1 diabetes (OR_M = 0.91 [0.85, 0.97])), and neoplasm diseases (i.e., hemangioma and lymphangioma (OR_M = 0.77 [0.63, 0.91])). Two of these associations were not significant in the sex-combined PGS analyses (**Table S7**).

Finally, five associations were positively associated in both sexes but showed significantly stronger associations in males, particularly for *PAU* (n = 4) and *beer quantity* (n = 1) PGS and substance use traits (e.g., AUD (OR_F = 1.18 [1.08, 1.28] vs. OR_M = 1.41 [1.35, 1.47]); **Figure 4A-B**, **Table S7**).

To assess whether sex-specific PGS improved prediction of AUD diagnosis, we compared the variance explained (Nagelkerke R^2) by sex-specific and sex-combined PGS. Consistent with our third hypothesis, sex-specific PGSs did not outperform the sex-combined PGSs in predicting AUD in either the female or male samples (**Figure 5**, **Tables S7-8**). In fact, several sex-specific PGSs (i.e., *drinking with meals, decreased drinking, spirits, red* and *white wine quantity and AUDIT total*) were not significantly associated with AUD in either sex (**Table S7**).



Figure 5. Predictive ability assessment of sex-specific and sex-combined polygenic scores (PGS) for alcohol use phenotypes on alcohol use disorder (AUD) diagnosis in BioVU and PMBB. **A.** Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals for the association between each alcohol use phenotype PGS and AUD Phecode in sex-stratified target samples. **B.** Weighted average Nagelkerke-R^2 values for each PGS in predicting AUD in BioVU and PMBB. The weighted average Nagelkerke R^2 across sites was calculated with the formula Nagelkerke-$R^2_{WA} = \sum w_i * R_i^2 / \sum w_i$. The range corresponds to minimum and maximum Nagelkerke R^2 across sites (see **Table S8**). Male-specific PGS are in blue squares, sex-combined PGS in males are in dark blue squares, female-specific PGS are in amber triangles, and sex-combined PGS in females are in dark amber triangles. Only alcohol use phenotype for which the PGS showed a significant association with AUD in either of the sex-specific PGSs are displayed. *Drinking with meals, decreased drinking*, *spirits, red* and *white wine quantity* and *AUDIT total* PGSs were not significantly associated with AUD in either sex (**Table S7**).

DISCUSSION

Sex differences in alcohol use patterns and trajectories are well documented, but the biological mechanisms underpinning these differences are relatively unknown (Salvatore et al., 2017). Using sex-stratified GWAS of alcohol use behaviors spanning measures of frequency, quantity and problematic use, we characterized their genetic architecture separately in females and males. We evaluated both *quantitative* sex differences (i.e., the magnitude of genetic influence by sex) and *qualitative* differences (i.e., specific genetic variants). Our findings supported our original hypotheses: (i) quantitative sex differences were broadly more pronounced for drinking quantity phenotypes, but less notable for frequency or problematic use,

(ii) externalizing comorbidities showed stronger genetic correlations in males with less evidence for stronger genetic correlations with internalizing comorbidities in females, and (iii) sex-specific PGSs revealed associations with sex-specific comorbidities, some of which were masked in sex-agnostic analyses. We argue that phenotypes strongly influenced by cultural and social differences, particularly the choice of beverage, shapes these sex-specific comorbidity patterns, and outline considerations for future sex-aware studies of alcohol use phenotypes.

Genetic and environmental factors jointly shape alcohol use behaviors. Twin studies have repeatedly shown that alcohol use behaviors are heritable, but evidence for large quantitative sex differences in heritability remains limited (40-45% in females, 50-52% in males; de Moor et al., 2011; Kendler et al., 2010; Prescott, 2002; Stringer et al., 2017; van Beek et al., 2012; Verhulst et al., 2015). Our GWAS results are largely consistent with these findings. We identified significant h^2_{SNP} for all 11 phenotypes, with similar estimates across sexes for most traits. This aligns with prior UK Biobank analyses showing minimal cross-sex divergence in h^2_{SNP} estimates across hundreds of other complex traits, including psychiatric and behavioral phenotypes (Ge et al., 2017). Thus, data both from family studies and GWAS suggest that the overall genetic contribution to alcohol use behaviors is broadly similar by sex.

Despite this broad similarity, important sex differences still emerged in our study for *beer quantity* and *PAU*, which showed significantly higher h^2_{SNP} in males compared to females. Because heritability depends on the study population and measurement (Ge et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2021), these gaps may reflect non-genetic influences, such as sample imbalance (e.g., 496,548 males vs. 143,198 females for *PAU*), differences in endorsement likely reflecting differences in social norms (e.g., UK Biobank male participants reported drinking ~5x more beer compared to females), or reporting biases (e.g., due to stigma surrounding alcohol use in females; Gomez et al., 2022; Stringer & Baker, 2018). Therefore, these differences should be interpreted with caution until replicated in balanced cohorts with harmonized measures.

Over the past decade, sex-agnostic GWASs have identified hundreds of loci associated with aspects of alcohol use behaviors (Deak et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2023; Mallard & Sanchez-Roige, 2021; Sanchez-Roige et al., 2019). When conducting GWAS in sex-stratified cohorts, we identified that sex-differentiated effects existed but were sparse. While the magnitude of effect across variants was largely concordant across sexes, we found four loci with significant sex differences: a female-specific association in *IZUMO1* (rs838147) for *drinking frequency* and *quantity*, and three male-specific associations in *ADH1B* (rs1229984), *KLB*

(rs28712821), and *FTO* (rs1421085) for *beer quantity* and/or *PAU*. However, there are two caveats to note. First, it is possible that differences in ascertainment biases may be again conflating the findings. For example, *ADH1B*, one of the most well-established genes implicated in alcohol use and AUD, shows robust associations with several alcohol use phenotypes in females, suggesting that the male-specific association observed for *beer quantity* may instead reflect reduce power in the female sample for this particular phenotype rather than true sex-differentiated genetic effects. In addition, a recent study using UK Biobank data identified a BMI-increasing *FTO* allele (rs10468280) to be at a higher frequency in males and more strongly associated with BMI in males, consistent with sex-differential participation bias (Pirastu et al., 2021). Similarly, we identified an *FTO* variant in high LD ($r^2 = 0.9$) with rs10468280 that showed sex-differentiated genetic effects in males for *PAU*, which may reflect similar selection biases rather than biology. Second, sex-stratified GWASs can only substitute genotype-by-sex interaction tests when covariate interactions and variance differences are equivalent in the two sexes. Therefore, individual-level data and genotype-by-sex interaction test will be ultimately needed to evaluate whether these reported sex differences are driven by genetic or non-genetic factors (Zhou et al., 2025). Overall, the absence of sex-differentiated loci for the remaining alcohol phenotypes may partly reflect limited statistical power rather than proof of homogeneity (Boraska et al., 2012). Indeed, sex-differentiated effects are now beginning to emerge for large-scale GWAS of somatic traits (Winkler et al., 2015). It is plausible that, for alcohol use phenotypes, as seen for other complex behavioral and psychiatric traits (Blokland et al., 2022), much larger and more balanced samples will be needed to detect sex-differentiated genetic effects, which, even if small, could be informative for mechanism and comorbidity.

Equal h^2_{SNP} across sexes and limited genome-wide sex-differentiated effects do not imply that the underlying polygenic architecture is shared in females and males (Khramtsova et al., 2023). In our data, between-sex genetic correlations significantly departed from 1.0, suggesting that sex-differentiated genetic effects for the alcohol phenotypes tested are prevalent but small in magnitude and distributed across the genome (Bernabeu et al., 2021; Savage et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2023). Mean r_g values were generally lower for quantity phenotypes (mean r_g = 0.87 ± 0.06 [frequency], 0.78 ± 0.06 [quantity] and 0.85 ± 0.08 [problematic use]). Differences were particularly pronounced for certain quantity measures, particularly *spirit quantity and beer quantity* (r_g = 0.68 and 0.70), but less for others, such as *red wine quantity* (r_g = 0.89), perhaps reflecting cultural or social differences in drinking behaviors around these specific beverages.

Cross-trait genetic correlations among alcohol phenotypes also differed between sexes: 43% of pairwise comparisons showed sex divergence, with some showing opposite patterns in males and in females. For instance, *drinking quantity* and *drinking with meals* were negatively genetically correlated in males, but positively in females. Males reported consuming larger quantities of alcohol on average (2.81 ± 1.00 vs. 2.12 ± 1.01), yet they were less likely to drink with meals (58.5% vs. 77.6%) compared to females. Thus, in males, drinking quantity likely reflects higher-volume drinking episodes outside mealtimes (often involving beer). Furthermore, even with the same number of drinks, females can reach higher blood alcohol concentrations due to lower total body water content (Erol & Karpyak, 2015; Mumenthaler et al., 1999). These patterns in behavior, physiological and reporting differences can bias genetic correlation estimates. Scaling measures of intake (g of ethanol/kg), modeling beverage and meal context, and testing methods that use multimodal techniques (e.g., Genomic SEM) to account for participation bias by sex (Pirastu et al., 2021; Savage et al., 2024) could clarify whether the observed sex-dependent patterns reflect biological or environmental differences.

When examining the relationship between female and male alcohol use behaviors and other comorbid traits, 18.6% of the genetic correlations that were significant in either males or females showed significant sex differences. We identified patterns partially consistent with our second hypothesis. In males, genetic correlations with externalizing traits (e.g., SUDs, ADHD, externalizing, extraversion or delay discounting) were stronger for *drinking quantity, beer quantity* and *PAU* compared to females. In females, we identified a single stronger genetic correlation with an internalizing trait (i.e., self-harm) for *beer quantity*, suggesting that the previously observed higher comorbidity with internalizing psychopathology in females (Farhane-Medina et al., 2022; Gutman & Codiroli McMaster, 2020) may be largely influenced by environmental or social factors rather than genetic influences. These patterns are consistent with epidemiologic and twin evidence (Gui et al., 2022; Merikangas & Almasy, 2020), reinforcing that AUD likely develops through partly different etiologic pathways in females and males.

Once more, the largest sex differences were found for overall drinking quantity rather than frequency or problematic use phenotypes and varied by beverage type. For example, *beer quantity* showed *positive* genetic correlations for externalizing traits in males, whereas *spirit quantity* showed *positive* genetic correlations for the same externalizing traits in females. In contrast, *red* and *white wine quantity* in males showed *negative* genetic correlations with externalizing traits. These findings may reflect cultural factors, including social norms, surrounding alcohol consumption, rather than purely biological differences. Furthermore, we

identified positive genetic correlations with *better* socioeconomic outcomes for overall drinking quantity in females only, and for red and white wine consumption in both sexes. This suggests that the counterintuitive positive genetic correlations that we and others have previously noted between *better* socio-educational outcomes and alcohol consumption in sex-combined samples, which likely reflects collider bias from nonrandom sampling in biobank studies (Collins, 2016; Fry et al., 2017; Rosoff et al., 2021; Swanson, 2012), may be largely driven by females and/or by specific beverage types, particularly wine, which is often a marker for higher socioeconomic status. Future work should account for beverage preference to avoid masking or mischaracterizing sex-differentiated effects.

In hospital-based cohorts, PGS analyses revealed sex-specific associations with alcohol-related medical comorbidities. Across BioVU and PMBB, 19.9% PGS-trait comparisons showed significant sex differences. These differences are unlikely to be simply a power artifact, because target-sample sizes by sex were comparable for most traits. In females, female-specific PGS were associated with increased risk of osteoarthritis, degenerative skin conditions, cardiomegaly, and end-stage renal disease, among others. We also observed some female-specific PGS associations (e.g., *drinking quantity* PGS) with lower risk of type 2 diabetes, ischemic heart disease, chronic liver disease and cirrhosis, which contrasts with prior epidemiological evidence suggesting that females are disproportionately affected by alcohol-related medical comorbidities (Agabio et al., 2016; Erol & Karpyak, 2015; Mancinelli et al., 2009; Parés et al., 1986). This pattern of paradoxical associations may again reflect the nonrandom sampling of the UK Biobank, which appears to be more evident for females, as well as ascertainment biases in hospital-based biobanks such as BioVU or PMBB. In these clinical settings, female patients at risk of developing these conditions may be more likely to seek medical care and reduce or stop drinking because of factors not accounted for in our study (e.g., family history, medical advice, contraindications for prescribed medications (Erol & Karpyak, 2015; Savage et al., 2024; Sealock et al., 2022). Therefore, the pattern of protective associations in females likely reflect ascertainment biases rather than true inverse biological relationships. In contrast, male-specific PGS associations concentrated in SUD, alcohol-related medical sequelae (e.g., alcoholic liver damage, liver cancer), and other externalizing-related traits (i.e., fracture of lower limb), consistent with the epidemiological literature reporting heavier drinking and higher externalizing behaviors in males (Dir et al., 2017; Hicks et al., 2007). Strikingly, some of these associations, such as the female-specific association with osteoarthritis and the male-specific association with fracture of the lower limb, were not detected

in sex-combined PGS analyses, highlighting the importance of sex-stratified approaches for uncovering sex-specific comorbidity profiles of alcohol use behaviors that are masked in sex-combined analyses.

Sex-stratified PGS did not outperform sex-combined PGS for AUD prediction, consistent with the idea that pooling females and males to compute PGSs often yields more precise SNP weights when cross-sex genetic overlap is substantial (r_g 0.7–0.9) (C. Zhang et al., 2022). As larger and more balanced sex-stratified GWAS become available, emerging approaches that jointly model genetic effects across sexes (e.g., PRS-CSx) (Merikangas & Almasy, 2020; Silveira et al., 2023; C. Zhang et al., 2022) can be applied to examine whether these approaches show better predictive performance in females and males.

Our study is not without limitations. First, GWAS are disproportionately male-dominant, especially for PAU, reflecting historical prevalence differences or ascertainment bias. This sample imbalance can result in power differences and inflate apparent male effects. Second, many sex-stratified alcohol GWAS were derived from volunteer cohorts (e.g., UK Biobank), where sex-differential participation can induce or magnify cross-trait correlations (Garcia-Sifuentes & Maney, 2021; Martin et al., 2021). Consumption phenotypes from volunteer cohorts may benefit from multivariate frameworks (e.g., Genomic SEM) to partial out shared structure not directly related to AUD liability, as we have shown in prior work (Mallard et al., 2022). Third, sex differences are unlikely to be explained solely by common autosomal variation. Although GWAS using UKB Biobank and 23andMe data included the X chromosome, X-aware tools (e.g., methods accounting for X-inactivation, such as GXwasR, (Bose et al., 2025) and rare-variant models are needed to test whether non-autosomal or rare variation contributes to sex differences (Martin et al., 2021). Finally, gene-by-environment interactions likely contribute to sex differences: genetic influences on alcohol use often strengthen in permissive contexts (e.g., peer drinking, low relationship/support), and attenuate in restrictive contexts (e.g., non-drinking peers or medical advice) (Poelen et al., 2009), with some evidence showing that this effect is stronger in females (Dick et al., 2007; Maxwell et al., 2022). In addition, social norms and behaviors surrounding alcohol consumption in the UK, where much of our data originate, likely differ across countries, ages and historical moments. Future work should include frameworks for quantifying and estimating polygenic GxE by sex, as well as incorporate data from diverse sociocultural settings (Miao et al., 2025).

In summary, sex differences in the genetic architecture of alcohol use phenotypes are polygenic and subtle, with little evidence for single variants with large sex-differentiated effects. Patterns of genetic correlation with psychiatric traits and medical outcomes were sex-specific, even when SNP-based heritability and genetic loci were mostly similar across sexes. The most pronounced sex differences were observed for drinking quantity measures and were influenced by beverage type. This work continues to motivate sex-aware analyses that consider the spectrum of alcohol use behaviors and environmental information in larger, balanced cohorts. Adopting these practices will enable future genetic studies that address, rather than ignore, AUD heterogeneity in females and males.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by National Institutes of Health grant numbers DP1DA054394 (JJM, SSR), T32GM139790 (JG, R25MH081482 (LV-R) and K01DA051759 (ECJ).

We would like to thank the research participants and employees of 23andMe Research Institute for making this work possible. The following members of the 23andMe Research Team contributed to this study: Stella Aslibekyan, Adam Auton, Elizabeth Babalola, Robert K. Bell, Jessica Bielenberg, Ninad S. Chaudhary, Zayn Cochinwala, Sayantan Das, Emily DelloRusso, Payam Dibaeinia, Sarah L. Elson, Nicholas Eriksson, Chris Eijsbouts, Teresa Filshtein, Pierre Fontanillas, Davide Foletti, Will Freyman, Zach Fuller, Julie M. Granka, Chris German, Éadaoin Harney, Alejandro Hernandez, Barry Hicks, David A. Hinds, M. Reza Jabalameli, Ethan M. Jewett, Yunxuan Jiang, Sotiris Karagounis, Lucy Kaufmann, Matt Kmiecik, Katelyn Kukar, Alan Kwong, Keng-Han Lin, Yanyu Liang, Bianca A. Llamas, Aly Khan, Steven J. Micheletti, Matthew H. McIntyre, Meghan E. Moreno, Priyanka Nandakumar, Dominique T. Nguyen, Jared O'Connell, Steve Pitts, G. David Poznik, Alexandra Reynoso, Shubham Saini, Morgan Schumacher, Leah Selcer, Anjali J. Shastri, Jingchunzi Shi, Suyash Shringarpure, Keaton Stagaman, Teague Sterling, Qiaojuan Jane Su, Joyce Y. Tung, Susana A. Tat, Vinh Tran, Xin Wang, Wei Wang, Catherine H. Weldon, Amy L. Williams, Peter Wilton.

We acknowledge the Penn Medicine BioBank (PMBB) for providing data and thank the patient- participants of Penn Medicine who consented to participate in this research program. We would also like to thank the Penn Medicine BioBank team and Regeneron Genetics Center for providing genetic variant data for analysis. The PMBB is approved under IRB protocol# 813913 and supported by Perelman School of Medicine at University of Pennsylvania, a gift

from the Smilow family, and the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under CTSA award number UL1TR001878.

Conflict of interest

S.L.E. and P.F. were employed by and held stock or stock options in 23andMe, Inc. at the time of the study. N.C.K. is consultant and holds stock options in CARI Health, Inc. All other authors report no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1000 Genomes Project Consortium, Auton, A., Brooks, L. D., Durbin, R. M., Garrison, E. P., Kang, H. M., Korbel, J. O., Marchini, J. L., McCarthy, S., McVean, G. A., & Abecasis, G. R. (2015). A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature*, *526*(7571), 68–74. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15393

Åberg, F., Byrne, C. D., Pirola, C. J., Männistö, V., & Sookoian, S. (2023). Alcohol consumption and metabolic syndrome: Clinical and epidemiological impact on liver disease. *Journal of Hepatology*, *78*(1), 191–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2022.08.030

Agabio, R., Campesi, I., Pisanu, C., Gessa, G. L., & Franconi, F. (2016). Sex differences in substance use disorders: Focus on side effects. *Addiction Biology*, *21*(5), 1030–1042. https://doi.org/10.1111/adb.12395

Baros, A. M., Latham, P. K., & Anton, R. F. (2008). Naltrexone and cognitive behavioral therapy for the treatment of alcohol dependence: Do sex differences exist? *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, *32*(5), 771–776. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2008.00633.x

Bernabeu, E., Canela-Xandri, O., Rawlik, K., Talenti, A., Prendergast, J., & Tenesa, A. (2021). Sex differences in genetic architecture in the UK Biobank. *Nature Genetics*, *53*(9), 1283–1289. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-021-00912-0

Blokland, G. A. M., Grove, J., Chen, C.-Y., Cotsapas, C., Tobet, S., Handa, R., Schizophrenia Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, St Clair, D., Lencz, T., Mowry, B. J., Periyasamy, S., Cairns, M. J., Tooney, P. A., Wu, J. Q., Kelly, B., Kirov, G., Sullivan, P. F., Corvin, A., Riley, B. P., … Goldstein, J. M. (2022). Sex-Dependent Shared and Nonshared Genetic Architecture Across Mood and Psychotic Disorders. *Biological Psychiatry*, *91*(1), 102–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2021.02.972

Boraska, V., Jerončić, A., Colonna, V., Southam, L., Nyholt, D. R., Rayner, N. W., Perry, J. R. B., Toniolo, D., Albrecht, E., Ang, W., Bandinelli, S., Barbalic, M., Barroso, I., Beckmann,

J. S., Biffar, R., Boomsma, D., Campbell, H., Corre, T., Erdmann, J., … Zeggini, E. (2012). Genome-wide meta-analysis of common variant differences between men and women. *Human Molecular Genetics*, *21*(21), 4805–4815. https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/dds304

Bose, B., Blostein, F., Kim, J., Winters, J., Actkins, K. V., Mayer, D., Congivaram, H., Niarchou, M., Edwards, D. V., Davis, L. K., & Stranger, B. E. (2025). *GXwasR: A Toolkit for Investigating Sex-Differentiated Genetic Effects on Complex Traits* (p. 2025.06.10.25329327). medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.06.10.25329327

Boykoff, N., Schneekloth, T. D., Hall-Flavin, D., Loukianova, L., Karpyak, V. M., Stevens, S. R., Biernacka, J. M., Mrazek, D. A., & Frye, M. A. (2010). Gender Differences in the Relationship between Depressive Symptoms and Cravings in Alcoholism. *The American Journal on Addictions / American Academy of Psychiatrists in Alcoholism and Addictions*, *19*(4), 352–356. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1521-0391.2010.00057.x

Bulik-Sullivan, B. K., Loh, P.-R., Finucane, H. K., Ripke, S., Yang, J., Schizophrenia Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, Patterson, N., Daly, M. J., Price, A. L., & Neale, B. M. (2015). LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nature Genetics*, *47*(3), 291–295. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3211

Carroll, R. J., Bastarache, L., & Denny, J. C. (2014). R PheWAS: Data analysis and plotting tools for phenome-wide association studies in the R environment. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, *30*(16), 2375–2376. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu197

Castillo-Carniglia, A., Keyes, K. M., Hasin, D. S., & Cerdá, M. (2019). Psychiatric comorbidities in alcohol use disorder. *The Lancet. Psychiatry*, *6*(12), 1068–1080. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30222-6

Chang, C. C., Chow, C. C., Tellier, L. C., Vattikuti, S., Purcell, S. M., & Lee, J. J. (2015). Second-generation PLINK: Rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *GigaScience*, *4*, 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13742-015-0047-8

Collins, S. E. (2016). Associations Between Socioeconomic Factors and Alcohol Outcomes. *Alcohol Research: Current Reviews*, *38*(1), 83–94.

Das, S., Forer, L., Schönherr, S., Sidore, C., Locke, A. E., Kwong, A., Vrieze, S. I., Chew, E. Y., Levy, S., McGue, M., Schlessinger, D., Stambolian, D., Loh, P.-R., Iacono, W. G., Swaroop, A., Scott, L. J., Cucca, F., Kronenberg, F., Boehnke, M., … Fuchsberger, C. (2016). Next-generation genotype imputation service and methods. *Nature Genetics*, *48*(10), 1284–1287. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3656

Dawson, D. A., Goldstein, R. B., Moss, H. B., Li, T.-K., & Grant, B. F. (2010). Gender differences in the relationship of internalizing and externalizing psychopathology to alcohol dependence: Likelihood, expression and course. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *112*(1), 9–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2010.04.019

de Moor, M. H. M., Vink, J. M., van Beek, J. H. D. A., Geels, L. M., Bartels, M., de Geus, E. J. C., Willemsen, G., & Boomsma, D. I. (2011). Heritability of problem drinking and the genetic overlap with personality in a general population sample. *Frontiers in Genetics*, *2*, 76. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2011.00076

Deak, J. D., Levey, D. F., Wendt, F. R., Zhou, H., Galimberti, M., Kranzler, H. R., Gaziano, J. M., Stein, M. B., Polimanti, R., Gelernter, J., & Million Veteran Program. (2022). Genome-Wide Investigation of Maximum Habitual Alcohol Intake in US Veterans in Relation to Alcohol Consumption Traits and Alcohol Use Disorder. *JAMA Network Open*, *5*(10), e2238880. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.38880

Deak, J. D., Miller, A. P., & Gizer, I. R. (2019). Genetics of alcohol use disorder: A review. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *27*, 56–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.07.012

Dennis, J., Sealock, J., Levinson, R. T., Farber-Eger, E., Franco, J., Fong, S., Straub, P., Hucks, D., Song, W.-L., Linton, M. F., Fontanillas, P., Elson, S. L., Ruderfer, D., Abdellaoui, A., Sanchez-Roige, S., Palmer, A. A., Boomsma, D. I., Cox, N. J., Chen, G., … Davis, L. K. (2021). Genetic risk for major depressive disorder and loneliness in sex-specific associations with coronary artery disease. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *26*(8), 4254–4264. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-019-0614-y

Dick, D. M., Pagan, J. L., Holliday, C., Viken, R., Pulkkinen, L., Kaprio, J., & Rose, R. J. (2007). Gender differences in friends' influences on adolescent drinking: A genetic epidemiological study. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, *31*(12), 2012–2019. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2007.00523.x

Dir, A. L., Bell, R. L., Adams, Z. W., & Hulvershorn, L. A. (2017). Gender Differences in Risk Factors for Adolescent Binge Drinking and Implications for Intervention and Prevention. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *8*, 289. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2017.00289

Erol, A., & Karpyak, V. M. (2015). Sex and gender-related differences in alcohol use and its consequences: Contemporary knowledge and future research considerations. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *156*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.08.023

Farhane-Medina, N. Z., Luque, B., Tabernero, C., & Castillo-Mayén, R. (2022). Factors associated with gender and sex differences in anxiety prevalence and comorbidity: A

systematic review. *Science Progress*, *105*(4), 368504221135469. https://doi.org/10.1177/00368504221135469

Fry, A., Littlejohns, T. J., Sudlow, C., Doherty, N., Adamska, L., Sprosen, T., Collins, R., & Allen, N. E. (2017). Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants With Those of the General Population. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *186*(9), 1026–1034. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwx246

Garcia-Sifuentes, Y., & Maney, D. L. (2021). Reporting and misreporting of sex differences in the biological sciences. *eLife*, *10*, e70817. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.70817

Ge, T., Chen, C.-Y., Neale, B. M., Sabuncu, M. R., & Smoller, J. W. (2017). Phenome-wide heritability analysis of the UK Biobank. *PLoS Genetics*, *13*(4), e1006711. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1006711

Ge, T., Chen, C.-Y., Ni, Y., Feng, Y.-C. A., & Smoller, J. W. (2019). Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and continuous shrinkage priors. *Nature Communications*, *10*, 1776. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09718-5

Gomez, K. U., Goodwin, L., Chisholm, A., & Rose, A. K. (2022). Alcohol use during pregnancy and motherhood: Attitudes and experiences of pregnant women, mothers, and healthcare professionals. *PLOS ONE*, *17*(12), e0275609. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275609

Gui, Y., Zhou, X., Wang, Z., Zhang, Y., Wang, Z., Zhou, G., Zhao, Y., Liu, M., Lu, H., & Zhao, H. (2022). Sex-specific genetic association between psychiatric disorders and cognition, behavior and brain imaging in children and adults. *Translational Psychiatry*, *12*(1), 347. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-022-02041-6

Gutman, L. M., & Codiroli McMaster, N. (2020). Gendered Pathways of Internalizing Problems from Early Childhood to Adolescence and Associated Adolescent Outcomes. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *48*(5), 703–718. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-020-00623-w

Hendriks, H. F. J. (2020). Alcohol and Human Health: What Is the Evidence? *Annual Review of Food Science and Technology*, *11*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-food-032519-051827

Hernandez-Avila, C. A., Rounsaville, B. J., & Kranzler, H. R. (2004). Opioid-, cannabis- and alcohol-dependent women show more rapid progression to substance abuse treatment. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *74*(3), 265–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2004.02.001

Hicks, B. M., Blonigen, D. M., Kramer, M. D., Krueger, R. F., Patrick, C. J., Iacono, W. G., & McGue, M. (2007). Gender Differences and Developmental Change in Externalizing Disorders From Late Adolescence to Early Adulthood: A Longitudinal Twin Study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *116*(3), 433–447. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.116.3.433

Jinwala, Z., Green, R., Khan, Y., Gelernter, J., Kember, R. L., & Hartwell, E. E. (2025). Predicting treatment-seeking status for alcohol use disorder using polygenic scores and machine learning in a deeply-phenotyped sample. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *274*, 112797. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2025.112797

Johnson, E. C., Salvatore, J. E., Lai, D., Merikangas, A. K., Nurnberger, J. I., Tischfield, J. A., Xuei, X., Kamarajan, C., Wetherill, L., COGA Collaborators, Rice, J. P., Kramer, J. R., Kuperman, S., Foroud, T., Slesinger, P. A., Goate, A. M., Porjesz, B., Dick, D. M., Edenberg, H. J., & Agrawal, A. (2023). The collaborative study on the genetics of alcoholism: Genetics. *Genes, Brain, and Behavior*, *22*(5), e12856. https://doi.org/10.1111/gbb.12856

Karpyak, V. M., Biernacka, J. M., Geske, J. R., Abulseoud, O. A., Brunner, M. D., Chauhan, M., Hall‐Flavin, D. K., Lewis, K. A., Loukianova, L. L., Melnyk, G. J., Onsrud, D. A., Proctor, B. D., Schneekloth, T. D., Skime, M. K., Wittkopp, J. E., Frye, M. A., & Mrazek, D. A. (2016). Gender-specific effects of comorbid depression and anxiety on the propensity to drink in negative emotional states. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, *111*(8), 1366–1375. https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13386

Kember, R. L., Vickers-Smith, R., Zhou, H., Xu, H., Jennings, M., Dao, C., Davis, L., Sanchez-Roige, S., Justice, A. C., Gelernter, J., Vujkovic, M., & Kranzler, H. R. (2023). Genetic Underpinnings of the Transition From Alcohol Consumption to Alcohol Use Disorder: Shared and Unique Genetic Architectures in a Cross-Ancestry Sample. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *180*(8), 584–593. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.21090892

Kendler, K. S., Myers, J., Dick, D., & Prescott, C. A. (2010). The Relationship Between Genetic Influences on Alcohol Dependence and on Patterns of Alcohol Consumption. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, *34*(6), 1058–1065. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2010.01181.x

Khramtsova, E. A., Wilson, M. A., Martin, J., Winham, S. J., He, K. Y., Davis, L. K., & Stranger, B. E. (2023). Quality control and analytic best practices for testing genetic models of sex differences in large populations. *Cell*, *186*(10), 2044–2061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2023.04.014

Kranzler, H. R., Zhou, H., & Kember, R. L. (2022). Identifying and Reducing Bias in Genome-Wide Association Studies of Alcohol-Related Traits. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *179*(1), 14–16. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2021.21111107

Kranzler, H. R., Zhou, H., Kember, R. L., Vickers Smith, R., Justice, A. C., Damrauer, S., Tsao, P. S., Klarin, D., Baras, A., Reid, J., Overton, J., Rader, D. J., Cheng, Z., Tate, J. P., Becker, W. C., Concato, J., Xu, K., Polimanti, R., Zhao, H., & Gelernter, J. (2019). Genome-wide association study of alcohol consumption and use disorder in 274,424 individuals from multiple populations. *Nature Communications*, *10*(1), 1499. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09480-8

Lai, D., Zhang, M., Abreu, M., Schwantes-An, T.-H., Chan, G., Dick, D. M., Kamarajan, C., Kuang, W., Nurnberger, J. I., Plawecki, M. H., Rice, J., Schuckit, M., Porjesz, B., Liu, Y., & Foroud, T. (2024). Alcohol Use Disorder Polygenic Score Compared With Family History and ADH1B. *JAMA Network Open*, *7*(12), e2452705. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.52705

Lee, J. J., McGue, M., Iacono, W. G., & Chow, C. C. (2018). The accuracy of LD Score regression as an estimator of confounding and genetic correlations in genome-wide association studies. *Genetic Epidemiology*, *42*(8), 783–795. https://doi.org/10.1002/gepi.22161

Lin, B., Paterson, A. D., & Sun, L. (2024). Better together against genetic heterogeneity: A sex-combined joint main and interaction analysis of 290 quantitative traits in the UK Biobank. *PLoS Genetics*, *20*(4), e1011221. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1011221

Loh, P.-R., Danecek, P., Palamara, P. F., Fuchsberger, C., A Reshef, Y., K Finucane, H., Schoenherr, S., Forer, L., McCarthy, S., Abecasis, G. R., Durbin, R., & L Price, A. (2016). Reference-based phasing using the Haplotype Reference Consortium panel. *Nature Genetics*, *48*(11), 1443–1448. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3679

Mallard, T. T., & Sanchez-Roige, S. (2021). Dimensional Phenotypes in Psychiatric Genetics: Lessons from Genome-Wide Association Studies of Alcohol Use Phenotypes. *Complex Psychiatry*, *7*(3–4), 45–48. https://doi.org/10.1159/000518863

Mallard, T. T., Savage, J. E., Johnson, E. C., Huang, Y., Edwards, A. C., Hottenga, J. J., Grotzinger, A. D., Gustavson, D. E., Jennings, M. V., Anokhin, A., Dick, D. M., Edenberg, H. J., Kramer, J. R., Lai, D., Meyers, J. L., Pandey, A. K., Harden, K. P., Nivard, M. G., de Geus, E. J. C., … Sanchez-Roige, S. (2022). Item-Level Genome-Wide Association Study of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test in Three

Population-Based Cohorts. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *179*(1), 58–70. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20091390

Mancinelli, R., Vitali, M., & Ceccanti, M. (2009). Women, alcohol and the environment: An update and perspectives in neuroscience. *Functional Neurology*, *24*(2), 77–81.

Martin, J., Khramtsova, E. A., Goleva, S. B., Blokland, G. A. M., Traglia, M., Walters, R. K., Hübel, C., Coleman, J. R. I., Breen, G., Børglum, A. D., Demontis, D., Grove, J., Werge, T., Bralten, J., Bulik, C. M., Lee, P. H., Mathews, C. A., Peterson, R. E., Winham, S. J., … Sex Differences Cross-Disorder Analysis Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium. (2021). Examining Sex-Differentiated Genetic Effects Across Neuropsychiatric and Behavioral Traits. *Biological Psychiatry*, *89*(12), 1127–1137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2020.12.024

Maxwell, A. M., Harrison, K., Rawls, E., & Zilverstand, A. (2022). Gender Differences in the Psychosocial Determinants Underlying the Onset and Maintenance of Alcohol Use Disorder. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *16*, 808776. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2022.808776

Merikangas, A. K., & Almasy, L. (2020). Using the tools of genetic epidemiology to understand sex differences in neuropsychiatric disorders. *Genes, Brain, and Behavior*, *19*(6), e12660. https://doi.org/10.1111/gbb.12660

Meyers, J. L., Salvatore, J. E., Vuoksimaa, E., Korhonen, T., Pulkkinen, L., Rose, R. J., Kaprio, J., & Dick, D. M. (2014). Genetic Influences on Alcohol Use Behaviors Have Diverging Developmental Trajectories: A Prospective Study among Male and Female Twins. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, *38*(11), 2869–2877. https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.12560

Miao, J., Song, G., Wu, Y., Hu, J., Wu, Y., Basu, S., Andrews, J. S., Schaumberg, K., Fletcher, J. M., Schmitz, L. L., & Lu, Q. (2025). PIGEON: A statistical framework for estimating gene-environment interaction for polygenic traits. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *9*(8), 1654–1668. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-025-02202-9

Miller, A. P., Kuo, S. I.-C., Johnson, E. C., Tillman, R., Brislin, S. J., Dick, D. M., Kamarajan, C., Kinreich, S., Kramer, J., McCutcheon, V. V., Plawecki, M. H., Porjesz, B., Schuckit, M. A., Salvatore, J. E., Edenberg, H. J., Bucholz, K. K., Meyers, J. L., Agrawal, A., & Collaborative Study on the Genetics of Alcoholism (COGA). (2023). Diagnostic Criteria for Identifying Individuals at High Risk of Progression From Mild or Moderate to Severe Alcohol Use Disorder. *JAMA Network Open*, *6*(10), e2337192. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.37192

Mumenthaler, M. S., Taylor, J. L., O'Hara, R., & Yesavage, J. A. (1999). Gender differences in moderate drinking effects. *Alcohol Research & Health: The Journal of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism*, *23*(1), 55–64.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering & Medicine. (2023). *Using Population Descriptors in Genetics and Genomics Research: A New Framework for an Evolving Field*. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/26902

Parés, A., Caballería, J., Bruguera, M., Torres, M., & Rodés, J. (1986). Histological course of alcoholic hepatitis. Influence of abstinence, sex and extent of hepatic damage. *Journal of Hepatology*, *2*(1), 33–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-8278(86)80006-x

Park, S. H., & Kim, D. J. (2020). Global and regional impacts of alcohol use on public health: Emphasis on alcohol policies. *Clinical and Molecular Hepatology*, *26*(4), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.3350/cmh.2020.0160

Pasaniuc, B., & Price, A. L. (2017). Dissecting the genetics of complex traits using summary association statistics. *Nature Reviews. Genetics*, *18*(2), 117–127. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg.2016.142

Peltier, M. R., Verplaetse, T. L., Mineur, Y. S., Petrakis, I. L., Cosgrove, K. P., Picciotto, M. R., & McKee, S. A. (2019). Sex differences in stress-related alcohol use. *Neurobiology of Stress*, *10*, 100149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ynstr.2019.100149

Pirastu, N., Cordioli, M., Nandakumar, P., Mignogna, G., Abdellaoui, A., Hollis, B., Kanai, M., Rajagopal, V. M., Parolo, P. D. B., Baya, N., Carey, C. E., Karjalainen, J., Als, T. D., Van der Zee, M. D., Day, F. R., Ong, K. K., FinnGen Study, 23andMe Research Team, iPSYCH Consortium, … Ganna, A. (2021). Genetic analyses identify widespread sex-differential participation bias. *Nature Genetics*, *53*(5), 663–671. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-021-00846-7

Poelen, E. A. P., Engels, R. C. M. E., Scholte, R. H. J., Boomsma, D. I., & Willemsen, G. (2009). Similarities in drinking behavior of twin's friends: Moderation of heritability of alcohol use. *Behavior Genetics*, *39*(2), 145–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-008-9250-z

Prescott, C. A. (2002). Sex differences in the genetic risk for alcoholism. *Alcohol Research & Health: The Journal of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism*, *26*(4), 264–273.

Price, A. L., Patterson, N. J., Plenge, R. M., Weinblatt, M. E., Shadick, N. A., & Reich, D. (2006). Principal components analysis corrects for stratification in genome-wide association studies. *Nature Genetics*, *38*(8), 904–909. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng1847

Rehm, J., Gmel, G. E., Gmel, G., Hasan, O. S. M., Imtiaz, S., Popova, S., Probst, C., Roerecke, M., Room, R., Samokhvalov, A. V., Shield, K. D., & Shuper, P. A. (2017). The relationship between different dimensions of alcohol use and the burden of disease-an update. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, *112*(6), 968–1001. https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13757

Roden, D. M., Pulley, J. M., Basford, M. A., Bernard, G. R., Clayton, E. W., Balser, J. R., & Masys, D. R. (2008). Development of a large-scale de-identified DNA biobank to enable personalized medicine. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, *84*(3), 362–369. https://doi.org/10.1038/clpt.2008.89

Rosoff, D. B., Clarke, T.-K., Adams, M. J., McIntosh, A. M., Davey Smith, G., Jung, J., & Lohoff, F. W. (2021). Educational attainment impacts drinking behaviors and risk for alcohol dependence: Results from a two-sample Mendelian randomization study with ~780,000 participants. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *26*(4), 1119–1132. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-019-0535-9

Salvatore, J. E., Cho, S. B., & Dick, D. M. (2017). Genes, Environments, and Sex Differences in Alcohol Research. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, *78*(4), 494–501. https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2017.78.494

Sanchez-Roige, S., Palmer, A. A., & Clarke, T.-K. (2020). Recent Efforts to Dissect the Genetic Basis of Alcohol Use and Abuse. *Biological Psychiatry*, *87*(7), 609–618. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2019.09.011

Sanchez-Roige, S., Palmer, A. A., Fontanillas, P., Elson, S. L., 23andMe Research Team, the Substance Use Disorder Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, Adams, M. J., Howard, D. M., Edenberg, H. J., Davies, G., Crist, R. C., Deary, I. J., McIntosh, A. M., & Clarke, T.-K. (2019). Genome-Wide Association Study Meta-Analysis of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) in Two Population-Based Cohorts. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *176*(2), 107–118. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.18040369

Savage, J. E., Barr, P. B., Phung, T., Lee, Y. H., Zhang, Y., McCutcheon, V. V., COGA Investigators, Ge, T., Smoller, J. W., Davis, L. K., Meyers, J., Porjesz, B., Posthuma, D., Mallard, T. T., & Sanchez-Roige, S. (2024). Genetic Heterogeneity Across Dimensions of Alcohol Use Behaviors. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *181*(11), 1006–1017. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.20231055

Sealock, J. M., Ziogas, I. A., Zhao, Z., Ye, F., Alexopoulos, S. P., Matsuoka, L., Chen, G., & Davis, L. K. (2022). Proposing a Sex-Adjusted Sodium-Adjusted MELD Score for Liver

Transplant Allocation. *JAMA Surgery*, *157*(7), 618–626. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2022.1548

Silveira, P. P., Pokhvisneva, I., Howard, D. M., & Meaney, M. J. (2023). A sex-specific genome-wide association study of depression phenotypes in UK Biobank. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *28*(6), 2469–2479. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-023-01960-0

Stringer, K. L., & Baker, E. H. (2018). Stigma as a Barrier to Substance Abuse Treatment Among Those With Unmet Need: An Analysis of Parenthood and Marital Status. *Journal of Family Issues*, *39*(1), 3–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X15581659

Stringer, S., Polderman, T. J. C., & Posthuma, D. (2017). Majority of human traits do not show evidence for sex-specific genetic and environmental effects. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 8688. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-09249-3

Swanson, J. M. (2012). The UK Biobank and selection bias. *The Lancet*, *380*(9837), 110. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61179-9

Szabo, G. (2018). Women and alcoholic liver disease—Warning of a silent danger. *Nature Reviews. Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, *15*(5), 253–254. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2018.8

van Beek, J. H. D. A., Kendler, K. S., de Moor, M. H. M., Geels, L. M., Bartels, M., Vink, J. M., van den Berg, S. M., Willemsen, G., & Boomsma, D. I. (2012). Stable Genetic Effects on Symptoms of Alcohol Abuse and Dependence from Adolescence into Early Adulthood. *Behavior Genetics*, *42*(1), 40–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-011-9488-8

Verhulst, B., Neale, M. C., & Kendler, K. S. (2015). The heritability of alcohol use disorders: A meta-analysis of twin and adoption studies. *Psychological Medicine*, *45*(5), 1061–1072. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291714002165

Willer, C. J., Li, Y., & Abecasis, G. R. (2010). METAL: Fast and efficient meta-analysis of genomewide association scans. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, *26*(17), 2190–2191. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btq340

Wilson, M. R., Beachy, S. H., & Schumm, S. N. (Eds.) (with Committee on the Use of Race and Ethnicity in Biomedical Research, Board on Health Sciences Policy, Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice, Board on Health Care Services, Health and Medicine Division, & National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine). (2025). *Rethinking Race and Ethnicity in Biomedical Research*. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/27913

Winkler, T. W., Justice, A. E., Graff, M., Barata, L., Feitosa, M. F., Chu, S., Czajkowski, J., Esko, T., Fall, T., Kilpeläinen, T. O., Lu, Y., Mägi, R., Mihailov, E., Pers, T. H., Rüeger, S.,

Teumer, A., Ehret, G. B., Ferreira, T., Heard-Costa, N. L., … Loos, R. J. F. (2015). The Influence of Age and Sex on Genetic Associations with Adult Body Size and Shape: A Large-Scale Genome-Wide Interaction Study. *PLoS Genetics*, *11*(10), e1005378. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1005378

Witkiewitz, K., Litten, R. Z., & Leggio, L. (2019). Advances in the science and treatment of alcohol use disorder. *Science Advances*, *5*(9), eaax4043. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aax4043

Zhang, C., Ye, Y., & Zhao, H. (2022). Comparison of Methods Utilizing Sex-Specific PRSs Derived From GWAS Summary Statistics. *Frontiers in Genetics*, *13*, 892950. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2022.892950

Zhang, D. (2024). *rsq: R-Squared and Related Measures* (Version 2.7) [Computer software]. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/rsq/index.html

Zhou, H., Kember, R. L., Deak, J. D., Xu, H., Toikumo, S., Yuan, K., Lind, P. A., Farajzadeh, L., Wang, L., Hatoum, A. S., Johnson, J., Lee, H., Mallard, T. T., Xu, J., Johnston, K. J. A., Johnson, E. C., Nielsen, T. T., Galimberti, M., Dao, C., … Gelernter, J. (2023). Multi-ancestry study of the genetics of problematic alcohol use in over 1 million individuals. *Nature Medicine*, *29*(12), 3184–3192. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-023-02653-5

Zhou, H., Wang, L., Mao, Z., Deans, P. J. M., Kember, R. L., Chen, Q., Zakiniaeiz, Y., Kohler, R., Peltier, M. R., Verplaetse, T. L., VA Million Veteran Program, Potenza, M. N., Brennand, K. J., Justice, A. C., Kranzler, H. R., Gelernter, J., & McKee, S. A. (2025). Genotype-by-sex interaction analyses for alcohol use disorder across biobanks. *Alcohol, Clinical & Experimental Research*. https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.70173