Sex differences, cross-ancestry generalizability, and noise-smoking interactions in the polygenic architecture of hearing loss in adults

Flavio De Angelis^{1,2}, Oana A. Zeleznik^{3,4}, Frank R. Wendt^{1,2}, Gita A. Pathak^{1,2}, Daniel S. Tylee^{1,2}, Antonella De Lillo^{1,5}, Dora Koller^{1,2,6}, Brenda Cabrera-Mendoza^{1,2}, Royce E Clifford^{7,8}, Adam X. Maihofer^{8,9,10}, Caroline M. Nievergelt^{8,9,10}, Gary C. Curhan^{3,4}, Sharon G. Curhan^{3,4}, Renato Polimanti^{1,2*}

1. Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, West Haven, Connecticut, USA

2. Veteran Affairs Connecticut Healthcare System, West Haven, Connecticut, USA

3. Channing Division of Network Medicine, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

4. Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

5. Department of Biology, University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Rome, Italy

6. Department of Genetics, Microbiology and Statistics, Faculty of Biology, University of Barcelona, Spain

7. Division of Otolaryngology, Department of Surgery, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

8. Research Service, Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, California, USA

9. Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

10. Center of Excellence for Stress and Mental Health, Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, California, USA.

***Correspondence to:** Renato Polimanti, PhD. Yale University School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry. VA CT 116A2, 950 Campbell Avenue, West Haven, CT 06516, USA. Phone: +1 (203) 932-5711 x5745. Fax: +1 (203) 937-3897. E-mail: renato.polimanti@yale.edu. ORCID: 0000-0003-0745-6046.

Abstract

We conducted a comprehensive genome-wide investigation of hearing loss (HL) in 748,668 adult participants of the UK Biobank, the Nurses' Health Studies (I and II), the Health Professionals Follow-up Study, and the Million Veteran Program. We identified 54 risk loci and characterized HL polygenic architecture, exploring sex differences, polygenic risk across ancestries, tissue-specific transcriptomic regulation, cause-effect relationships with genetically-correlated traits, and gene interactions with HL environmental risk factors. Our transcriptomic regulation analysis highlighted the potential role of the central nervous system in HL pathogenesis. This was supported by the multivariate interaction analysis that showed how genes involved in brain development interact with sex, noise pollution, and tobacco smoking in relation to their HL associations. Additionally, the genetically-informed causal inference analysis showed that HL is linked to many physical and mental health outcomes. These results provide many novel insights into the complex biology and epidemiology of HL in adults.

INTRODUCTION

Acquired hearing loss (HL) is the third most common chronic health condition¹ and the fourth leading cause of disability globally². The World Health Organization (WHO) report of hearing projects that nearly 2.5 billion individuals will have some degree of HL by 2050³. HL is associated with several comorbid conditions⁴. For instance, HL-induced impaired communication ability particularly among older people can lead to social isolation with major health, psychosocial, and economic consequences, reducing the quality of life^{4,5}. HL affects individuals of all ages, but its prevalence increases with age, reflecting the cumulative effect of environmental factors and genetic predisposition⁶.

Heritability estimates for acquired HL range from 30% up to 70%⁷, highlighting that genetic variation is a key determinant for individual HL risk. More than 100 genes present mutations that result in congenital HL not associated with disorders in other organs or dysmorphic features (non-syndromic HL)^{8,9}. Mutations causing congenital HL affect genes involved in cochlear function, specifically affecting the sensory and mechanosensory cells¹⁰⁻¹². Beyond these Mendelian forms, acquired HL cases appear to be due to the additive effect of many common genetic variants with small individual effects. Large-scale genome-wide association studies (GWAS) conducted in population-based cohorts have identified more than 50 common risk variants and characterized the regulatory role of these loci in multiple cell and tissue types¹³⁻¹⁶. Although these studies have generated important insights into the genetic predisposition to HL, there are several aspects of the HL pathogenesis that are currently under-investigated by genetic studies. For instance, HL among older adults is more common, more severe, and with earlier onset in men than in women, even after adjusting for confounding factors such as higher occupational noise exposure in men^{17,18}. However, the molecular pathways that underlie HL sex differences are unclear. Similarly, we have a limited understanding which are the biological processes interacting with HL environmental risk factors. Several studies showed that noise pollution and tobacco smoking are HL risk factors¹⁹⁻²², but to

date no large-scale studies investigated how genetic variation interacts with noise pollution and tobacco smoking in determining HL risk.

In the present study, we conducted an extensive genome-wide investigation across the UK Biobank (UKB; 251,233 women and 214,549 men)¹⁴, the Nurses' Health Studies (NHS I, 14,978 women; and NHS II, 12,533 women)^{23,24} and the Health Professionals Follow-up Study (HPFS, 8,532 men)²⁵. The risk loci identified were replicated in a sample of 226,043 participants from the Million Veteran Program (MVP)²⁶. Our findings provide a more comprehensive understanding of the genetic basis of HL sex differences, uncovering novel sex-specific risk loci, molecular processes, putative cause-effect relationships, and the interaction of genetic variation with sex, noise pollution, and smoking behaviors.

METHODS

Cohorts and hearing-loss assessment

We leveraged genome-wide information from 748,668 adult participants recruited by the UKB, NHS I, NHS II, HPFS, and MVP cohorts to investigate the polygenic architecture of HL.

UKB is a large population-based research resource, containing in-depth genetic and health information from over 500,000 UK participants 40-69 years at enrollment¹⁴. UKB HL-related phenotypes were defined by self-reported items derived from a touchscreen questionnaire and audiometric measurements assessed through the Speech Recognition Threshold (SRT) test. The self-reported items included the following binary traits: “*Do you have any difficulty with your hearing?*” (UKB Field ID: 2247); “*Do you find it difficult to follow a conversation if there is background noise (such as TV, radio, children playing)?*” (UKB Field ID: 2257); and “*Do you use a hearing aid most of the time?*” (UKB Field ID: 3393). UKB participants who indicated they were completely deaf (N=144) were excluded from the analysis to reduce the likelihood of including congenital forms of HL¹⁶. For ~12% of the UKB participants (59,807 for UKB Field ID 2247;

100 60,448; and 40,656 for UKB Field ID 3393), these items were assessed multiple times. Since age is
101 a strong risk factor for acquired HL, we considered the most recent assessment when multiple
102 assessments were available to improve the ability to detect the disease onset. In addition to
103 considering these binary traits individually, we combined them in a four-category ordinal phenotype
104 (Supplemental Table 1). For the SRT-derived audiometric measurements, we considered the UKB
105 item “*the signal-to-noise ratio at which half of the presented speech can be understood correctly*”
106 for both left and right ears (UKB Field ID: 20019 and 20021, respectively). Because of the much
107 larger sample size, we included unrelated UKB participants of European descent in the primary
108 discovery sample. The other ancestry groups available in UKB were used for single-variant and
109 polygenic risk score (PRS) replication (see section Cross-ancestry Replication and Polygenic Risk
110 Scoring).

111
112 Additional genome-wide information was derived from NHS I, NHS II, and HPFS cohorts. The
113 NHS I began in 1976 when 121,700 female registered nurses, aged 30–55 years, were enrolled by
114 completing a baseline questionnaire about their health and lifestyle. In 1989, the NHS II was
115 established and enrolled 116,429 younger female registered nurses, aged 25 to 42 years²⁴. The
116 HPFS began in 1986 and enrolled 51,529 male health professionals, aged 40 to 75 years. In each of
117 the cohorts, detailed information on demographics, health, diet, and lifestyle factors was collected
118 and updated every 2 years (every 4 years for diet). The follow-up rates in all 3 cohorts exceed 90%
119 of eligible person-time²⁷. Self-reported hearing status was determined based on participants’
120 responses to biennial questionnaires. “*Hearing difficulty*” was defined as a participant report of a
121 hearing problem that was mild, moderate, severe (non-hearing aid user), or severe (hearing aid
122 user). Leveraging samples with genome-wide information, we investigated 14,978 unrelated female
123 NHS I participants, 12,533 unrelated female NHS II participants, and 8,532 unrelated male HPFS
124 participants, all of European descent. To maximize the sample size available, we meta-analyzed
125 NHS I and II cohorts and referred to them hereafter as a single NHS sample.

126

127 The MVP is a biobank funded by the US Department of Veterans Affairs that to date enrolled more
128 than 800,000 participants among active users of the Veterans Health Administration healthcare
129 system²⁶. In our analysis, we used genome-wide information regarding 85,743 cases and 140,300
130 controls based on self-reported hearing-loss information. Information regarding HL assessment in
131 MVP has been previously described²⁸.

132

133 **Genome-wide data quality control and GWAS meta-analysis**

134 We used UKB imputed data²⁹, filtering variants with imputation score < 0.8 , minor allele
135 frequency (MAF) < 0.01 , Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium p-values $< 10^{-6}$, and missingness > 0.1 . The
136 genetic data were employed to identify related individuals by estimating kinship coefficients for all
137 pairs of samples. Accordingly, we removed individuals based on relatedness (one individual from
138 pairs with kinship coefficient > 0.042 was removed, with the preference to retain cases), forming a
139 maximally unrelated subset²⁹. In the NHS and HPFS cohorts, SNPs with imputation score < 0.8 or
140 minor allele frequency < 0.05 were excluded. Quality checks included the exclusion of those
141 participants with a poor genotype call rate ($< 95\%$) and a check for relatedness. The SNPs with a
142 poor call rate ($< 95\%$), out of Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium ($P < 10^{-5}$), with high duplicate
143 discordance rates, or monomorphic were excluded. Genotyped data from each of the NHS and
144 HPFS studies were imputed using the 1000 Genomes Project Phase 3 reference panel^{30,31}. Details
145 regarding genotyping and imputation of the MVP samples were described elsewhere³². Relatedness
146 was estimated using KING³³. For each pair of subjects with an estimated kinship coefficient > 0.088
147 (2nd degree or closer), one individual was removed, with the preference to retain cases. If
148 individuals had the same diagnostic status, one individual was removed at random. HARE
149 (harmonized ancestry and race/ethnicity) estimates³⁴ were used to select European ancestry
150 individuals. GWAS were carried out in the UKB, NHS, and HPFS by logistic regression, using
151 PLINK 2.0³⁵ and including age and the first 10 within-ancestry PCs as covariates. For the sex-

combined analyses, sex was also included as a covariate. The GWAS generated by the individual cohorts were meta-analyzed using the inverse variance-based method implemented in METAL³⁶. In MVP, GWAS was performed using logistic regression of the hearing phenotype on imputed SNP dosages including covariates for 10 PCs, age, and sex, using PLINK 1.9 software³⁵.

SNP-based heritability and genetic correlation

SNP-based heritability (SNP- h^2) and genetic correlation (rg) for all hearing traits were estimated using the Linkage Disequilibrium Score Regression (LDSC) method³⁷. As recommended by the LDSC developers (details at <https://github.com/bulik/ldsc>), the analysis was conducted considering the HapMap 3 reference panel and pre-computed LD scores based on the 1000 Genomes Project reference data for individuals of European ancestry. SNP- h^2 and genetic correlations were evaluated among HL trait assessed in the UKB, NHS, HPFS, and their meta-analyses. Since functional categories of the genome contribute disproportionately to the heritability of complex diseases³⁸, SNP- h^2 partitioning was conducted with LDSC using 95 baseline genomic annotations³⁹ such as allele frequency distributions, conserved genomic regions, regulatory elements, and annotations for genic, loss-of-function (LoF) intolerant, positively and negatively selected regions⁴⁰. We also conducted a UKB phenome-wide genetic correlation analysis of HL, testing 7,153 phenotypes for the sex-combined investigation, 3,287 phenotypes for the female-specific investigation, and 3,144 phenotypes for the male-specific investigation. The genome-wide association statistics for the sex-combined analysis were derived from the Pan-UKB data release (available at <https://pan.ukbb.broadinstitute.org/downloads>). The sex-specific genome-wide association statistics were derived from a previous UKB analysis (available at <http://www.nealelab.is/uk-biobank>).

Latent causal variable analysis

To evaluate whether the genetic correlations of HL are due to cause-effect relationships, we used the latent causal variable (LCV) method to conduct a genetically-informed causal inference

analysis⁴¹. As recommended, only SNPs with MAF > 5% were considered, and the major histocompatibility region was removed. Considering traits that reached at least a nominally significant genetic correlation ($p < 0.05$) with HL, we tested 879 traits in the sex-combined analysis, 323 traits in the female-specific analysis, and 332 traits in the male-specific analysis. For each comparison, the genetic causality proportion (gcp) can range from zero (no partial genetic causality) to one (full genetic causality).

184

185 **Variant prioritization, fine-mapping, and multi-tissue transcriptome-wide association study**

186 To identify the causal loci underlying the statistical association observed, we functionally annotated
187 GWAS findings and prioritized the most likely causal SNPs and genes using pre-calculated LD
188 structure based on 1000 Genomes Project EUR reference populations⁴². The risk loci identified in
189 the sex-combined and sex-specific meta-analyses were classified considering the following
190 parameters derived from Functional Mapping and Annotation of Genome-Wide Association Studies
191 (FUMA)⁴²: $\text{leadP} = 5 \times 10^{-8}$; $\text{gwasP} = 0.05$; $R^2 = 0.1$; $\text{refpanel} = 1000$ Genomes Project Phase3 EUR
192 reference populations; $\text{MAF} = 0.01$; $\text{refSNPs} = 1$; $\text{mergeDist} = 250$. Positional mapping was
193 performed considering $\text{MapWindowSize} = 10$ and the minimum Combined Annotation Dependent
194 Depletion (CADD)⁴³ score for SNP filtering was set to 0. Gene-based analysis and gene-set analysis
195 were performed with Multi-marker Analysis of GenoMic Annotation (MAGMA)⁴⁴ integrated into
196 FUMA. Tissue enrichment analysis was performed using Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx)
197 project v8 data⁴⁵.

198 We fine-mapped the association statistics for a 3MB region around the lead SNP of the genomic
199 risk locus identified by FUMA ($r^2 = 0.1$; $\text{window} = 250\text{bp}$). Each region for the respective
200 association was fine-mapped to determine 95% credible set using susieR ⁴⁶ with at most 10 causal
201 variants (default). The credible set reports variants most likely to be causal based on the marginal
202 posterior inclusion probability (PIP) ranging from 0 to 1, with values closer to 1 to be most causal.

203 To further explore transcriptomic regulation in the context of HL, we performed a multi-tissue
204 TWAS (transcriptome-wide association study), using the S-MultiXcan approach to combine
205 information across 49 GTEx tissues adjusting for tissue–tissue correlation⁴⁷.

206

207 **Cross-ancestry replication and polygenic risk scoring**

208 We used data from the Pan-UKB data release (available at
209 <https://pan.ukbb.broadinstitute.org/downloads>) to conduct cross-ancestry replication and PRS
210 analyses. Specifically, we derived PRS of HL associations from EUR ancestry (base dataset) and
211 tested in UKB participants of African (AFR N=6,636), admixed American (AMR N=980),
212 Centra/South Asian (CSA N=8,876), East Asian (EAS N=2,709), and Middle Eastern (MID
213 N=1,599) ancestries (target datasets). PRS analysis based on HL meta-analyzed and sex-stratified
214 GWAS was computed using PRSice v. 2.3.1.c⁴⁸, using the clumping-thresholding method to
215 maximize the predictive ability of the derived polygenic scores⁴⁹. Using 1000 Genomes Project
216 EUR populations as reference panel, SNPs were clumped based on 250kb windows, based on
217 clump-r2 threshold=0.1 and clump-p threshold=1, respectively. The step size of the threshold was
218 set to 5×10^{-5} , and the range of p-value thresholds was from 5×10^{-8} to $p=1$ using an additive model
219 for regression at each threshold.

220

221 **Multivariate gene-by-environment genome-wide interaction study**

222 A multivariate gene-by-environment genome-wide interaction study (GEWIS) was performed using
223 StructLMM⁵⁰, a linear mixed-model approach to efficiently detect interactions between loci and
224 multiple potentially correlated environments. Since StructLMM assumes a quantitative trait, the
225 GEWIS was conducted considering the four-category ordinal trait described above (Supplemental
226 Table 1). The multivariate GEWIS was performed considering a total of 14 environments, including
227 sex, smoking behaviors and exposures, and different types of noise pollution exposure
228 (Supplemental Table 2). Marginal log-likelihoods (log (Bayes factor -BF)) between the full model

and the reduced model with environments removed were used to identify the most relevant environments for the detected locus interaction effects. A pathway enrichment analysis was conducted considering loci with nominally significant multivariate gene-environment interaction. These variants were clumped using R `ld_clump` function (ieugwasr R package) using `clump_kb = 10,000`, `clump_r2 = 0.001`, and `clump_p = 0.05`. The resulting variants showing $BF > 1$ were mapped to genes through Ensembl platform⁵¹. A Gene Ontology (GO) enrichment analysis was performed using the Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (DAVID)⁵² and GO terms surviving false discovery rate (FDR) multiple testing correction ($q < 0.05$) were retained as significant.

RESULTS

SNP-based heritability and genetic correlation among hearing-loss traits

We investigated the SNP- h^2 across multiple HL traits. In the UKB, these included phenotypes derived from the touchscreen questionnaire and an automated hearing assessment (i.e., SRT test). For the questionnaire-derived HL traits, the SNP- h^2 ranged from 0.017 ± 0.002 for “*Hearing aid use*” to 0.050 ± 0.002 for “*Hearing difficulties with background noise*”. The genome-wide statistics of these HL traits were characterized by inflation due to polygenicity (genomic-control $\lambda > 1.09$) and not because of possible confounders (LDSC intercept < 1.03 ; Supplemental Table 3). With respect to STR-derived traits, the SNP- h^2 was lower $< 1\%$ with only right-ear assessment with an estimate statistically different from zero (SRT-right SNP- $h^2 = 0.009 \pm 0.002$; Table 1). The limited informativeness of the SRT test in genetic studies is in line with previous findings^{16,53}. Accordingly, the SRT-derived traits were excluded for further evaluations.

255 The genetic correlations among the questionnaire-derived HL traits in UKB ranged from
256 $rg=0.830\pm0.013$ between “*Hearing difficulties*” and “*Hearing difficulties with background noise*”,
257 to $rg=0.393\pm0.039$ between “*Hearing difficulties with background noise*” and “*Hearing aid use*”
258 (Figure 1; Supplemental Table 4).

259
260 The ordinal phenotype derived from combining the three questionnaire-derived HL traits in UKB
261 (Supplemental Table 1; hereafter abbreviated as HL-ORD) showed a high genetic correlation with
262 each of the binary phenotypes, ranging from $rg=0.927\pm0.015$ with “*Hearing difficulties*” to
263 $rg=0.830\pm0.020$ with “*Hearing aid use*”.

264
265 To further investigate the differences across the questionnaire-derived HL traits, we conducted a
266 sex-stratified analysis and tested the genetic correlation among whole-sample and sex-stratified
267 analyses in UKB and also with respect to HL assessed in NHS (female participants only; SNP-
268 $h^2=0.077\pm0.020$) and HPFS (male participants only; SNP- $h^2=0.161\pm0.053$). Considering each of
269 the HL traits tested, no difference was observed between sexes in the SNP- h^2 estimates (Table 1).
270 Among the UKB questionnaire-derived HL traits, “*Hearing difficulties with background noise*”
271 showed the highest rg between males and females ($rg=0.882\pm0.035$), while the lowest rg between
272 sexes was observed for the HL-ORD trait ($rg=0.782\pm0.050$).

273
274 Considering the HPFS HL outcome and male-specific UKB analyses, the highest genetic
275 correlation was observed for “*Hearing difficulty*” ($rg=0.633\pm0.136$). The same trait was the one
276 with the highest genetic correlation with the NHS HL outcome among the UKB female-specific
277 analyses ($rg=0.737\pm0.115$). Based on the genetic correlations among UKB, HPFS, and NHS, the
278 UKB “*Hearing difficulties*” was defined as the primary UKB phenotype and the loci identified with
279 respect to this trait were tested for single-variant and PRS replication using the NHS and HPFS
280 datasets. Additionally, to maximize the discovery of our analyses, we also meta-analyzed UKB,

NHS, and HPFS cohorts (278,744 female participants from UKB and NHS and 223,081 male participants from UKB and HPFS).

Genome-wide association analyses

In UKB sex-combined analysis, we identified 46 LD-independent genome-wide significant (GWS) loci ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) associated with hearing difficulties (Supplemental Table 5). In the sex-stratified analyses, we identified 14 and 19 LD-independent GWS loci in males and females, respectively (Supplemental Tables 6 and 7). In a few instances, the top-index variant identified in the sex-stratified analyses was LD-independent from the ones mapped in the GWAS loci observed in the entire cohorts. Additionally, we identified six variants with statistical differences in the sex-specific effects of the HL-associated variants (Supplemental Tables 6 and 7; rs2876317 in *PDE7B*; rs9784468 in *SORBS2*, rs1808828 in *ABLM3*, rs9677089 in *SPTBN1*, rs12515096 in *ARHGEF28*, and rs35624969 in *TBL2*).

Beyond single-variant associations, the PRS derived from UKB were significantly associated with hearing difficulties in NHS and HPFS considering sex-combined and sex-stratified analyses (sex-combined PRS on NHS+HPFS: $R^2=0.05\%$, $p=6.59 \times 10^{-6}$; female-specific PRS on NHS: $R^2=0.47\%$, $p=1.77 \times 10^{-30}$, male-specific PRS on HPFS: $R^2=0.5\%$, $p=2.84 \times 10^{-11}$).

The GWAS meta-analysis of UKB, NHS, and HPFS (N=501,825) provided a higher statistical power, identifying 54 LD-independent loci significantly associated with hearing difficulties (Table 2).

In the sex-stratified investigation, we gained one additional locus in the male-specific GWAS meta-analysis (15 LD-independent GWS loci) and five additional loci in the female-specific GWAS meta-analysis (24 LD-independent GWS loci). Similar to the UKB-only GWAS, few index variants identified in the sex-specific GWAS meta-analysis were LD-independent of the loci identified in

the overall GWAS meta-analysis and we identified statistical differences between sexes in their effect size for three variants (Supplemental Table 8; rs13399656 mapped to *SPTBN1*, rs1808828 in *ABLIM3*, and rs11738813 in *ARHGEF28*).

Considering the 54 loci reaching genome-wide significance in the sex-combined meta-analysis, we tested whether the effects detected were replicated in an independent sample, 226,043 MVP participants of European descent. We observed that 34 loci were at least nominally replicated in the MVP cohort (Table 2; $p < 0.05$). Considering concordance between discovery and replication cohorts, 49 loci showed consistent effect direction. The probability of observing concordant directions of 49 out of the 54 loci tested by chance is 5.9×10^{-6} . Leveraging our discovery GWAS meta-analysis as a training dataset, we conducted a PRS analysis in the MVP cohort that showed highly significant prediction across all variant-inclusion thresholds tested ($p < 1.20 \times 10^{-103}$; Supplemental Table 9).

To assess the cross-ancestry generalizability of the loci identified by the GWAS meta-analysis, we conducted a replication analysis of the single-variant associations in the UKB participants of non-European descent (AFR N=6,636; AMR N=980; CSA N=8,876; EAS N=2,709; MID N=1,599). Considering a nominal significance threshold, we replicated ($p < 0.05$) the associations of four variants (rs6675438, rs61863078, rs2273654, and rs61734651) in AFR, five variants (rs666720, rs1220628, rs271143, rs9493627, rs146229052) in AMR, ten variants were replicated in CSA (rs666720, rs6662164, rs148512269, rs6869243, rs6871548, rs296430, rs2296506, rs766262445, rs72930998, and rs1005473), and two variants in EAS (rs11238325, and rs34993346) (Supplemental Table 10). The limited number of single-loci replication is due to the dramatic difference in sample size between the EUR discovery cohort (N=501,825) and the non-EUR replication cohorts (total N=20,800). However, we observed a significant cross-ancestry transferability in the HL PRS considering the GWAS meta-analysis and UKB-only GWAS as training datasets. Specifically, we observed an increased statistical power of the PRS derived from

the GWAS meta-analysis (UKB-NHS-HPFS PRS: AFR $R^2=4.73\%$, $p=4.65\times 10^{-68}$; AMR $R^2=1.96\%$, $p=1.23\times 10^{-5}$; CSA $R^2=3.5\%$, $p=6.26\times 10^{-66}$; EAS $R^2=2.45\%$, $p=1.94\times 10^{-15}$) when compared to the one derived from the UKB-only GWAS (UKB-only PRS: AFR $R^2=0.14\%$, $p=0.001$; AMR $R^2=0.54\%$, $p=0.0140$; CSA $R^2=0.13\%$, $p=6.01\times 10^{-4}$; EAS $R^2=0.08$, $p=0.076$). Due to the limited sample size available, we did not conduct a sex-stratified cross-ancestry replication analysis with respect to single-variant and PRS associations.

Because of the higher statistical power, the following sections describe the *in-silico* analyses conducted on the basis of the GWAS meta-analyses of UKB (field ID 2247 “Hearing difficulties”), NHS (“Hearing problems”), and HPFS (“Hearing problems”).

Variant prioritization, fine-mapping, and multi-tissue transcriptome-wide association study

To translate genetic associations into information regarding potential causal genes associated with hearing difficulties, we integrated different approaches ranging from positional mapping to imputation of genetically-regulated transcriptomic variation.

First, we performed a fine-mapping analysis for each GWS locus. Based on the PIP of the 4,382 SNP associations reaching GWS in the sex-combined GWAS meta-analysis, we identified 218 variants that are most likely to be causal (PIP > 30%; Supplemental Figure 1). Considering a CADD score threshold of 10 (top 1% of pathogenic variants across the human genome), we further prioritized 24 variants that mapped to 18 unique genes (Supplemental Table 11). Some of them (e.g., *ARID5B*, *CTBP2*, and *FTO*) were previously identified as causal loci of Mendelian forms of deafness and HL^{8,16}. Applying the same mapping strategy to the sex-stratified GWS loci, we identified 84 and 46 variants in the credible set for female- and male-specific analyses, respectively (Supplemental Figures 2 and 3). These included six female-specific and two male-specific

pathogenic variants (CADD score>10). The sex-stratified mapping genes mostly overlapped with the ones identified in the sex-combined GWAS meta-analysis.

In addition to the positional mapping approach, we also implemented an independent method based on the genetic regulation of transcriptomic variation. Combining tissue-specific information regarding expression quantitative trait loci (eQTL), we conducted a multi-tissue TWAS using the S-MultiXcan approach⁴⁷. In the sex-combined meta-analysis, we identified 107 transcriptome-wide significant (TWS) genes (multi-tissue $p < 2.24 \times 10^{-6}$; Figure 2; Supplemental Table 12).

Considering top tissue-specific effect underlying the cross-tissue associations, we observed that five of the top-10 strongest associations were brain-related: putamen basal ganglia (*CRIP3* $p = 1.19 \times 10^{-23}$), spinal cord c-1 (*PIK3R3* $p = 1.32 \times 10^{-19}$), pituitary gland (*TMEM69* $p = 2.14 \times 10^{-18}$), caudate basal ganglia (*IPP* $p = 3.04 \times 10^{-18}$), cerebellar hemisphere (*SLC22A7* $p = 3.56 \times 10^{-18}$), and cerebellum (*MAST2* $p = 3.17 \times 10^{-17}$). The strongest non-brain related TWS associations included tibial artery (*ARHGEF28* $p = 3.29 \times 10^{-17}$), cultured fibroblasts (*ACAN* $p = 5.17 \times 10^{-17}$), left ventricle (*DLK2* $p = 1.03 \times 10^{-16}$), and tibial nerve (*NASP* $p = 1.42 \times 10^{-16}$). In the sex-stratified meta-analysis, we identified 55 and 26 multi-tissue TWS associations in females and males, respectively (Supplemental Table 13). The sex-specific loci mostly overlapped with those identified in the sex-combined TWAS: i) 14 genes were TWS in three analyses; ii) 45 out of 55 female-specific TWS genes were also significant in the sex-combined TWAS; iii) 23 out of the 26 male-specific TWS genes were also significant in the sex-combined TWAS. However, for tissue-specific effects, we observed that the top genes were not related to brain transcriptomic regulation (top female-specific association: liver-*CRIP3* $p = 1.59 \times 10^{-18}$; top male-specific association: spleen-*PHLDB1* $p = 1.59 \times 10^{-11}$). Additionally, among female-specific associations, we identified associations related to female organs: mammary gland (*ABCC10* $p = 6.16 \times 10^{-15}$) and vagina (*BAIAP2L2* $p = 7.45 \times 10^{-13}$).

Enrichment for regulatory elements and biological pathways

To dissect further its polygenic architecture, we partitioned HL SNP- h^2 with respect to regulatory elements to uncover enrichment of relevant biological annotations and processes. We observed that several annotations related to the regulatory function of the human genome are more likely to be involved in HL predisposition than that expected by chance (Supplemental Table 14). These included evolutionary-conserved regions (e.g., “*genomic evolutionary rate profiling scores*” $p=1.11 \times 10^{-16}$) and “elements involved in epigenetic and transcriptomic regulation (e.g., “*CpG dinucleotide content*” $p=1.53 \times 10^{-10}$; “*super-enhancer regions*” $p=1.54 \times 10^{-7}$). In a complementary approach, we performed gene set enrichment analysis of HL-associated genes (based on positionally mapping). Two biological pathways were observed to be statistically overrepresented: “*response to trabectedin*” ($p=1.58 \times 10^{-8}$) and “*sensory perception of mechanical stimulus*” ($p=1.69 \times 10^{-7}$). With respect to both analyses, we did not identify statistical differences in the enrichments calculated from the sex-specific genetic associations.

Phenome-wide genetic correlation and latent causal variable analysis of hearing loss

To investigate the genetic overlap of HL with other traits and diseases, we assessed phenome-wide genetic correlation considering 5,337 phenotypes for the sex-combined analysis, 2,353 for the female-specific analysis, and 2,249 for the male-specific analysis. Considering a Bonferroni correction accounting for the number of phenotypes tested in sex-combined, female, and male analyses, we identified 309, 79, and 109 significant genetic correlations, respectively (Figure 3; Supplemental Table 15).

With respect to the sex-combined GWAS meta-analysis, the strongest genetic correlation was “*Tinnitus*” ($r_g=0.52$, $p=2.44 \times 10^{-55}$). Other strong positive genetic correlations included “*Long-standing illness, disability or infirmity*” ($r_g=0.36$, $p=7.12 \times 10^{-41}$); and “*Frequency of tiredness / lethargy in last 2 weeks*” ($r_g=0.33$, $p=3.85 \times 10^{-37}$). Among negative HL genetic correlations, we

410 observed “*Leisure/social activities*” ($rg=-0.19$, $P=3.30\times10^{-10}$) and “*Belief that own life is*
411 *meaningful*” ($rg=-0.18$, $p=3.38\times10^{-6}$). Although many of the sex-specific genetic correlations
412 overlapped with those shared with sex-combined analysis, we also identified five traits with
413 statistically significant sex differences in their genetic correlation with HL. Four of them were
414 related to educational attainment with the strongest one observed for “*Qualification: College or*
415 *University degree*” (female $rg=0.11$, $P=2.52\times10^{-5}$, male $rg=-0.12$, $P=1.15\times10^{-5}$; $p_{\text{sex-difference}}=1.16\times10^{-9}$). The fifth genetic correlation was related to “*Time spend outdoors in summer*”
416 (female $rg=-0.16$, $P=2.73\times10^{-5}$, male $rg=0.06$, $P=0.08$; $p_{\text{sex-difference}}=1.95\times10^{-5}$).
417
418
419 To distinguish genetic correlations due to shared genetic mechanisms from those due to possible
420 cause-effect relationships, we conducted an LCV analysis, identifying 22 significant putative causal
421 effects ($p<5.68\times10^{-5}$; Figure 4, Supplemental Table 16).
422
423 The traits with putative causal effect on HL included psychiatric traits (e.g., “*Ever had period of*
424 *mania / excitability*” $gcp=0.508$, $p=3.59\times10^{-23}$), neurological disease (e.g., “*Migraine*” $gcp=0.891$,
425 $p=7.1\times10^{-21}$), gastrointestinal outcomes (e.g., “*ICD-10 K63 Other diseases of intestine*” $gcp=0.884$,
426 $p=2.25\times10^{-11}$), urogenital outcomes (e.g., “*ICD-10 N32 Other disorders of bladder*” $gcp=0.755$,
427 $p=7.83\times10^{-15}$), medication use (e.g., “*Ranitidine*” $gcp=0.691$, $p=1.38\times10^{-12}$), cardiovascular
428 diseases (“*Stroke family history*” $gcp=0.825$, $p=6.67\times10^{-11}$), immunological conditions
429 (“*Eczema/dermatitis*” $gcp=0.327$, $p=3.82\times10^{-5}$), and workplace environment (“*Workplace very*
430 *dusty*” $gcp=0.733$, $p=2.04\times10^{-10}$). We also identified genetic evidence that support a putative causal
431 role on HL for four outcomes: “*Tinnitus*” ($gcp=0.705$, $p=4.85\times10^{-8}$); “*I was easily distracted*”
432 ($gcp=0.069$, $p=8.44\times10^{-15}$), and “*Felt distant from other people in past month*” ($gcp=0.331$,
433 $p=6.52\times10^{-6}$). Although it did not survive multiple testing correction, the strongest sex difference
434 was observed with respect to “*Not having bipolar or depression disorder*” where there was a

negative genetic causal effect on HL in females but not in males (females $gcp = -0.73$, $p = 0.005$; males $gcp = -0.28$, $p = 0.147$; $p_{\text{sex-difference}} = 7.69 \times 10^{-4}$).

Multivariate gene-by-environment genome-wide interaction analysis

To investigate the role of gene-environment interactions in the predisposition to HL, we conducted a multivariate GEWIS. Because of the assumptions of the linear mixed model approach used⁵⁰, we conducted this analysis with respect to the HL-ORD trait (UKB N=300,818). We tested 14 environmental factors simultaneously (Supplemental Table 2). In addition to sex, these include environments related to noise pollution (N=5) and tobacco smoking habits (N=8). Although no variant survived genome-wide testing correction, we identified 1,278 LD-independent nominally significant multivariate interactions (Supplemental Table 17). To identify environment-specific effects underlying the multivariate interactions of each of these variants, we considered $BF > 1$ following StructLMM recommendations⁵⁰. We then conducted a GO enrichment analysis stratifying the LD-independent loci with nominally significant multivariate interactions based on the environment where they showed a $BF > 1$. Considering FDR multiple testing correction at 5%, we identified 204 significant enrichments with respect to 57 unique GO terms. Most GO enrichments were shared across loci showing interaction effects with specific sex, noise, and smoking environmental factors ($BF > 1$). Specifically, loci with environment-specific interactions related to sex, noise, and smoking showed 17 shared GO enrichments with respect to (e.g., GO:0007399 Nervous system development: “Sex” $p = 2.0 \times 10^{-6}$; “Average evening sound level of noise pollution” $p = 1.3 \times 10^{-6}$; “Maternal smoking around birth” $p = 3.6 \times 10^{-7}$). Similarly, loci interacting only with noise and smoking environment (but not sex) shared 17 GO enrichments (e.g., GO:0030182 Neuron differentiation: “Noisy workplace” $p = 4.4 \times 10^{-5}$; “Ever smoked” $p = 4.4 \times 10^{-6}$) and two GO enrichments related to loci with environment-specific interactions related to sex and smoking (e.g., GO:0050767 Regulation of neurogenesis: “Sex” $p = 7.5 \times 10^{-5}$; “Maternal smoking around birth” $p = 4.6 \times 10^{-5}$). We also identified enrichments related to loci interacting only with a specific

environment category: seven GO terms related to sex interactions (e.g., GO:0030857 Negative regulation of cell differentiation: “*Sex*” $p=8.2 \times 10^{-5}$), 10 GO terms related to noise-pollution interactions (e.g., GO:0050885 Neuromuscular process controlling balance: “*Noisy workplace*” $p=3.7 \times 10^{-4}$), and three GO terms related to smoking interactions (e.g., GO:0016101 Diterpenoid metabolic process: “*Smoking/smokers in household*” $p=2.1 \times 10^{-4}$).

DISCUSSION

We conducted a large-scale investigation integrating information from genome-wide associations with tissue-specific transcriptomic variation and a causal inference analysis to translate genetic findings into insights regarding HL biology and epidemiology. Additionally, we expanded the focus of our investigation to differences between sexes and ancestries and to the interplay of genetic variation with noise pollution and tobacco smoking, two well-known HL risk factors.

Initially, we compared the SNP- h^2 of different HL definitions available from UKB. These included three questionnaire-derived self-reported hearing traits and one trait derived from audiometric measures. Consistent with previous studies^{16,53}, we observed that SRT-derived assessment had a very low SNP- h^2 ($<1\%$) that did not permit us to investigate further this HL outcome. Conversely, self-reported HL outcomes showed significant SNP- h^2 that was informative to investigate their polygenic architecture. We observed a high genetic correlation ($rg>0.7$) between them with the only exception being “*Hearing difficulty with background noise*” and “*Hearing aid use*” where the genetic correlation was much lower ($rg<0.4$). This may be because the proportion of individuals who seek hearing aids for their hearing loss is very low, even in the UK where hearing aids are fully covered by the National Health Service. Considering the HL outcome available in NHS and HPFS cohorts, we observed the highest correlation with the UKB outcome “*Hearing difficulties*”. Accordingly, these traits were used for the GWAS meta-analysis and the subsequent *in silico*

investigations. These self-reported traits are considered relatively reliable instruments to investigate “real world” hearing impairment, although potentially influenced by psycho-social factors¹⁶. In the sex-combined GWAS meta-analysis including 501,825 individuals, we identified 54 LD-independent genome-wide significant associations, 14 of which are novel with respect to those identified by previous HL GWAS^{8,13,16,54}. In the UKB-NHS-HPFS meta-analysis, three variants showed statistical differences between sexes in their effect size. Specifically, rs13399656 in *SPTBN1* was the top findings in the sex-difference associations. This gene was previously recognized as a target for β -estradiol as the top upstream regulator⁵⁵ and was already associated with altered expression in estrogen-responsive tissues in HL⁸. Similarly, rs1808828 mapped to *ABLIM3* and rs11738813 in *ARHGEF28* were identified as intronic variants mapped in genes involved in estrogen signaling pathway^{56,57}. These sex-specific associations changes in significant loci involved in hormonal regulating pathways may reflect the potential role of estrogen on hearing functions.

Although this primary analysis was conducted in individuals of European descent, we replicated several associations in an independent sample of 20,800 UKB participants of AFR, AMR, CSA, EAS, and MID descent. Additionally, we demonstrated that HL polygenic risk is partially shared across ancestry groups. However, consistent with previous studies of other health outcomes^{58–60}, there are large differences in the predictive power due to the genetic diversity across human populations. Additionally, in some cases the HL variance explained by the cross-ancestry PRS association is larger than the one observed in the same-ancestry PRS association. This can be explained by two factors: i) the cross-ancestry results are based on the UKB cohort where the participants share the same HL assessment and sample characteristics; ii) the different LD structures of the ancestries investigated may have inflated the results observed.

512 The fine-mapping of the risk loci led to identifying putatively pathogenic variants (CADD
513 score>10) mapped to genes previously demonstrated to be involved in HL pathogenesis.
514 Specifically, we identified the exonic variant rs13147559 mapping in *CLRN2* as the strongest
515 finding (CADD=22.5). This locus has been identified as causative for non-syndromic HL⁶¹ and may
516 have a role in hair cell mechano-transduction⁶². Two exonic mutations in *NOL12:TRIOBP* were
517 also identified as potentially deleterious (rs5756795 and rs7284476). *TRIOBP* alterations are related
518 to both congenital deafness⁶³ or Mendelian HL¹⁵. Mutations mapped to this gene have been
519 thoroughly analyzed, especially in patients with a post-lingual HL (i.e., HL occurring after the
520 development of normal speech)^{64,65}. Non-coding regulatory variants were also identified in HL-
521 related genes such as *DLG4*, *ARID5B*, and *CTBP2*. In mice, elevated *Arid5b* in the aged cochlea is
522 known to be critical for the etiologies of sensorineural HL, such as age-related HL, noise- and
523 ototoxic drug-induced HL⁶⁶. Conversely, *DLG4* was previously identified as significantly related to
524 hearing due to its association with the hippocampal glutamatergic synapse pathways⁶⁷. The
525 deleterious variant mapping at *CTBP2* also supports the role of the central nervous system in HL
526 pathogenesis. Indeed, *CtBP2* is a marker for cochlear ribbon synapses, and deleterious variants
527 (such as rs183893500, CADD=15.24) could influence vulnerability to cochlear synaptopathy (i.e.,
528 loss of nerve connections between the sensory cells and the central nervous system) in acquired
529 sensorineural HL^{68,69}.

530
531 Our TWAS further highlighted that HL genetic basis is partially linked to brain transcriptomic
532 regulation. We identified that several genes previously implicated in HL pathogenesis because of
533 their potential involvement in the peripheral structures of the auditory system, which also showed
534 predicted expression differences in various brain regions. For example, while *CRIP3* has broad
535 expression in inner and outer hair cells⁸, we observed that transcriptomic changes of this gene in the
536 putamen basal ganglia were associated with HL. Similarly, other genes that may be implicated in
537 HL pathogenesis through both peripheral and central mechanisms include *IPP* (previously reported

as highly expressed in human cochlear, cochlear hair cells, and spiral ganglion cells in mice⁵⁴),
PIK3R3 (previously identified as specific to cell types in the cochlea⁷⁰), *MAST2* (showing
differential expression in the development of the inner ear⁵⁴), and *SLC22A6* (identified as related to
cochlear impairment⁷¹). Taken together, these results suggest that auditory dysfunction is not
restricted to peripheral auditory structures, but subcortical neuroplastic changes involving the area
receiving ascending signals from inferior brainstem nuclei could also be involved⁷². Additionally,
several TWAS associations were related to the transcriptomic regulation in the cerebellum in line
with the involvement of this brain region in auditory pathways⁷³.

The sex-stratified TWAS showed several additional associations related to peripheral tissues. In
particular, the female-specific TWAS identified as top findings transcriptomic changes of genes in
breast mammary tissue (*ABCC10*) and vagina (*BAIAP2L2*). These associations in hormonally
regulated tissues may reflect a potential role of estrogen in hearing function⁷⁴. Indeed, our sex-
stratified analyses identified associations mapped in genes involved in the estrogen signaling
pathway (i.e., *SPTBN1*, *ABLIM3*, and *ARHGEF28*). With respect to the loci identified by the
female-specific TWAS, *BAIAP2L2* is particularly interesting. In mice, mutations of the homologous
gene *Baiap2l2* were associated with alterations in hair cell transduction and deafness⁷⁵ while the
human locus *BAIAP2L2* is associated with suppression of the estrogen-mediated S-phase entry
pathway in cell-cycle⁷⁶. As the HL is associated with reduced estrogens levels, we hypothesize that
the interplay between *BAIAP2L2* transcriptomic regulation and estrogen levels may play a role in
HL in women.

We leveraged the genome-wide association statistics generated by our sex-combined and sex-
stratified analyses to explore HL polygenic architecture in the context of other traits and diseases.
Our phenome-wide genetic correlation analysis identified a wide range of health outcomes that
share a significant proportion of their genetic liability with HL. The subsequent genetically-

informed causal inference analysis showed that some of these genetic correlations may be due to cause-effect relationships linking HL to different health domains, including neurological, cardiovascular, and cancer-related outcomes. In line with the shared involvement of the auditory system, the strongest HL genetic correlation was with tinnitus (i.e., the conscious perception of an auditory sensation in the absence of a corresponding external stimulus⁷⁷). This is consistent with the strong association between tinnitus and HL in the elderly⁷⁸. A previous Mendelian randomization analysis showed a bidirectional relationship between them²⁸. However, our LCV analysis supports that HL may have a causal effect on tinnitus. Further studies will be needed to understand the underlying dynamics of these comorbidities.

In addition, we observed several traits related to the psychological distress generally observed in elderly individuals. They included positive genetic correlations with disability/infirmity and tiredness/lethargy and negative genetic correlations with the propensity to social activities and the belief that life is meaningful. These findings illustrate that HL is associated with multiple aspects of quality of life in aging populations. We also identified five traits that showed statistically significant sex differences in their correlation with HL. Four of them were related to educational attainment where the genetic correlation with HL was positive in females and negative in males. A previous study demonstrated that the characteristics and the recruitment strategy of the UKB cohort (the largest sample in our meta-analysis) influenced some of the sex differences observable in this study population⁷⁹. Accordingly, this sex difference may be specific to the structure of the UKB cohort. The other sex difference was related to time spent outside that showed a negative genetic correlation in females but not in males. This could be related to the higher comorbidity of HL with depression observed in women compared to men⁸⁰.

Finally, our multivariate GEWIS analysis explored the interplay of genetic variation with sex differences and two established HL risk factors, noise pollution and tobacco smoking. Although no

single interactive locus remained statistically significant after multiple testing correction, we observed several biological processes that are potentially involved in the inter-individual susceptibility to the effects of HL environmental risk factors. Loci interacting with sex, noise, and smoking environmental factors were mostly enriched for the same molecular pathways, suggesting that HL environmental risk factors may affect the same biological processes that lead to the onset of the diseases. In particular, we observed an overrepresentation of pathways related to brain developmental processes. An intriguing finding was the observed higher risk of HL with maternal smoking around birth, suggesting that early life exposures may influence later life auditory function.

Although our findings advance our understanding of HL and its consequences in adults, we also acknowledge several limitations. Similar to previous HL GWAS^{8,13–16}, our primary analyses were based on self-reported data. These appear to be more informative than the audiometric measures derived from SRT test, but they can still be biased by misreporting linked to cognitive processes, social desirability, and survey conditions. Our study was focused on acquired HL in adults and we excluded individuals with congenital HL when possible. However, we did not have information regarding HL age of onset across all cohorts investigated. Accordingly, a small proportion (<1%) of congenital HL cases may be present in our study populations. No sex-specific TWAS models are currently available from GTEx. Accordingly, our sex-stratified TWAS was conducted using sex-stratified genome-wide association statistics and sex-combined transcriptomic reference panels. This has likely reduced the statistical power of our analysis. Additionally, GTEx does not include tissues related to peripheral auditory system, limiting our ability to explore the differences in transcriptomic changes in the peripheral and central auditory system. Although we investigated cross-ancestry transferability of HL genetic risk, the limited diversity of the cohorts investigated did not permit us to explore the genetic basis of HL across ancestry groups. Similar to what observed

for other complex traits, HL PRS explained a small phenotypic variance when applied across cohorts (e.g., the PRS derived from UKB-NHS-HPFS meta-analysis and applied to MVP sample).

In conclusion, we conducted a comprehensive investigation of the polygenic architecture of HL that i) identified novel risk loci, ii) provided evidence of the shared HL pathogenesis across human populations, iii) integrated genetic and transcriptomic data to dissect HL biology, iv) leveraged genome-wide information to explore the mechanisms underlying HL comorbidities, and v) uncovered possible biological processes that could underlie inter-individual differences in susceptibility to the effects of HL environmental risk factors. Further studies will be needed to translate this information into tools useful to improve HL preventive and therapeutic strategies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is funded by the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (R21 DC018098, UO1 DC010811). The authors also acknowledge grants from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (R33 DA047527), the National Institute on Mental Health (F32 MH122058), the National Cancer Institute (UM1 CA186107, UO1 CA167552, and UO1 CA176726), the One Mind, and the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (Individual Fellowship 101028810). This research was performed using the UK Biobank Resource under the application 58146. This research is also based on data from the Million Veteran Program, Office of Research and Development, Veterans Health Administration, and was supported by award #MVP010. This publication does not represent the views of the Department of Veteran Affairs or the United States Government. We thank all the participants in the UK Biobank, the Nurse's Health Studies, the Health Professionals Follow-up Study, and the Million Veteran Program.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Dr Clifford reported receiving personal fees from Decibel Therapeutics outside the submitted work.
Dr. S. Curhan serves as a consultant to Decibel Therapeutics. Dr. G. Curhan serves as a consultant to Decibel Therapeutics, AstraZeneca, Shire, Allena Pharmaceuticals, RenalGuard, OrfanBiotech, OM1, and Merck. He receives royalties from UpToDate for being an author and Section Editor.
None of the other authors declare any competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Masterson, E. A. Hearing Impairment Among Noise-Exposed Workers — United States, 2003–2012. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **65**, (2016).
2. GBD 2015 Disease and Injury Incidence and Prevalence Collaborators. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 310 diseases and injuries, 1990–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* **388**, 1545–1602 (2016).
3. World Report on Hearing. <https://www.who.int/teams/noncommunicable-diseases/sensory-functions-disability-and-rehabilitation/highlighting-priorities-for-ear-and-hearing-care>.
4. Deal, J. A. *et al.* Incident Hearing Loss and Comorbidity: A Longitudinal Administrative Claims Study. *JAMA Otolaryngol. Neck Surg.* **145**, 36–43 (2019).
5. Shukla, A. *et al.* Hearing Loss, Loneliness, and Social Isolation: A Systematic Review. *Otolaryngol.--Head Neck Surg. Off. J. Am. Acad. Otolaryngol.-Head Neck Surg.* **162**, 622–633 (2020).
6. Malcolm, M., Frost, H. & Cowie, J. Loneliness and social isolation causal association with health-related lifestyle risk in older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. *Syst. Rev.* **8**, 48 (2019).
7. Nicolson, T. Navigating Hereditary Hearing Loss: Pathology of the Inner Ear. *Front. Cell. Neurosci.* **15**, 184 (2021).

- 665 8. Praveen, K. *et al.* Population-scale analysis of common and rare genetic variation associated
666 with hearing loss in adults. <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.09.27.21264091> (2021)
667 doi:10.1101/2021.09.27.21264091.
- 668 9. Cunningham, L. L. & Tucci, D. L. Hearing Loss in Adults. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **377**, 2465–2473
669 (2017).
- 670 10. Hayashi, K., Suzuki, Y., Fujimoto, C. & Kanzaki, S. Molecular Mechanisms and Biological
671 Functions of Autophagy for Genetics of Hearing Impairment. *Genes* **11**, 1331 (2020).
- 672 11. Zhang, L. *et al.* THOC1 deficiency leads to late-onset nonsyndromic hearing loss through
673 p53-mediated hair cell apoptosis. *PLOS Genet.* **16**, e1008953 (2020).
- 674 12. Zhang, W. *et al.* Cochlear Gene Therapy for Sensorineural Hearing Loss: Current Status and
675 Major Remaining Hurdles for Translational Success. *Front. Mol. Neurosci.* **11**, 221 (2018).
- 676 13. Hoffmann, T. J. *et al.* A Large Genome-Wide Association Study of Age-Related Hearing
677 Impairment Using Electronic Health Records. *PLoS Genet.* **12**, e1006371 (2016).
- 678 14. Sudlow, C. *et al.* UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide
679 range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS Med.* **12**, e1001779 (2015).
- 680 15. Kalra, G. *et al.* Biological insights from multi-omic analysis of 31 genomic risk loci for
681 adult hearing difficulty. *PLOS Genet.* **16**, e1009025 (2020).
- 682 16. Wells, H. R. R. *et al.* GWAS Identifies 44 Independent Associated Genomic Loci for Self-
683 Reported Adult Hearing Difficulty in UK Biobank. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **105**, 788–802 (2019).
- 684 17. Villavisanis, D. F., Berson, E. R., Lauer, A. M., Cosetti, M. K. & Schrode, K. M. Sex-Based
685 Differences in Hearing Loss: Perspectives from Non-Clinical Research to Clinical Outcomes.
686 *Otol. Neurotol. Off. Publ. Am. Otol. Soc. Am. Neurotol. Soc. Eur. Acad. Otol. Neurotol.* **41**, 290–
687 298 (2020).
- 688 18. Nolan, L. S. Age-related hearing loss: Why we need to think about sex as a biological
689 variable. *J. Neurosci. Res.* **98**, 1705–1720 (2020).

- 690 19. Ma, J., Li, C., Kwan, M.-P., Kou, L. & Chai, Y. Assessing personal noise exposure and its
691 relationship with mental health in Beijing based on individuals' space-time behavior. *Environ.*
692 *Int.* **139**, 105737 (2020).
- 693 20. Polimanti, R., Jensen, K. P. & Gelernter, J. Phenome-wide association study for CYP2A6
694 alleles: rs113288603 is associated with hearing loss symptoms in elderly smokers. *Sci. Rep.* **7**,
695 1034 (2017).
- 696 21. Agrawal, Y., Platz, E. A. & Niparko, J. K. Prevalence of hearing loss and differences by
697 demographic characteristics among US adults: data from the National Health and Nutrition
698 Examination Survey, 1999-2004. *Arch. Intern. Med.* **168**, 1522–1530 (2008).
- 699 22. Lin, B. M. *et al.* Cigarette Smoking, Smoking Cessation, and Risk of Hearing Loss in
700 Women. *Am. J. Med.* **133**, 1180–1186 (2020).
- 701 23. Colditz, G. A., Manson, J. E. & Hankinson, S. E. The Nurses' Health Study: 20-year
702 contribution to the understanding of health among women. *J. Womens Health* **6**, 49–62 (1997).
- 703 24. Tworoger, S. S., Sluss, P. & Hankinson, S. E. Association between plasma prolactin
704 concentrations and risk of breast cancer among predominately premenopausal women. *Cancer*
705 *Res.* **66**, 2476–2482 (2006).
- 706 25. Rimm, E. B. *et al.* Prospective study of alcohol consumption and risk of coronary disease in
707 men. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* **338**, 464–468 (1991).
- 708 26. Gaziano, J. M. *et al.* Million Veteran Program: A mega-biobank to study genetic influences
709 on health and disease. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* **70**, 214–223 (2016).
- 710 27. Bao, Y. *et al.* Origin, Methods, and Evolution of the Three Nurses' Health Studies. *Am. J.*
711 *Public Health* **106**, 1573–1581 (2016).
- 712 28. Clifford, R. E., Maihofer, A. X., Stein, M. B., Ryan, A. F. & Nievergelt, C. M. Novel Risk
713 Loci in Tinnitus and Causal Inference With Neuropsychiatric Disorders Among Adults of
714 European Ancestry. *JAMA Otolaryngol.-- Head Neck Surg.* **146**, 1015–1025 (2020).

- 715 29. Bycroft, C. *et al.* The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data.
716 *Nature* **562**, 203–209 (2018).
- 717 30. Lindström, S. *et al.* A comprehensive survey of genetic variation in 20,691 subjects from
718 four large cohorts. *PLOS ONE* **12**, e0173997 (2017).
- 719 31. Ware, E. B. *et al.* Genome-wide Association Study of 24-Hour Urinary Excretion of
720 Calcium, Magnesium, and Uric Acid. *Mayo Clin. Proc. Innov. Qual. Outcomes* **3**, 448–460
721 (2019).
- 722 32. Hunter-Zinck, H. *et al.* Genotyping Array Design and Data Quality Control in the Million
723 Veteran Program. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **106**, 535–548 (2020).
- 724 33. Manichaikul, A. *et al.* Robust relationship inference in genome-wide association studies.
725 *Bioinforma. Oxf. Engl.* **26**, 2867–2873 (2010).
- 726 34. Fang, H. *et al.* Harmonizing Genetic Ancestry and Self-identified Race/Ethnicity in
727 Genome-wide Association Studies. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **105**, 763–772 (2019).
- 728 35. Chang, C. C. *et al.* Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer
729 datasets. *GigaScience* **4**, (2015).
- 730 36. Willer, C. J., Li, Y. & Abecasis, G. R. METAL: fast and efficient meta-analysis of
731 genomewide association scans. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 2190–2191 (2010).
- 732 37. Bulik-Sullivan, B. K. *et al.* LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from
733 polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nat. Genet.* **47**, 291–295 (2015).
- 734 38. Finucane, H. K. *et al.* Partitioning heritability by functional annotation using genome-wide
735 association summary statistics. *Nat. Genet.* **47**, 1228–1235 (2015).
- 736 39. Gazal, S., Marquez-Luna, C., Finucane, H. K. & Price, A. L. Reconciling S-LDSC and
737 LDAK functional enrichment estimates. *Nat. Genet.* **51**, 1202–1204 (2019).
- 738 40. Wendt, F. R. *et al.* Characterizing the effect of background selection on the polygenicity of
739 brain-related traits. *Genomics* **113**, 111–119 (2021).

- 740 41. O'Connor, L. J. & Price, A. L. Distinguishing genetic correlation from causation across 52
741 diseases and complex traits. *Nat. Genet.* **50**, 1728–1734 (2018).
- 742 42. Watanabe, K., Taskesen, E., van Bochoven, A. & Posthuma, D. Functional mapping and
743 annotation of genetic associations with FUMA. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1826 (2017).
- 744 43. Rentzsch, P., Witten, D., Cooper, G. M., Shendure, J. & Kircher, M. CADD: predicting the
745 deleteriousness of variants throughout the human genome. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47**, D886–D894
746 (2019).
- 747 44. Leeuw, C. A. de, Mooij, J. M., Heskes, T. & Posthuma, D. MAGMA: Generalized Gene-Set
748 Analysis of GWAS Data. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **11**, e1004219 (2015).
- 749 45. THE GTEx CONSORTIUM. The GTEx Consortium atlas of genetic regulatory effects
750 across human tissues. *Science* **369**, 1318–1330 (2020).
- 751 46. Wang, G., Sarkar, A., Carbonetto, P. & Stephens, M. A simple new approach to variable
752 selection in regression, with application to genetic fine mapping. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat.*
753 *Methodol.* **82**, 1273–1300 (2020).
- 754 47. Barbeira, A. N. *et al.* Integrating predicted transcriptome from multiple tissues improves
755 association detection. *PLoS Genet.* **15**, e1007889 (2019).
- 756 48. Choi, S. W. & O'Reilly, P. F. PRSice-2: Polygenic Risk Score software for biobank-scale
757 data. *GigaScience* **8**, (2019).
- 758 49. Choi, S. W., Mak, T. S.-H. & O'Reilly, P. F. Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic risk
759 score analyses. *Nat. Protoc.* (2020) doi:10.1038/s41596-020-0353-1.
- 760 50. Moore, R. *et al.* A linear mixed model approach to study multivariate gene-environment
761 interactions. *Nat. Genet.* **51**, 180–186 (2019).
- 762 51. Howe, K. L. *et al.* Ensembl 2021. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **49**, D884–D891 (2021).
- 763 52. Jiao, X. *et al.* DAVID-WS: a stateful web service to facilitate gene/protein list analysis.
764 *Bioinformatics* **28**, 1805–1806 (2012).

- 765 53. Cherny, S. S. *et al.* Self-reported hearing loss questions provide a good measure for genetic
766 studies: a polygenic risk score analysis from UK Biobank. *Eur. J. Hum. Genet.* **28**, 1056–1065
767 (2020).
- 768 54. Nagtegaal, A. P. *et al.* Genome-wide association meta-analysis identifies five novel loci for
769 age-related hearing impairment. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 15192 (2019).
- 770 55. Youngblood, H. A. *et al.* Identification of Estrogen Signaling in a Prioritization Study of
771 Intraocular Pressure-Associated Genes. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **22**, 10288 (2021).
- 772 56. Wu, J.-R., Zhao, Y., Zhou, X.-P. & Qin, X. Estrogen receptor 1 and progesterone receptor
773 are distinct biomarkers and prognostic factors in estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer:
774 Evidence from a bioinformatic analysis. *Biomed. Pharmacother.* **121**, 109647 (2020).
- 775 57. Wardell, S. E., Nelson, E. R., Chao, C. A. & McDonnell, D. P. Bazedoxifene Exhibits
776 Antiestrogenic Activity in Animal Models of Tamoxifen-Resistant Breast Cancer: Implications
777 for Treatment of Advanced Disease. *Clin. Cancer Res.* **19**, 2420–2431 (2013).
- 778 58. Sirugo, G., Williams, S. M. & Tishkoff, S. A. The Missing Diversity in Human Genetic
779 Studies. *Cell* **177**, 26–31 (2019).
- 780 59. Rosenberg, N. A., Edge, M. D., Pritchard, J. K. & Feldman, M. W. Interpreting polygenic
781 scores, polygenic adaptation, and human phenotypic differences. *Evol. Med. Public Health* **2019**,
782 26–34 (2019).
- 783 60. Duncan, L. *et al.* Analysis of polygenic risk score usage and performance in diverse human
784 populations. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 3328 (2019).
- 785 61. Vona, B. *et al.* A biallelic variant in CLRN2 causes non-syndromic hearing loss in humans.
786 *Hum. Genet.* **140**, 915–931 (2021).
- 787 62. Dunbar, L. A. *et al.* Clarin- 2 is essential for hearing by maintaining stereocilia integrity and
788 function. *EMBO Mol. Med.* **11**, e10288 (2019).
- 789 63. Zhou, B. *et al.* A novel mutation in TRIOBP gene leading to congenital deafness in a
790 Chinese family. *BMC Med. Genet.* **21**, 121 (2020).

- 791 64. Kochhar, A., Hildebrand, M. S. & Smith, R. J. H. Clinical aspects of hereditary hearing loss.
792 *Genet. Med.* **9**, 393–408 (2007).
- 793 65. Pollak, A. *et al.* Whole exome sequencing identifies TRIOBP pathogenic variants as a cause
794 of post-lingual bilateral moderate-to-severe sensorineural hearing loss. *BMC Med. Genet.* **18**, 142
795 (2017).
- 796 66. Fujimoto, C. & Yamasoba, T. Mitochondria-Targeted Antioxidants for Treatment of
797 Hearing Loss: A Systematic Review. *Antioxidants* **8**, 109 (2019).
- 798 67. Deng, T. *et al.* Hippocampal Transcriptome-Wide Association Study Reveals Correlations
799 Between Impaired Glutamatergic Synapse Pathway and Age-Related Hearing Loss in BXD-
800 Recombinant Inbred Mice. *Front. Neurosci.* **15**, 1356 (2021).
- 801 68. Liberman, M. C. & Kujawa, S. G. Cochlear synaptopathy in acquired sensorineural hearing
802 loss: Manifestations and mechanisms. *Hear. Res.* **349**, 138–147 (2017).
- 803 69. Xiong, W., Yu, S., Liu, K. & Gong, S. Loss of cochlear ribbon synapses in the early stage of
804 aging causes initial hearing impairment. *Am. J. Transl. Res.* **12**, 7354–7366 (2020).
- 805 70. Xue, N. *et al.* Genes related to SNPs identified by Genome-wide association studies of age-
806 related hearing loss show restriction to specific cell types in the adult mouse cochlea. *Hear. Res.*
807 **410**, 108347 (2021).
- 808 71. Fitzakerley, J. L. & Trachte, G. J. Genetics of guanylyl cyclase pathways in the cochlea and
809 their influence on hearing. *Physiol. Genomics* **50**, 780–806 (2018).
- 810 72. Qu, H., Tang, H., Pan, J., Zhao, Y. & Wang, W. Alteration of Cortical and Subcortical
811 Structures in Children With Profound Sensorineural Hearing Loss. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **14**,
812 534 (2020).
- 813 73. Llano, D. A., Kwok, S. S., Devanarayan, V. & The Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging
814 Initiative (ADNI). Reported Hearing Loss in Alzheimer’s Disease Is Associated With Loss of
815 Brainstem and Cerebellar Volume. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **15**, 562 (2021).

816 74. Simonoska, R. *et al.* Inner ear pathology and loss of hearing in estrogen receptor- β deficient
817 mice. *J. Endocrinol.* **201**, 397–406 (2009).

818 75. Carlton, A. J. *et al.* Loss of Baiap2l2 destabilizes the transducing stereocilia of cochlear hair
819 cells and leads to deafness. *J. Physiol.* **599**, 1173–1198 (2021).

820 76. Xu, L. *et al.* BAI1 - associated protein 2 - like 2 is a potential biomarker in lung cancer.
821 *Oncol. Rep.* **41**, 1304–1312 (2019).

822 77. Baguley, D., McFerran, D. & Hall, D. Tinnitus. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* **382**, 1600–1607 (2013).

823 78. Biswas, R. *et al.* Tinnitus prevalence in Europe: a multi-country cross-sectional population
824 study. *Lancet Reg. Health – Eur.* **0**, (2021).

825 79. Pirastu, N. *et al.* Genetic analyses identify widespread sex-differential participation bias.
826 *Nat. Genet.* **53**, 663–671 (2021).

827 80. Scinicariello, F. *et al.* Age and sex differences in hearing loss association with depressive
828 symptoms: analyses of NHANES 2011-2012. *Psychol. Med.* **49**, 962–968 (2019).

829

830

831 **Figure Legends**

832 **Figure 1:** Genetic correlation among hearing loss traits assessed via questionnaire in UK Biobank.
833 The square shade intensity is proportional to the magnitude of the correlation.

834 **Figure 2:** Multi-tissue transcriptome-wide association study of hearing loss based on the sex-
835 combined meta-analysis. The y-axis corresponds to two-tailed $-\log_{10}$ (p-value of the S-MultiXcan
836 association). The x-axis reports the genes grouped based on the best single-tissue S-PrediXcan
837 association. The red line refers to the Bonferroni multiple testing correction accounting for the
838 number of genes tested ($p < 2.24 \times 10^{-6}$). Bold labels are reported for the top-10 Bonferroni significant
839 association. Additional labels are included for the top significant result for each tissue. Detailed
840 results are available in Supplemental Table 12.

841 **Figure 3:** Phenome-wide genetic correlation of hearing loss in the sex-combined analysis. The x-
842 axis reports the genetic correlation of hearing loss with the traits tested. The y-axis corresponds to
843 two-tailed $-\log_{10}(p\text{-value})$. Blue shades correspond to significance strength, from white, non-
844 significant ($p > 0.05$), to light blue (nominal significance $p < 0.05$), to blue (Bonferroni correction
845 $p < 9 \times 10^{-6}$), and dark blue (top 10 results). Phenotype labels are included for the top 10 results. Full
846 results are reported in Supplemental Table 15.

847 **Figure 4:** Visual representation of the 22 significant putative causal effects identified through the
848 latent causal variable analysis. Brown labels: HL has causative effect for the trait in the label;
849 Purple labels: Trait in the label has causative effect for HL. The absolute gcp (genetic causality
850 proportion) value for each association is reported within the arrow, and the directions refer to the
851 cause-effect relationship (Blue: HL causes Trait; Red: Trait causes HL). The shade intensity of the
852 arrows is proportional to the statistical significance of the gcp estimates. Description of each trait
853 tested, and details of the associations is available in Supplemental Table 16.

854 **Supplemental Figure 1:** Visual representation of the fine-mapping analysis for sex-combined
855 meta-analysis. Each panel refers to a GWS risk locus. The variants were identified according to
856 their LD with respect to the lead SNP and inclusion in the credible set with at most ten causal
857 variants.

858 **Supplemental Figure 2:** Visual representation of the fine-mapping analysis for female meta-
859 analysis. Each panel refers to a GWS risk locus. The variants were identified according to their LD
860 with respect to the lead SNP and inclusion in the credible set with at most ten causal variants.

861 **Supplemental Figure 3:** Visual representation of the fine-mapping analysis for male meta-analysis.
862 Each panel refers to a GWS risk locus. The variants were identified according to their LD with
863 respect to the lead SNP and inclusion in the credible set with at most ten causal variants.

864

865

866

867

868

● Adipose	● Adrenal Gland	● Artery	● Brain
● Breast	● Cells	● Colon	● Esophagus
● Heart	● Kidney	● Liver	● Lung
● Salivary Gland	● Skeletal Muscle	● Tibial Nerve	● Ovary
● Pancreas	● Pituitary Gland	● Prostate	● Skin
● Small Intestine	● Spleen	● Stomach	● Testis
● Thyroid	● Uterus	● Vagina	● Whole Blood

Table 1: SNP heritability (SNP-h²) of hearing loss related traits assessed in the UK

Biobank. SE: standard error.

Analysis	Trait	N	SNP-h ²	SE	SNP-h ² Z-score
Sex-combined	Hearing difficulty/problems	465,782 (125,011 cases and 340,771 controls)	0.038	0.002	20.16
	Hearing difficulty/problems with background noise	476,031 (183,497 cases and 292,534 controls)	0.050	0.002	26.11
	Hearing aid user	321,577 (17,754 cases and 303,823 controls)	0.017	0.002	9.67
	Speech-reception-threshold (SRT) estimate (left)	195,188	0.002	0.002	0.96
	Speech-reception-threshold (SRT) estimate (right)	195,916	0.009	0.002	3.74
	Hearing loss ordinal trait	300,818	0.045	0.003	15.23
Males	Hearing difficulty/problems	214,549 (68,781 cases and 145,768 controls)	0.048	0.003	15.45
	Hearing difficulty/problems with background noise	218,106 (97,002 cases and 121,104 controls)	0.050	0.003	16.23
	Hearing aid user	156,017 (9,882 cases and 146,135 controls)	0.021	0.003	6.59
	Hearing loss ordinal trait	147,719	0.051	0.004	12.73
Females	Hearing difficulty/problems	251,233 (56,230 cases and 195,003 controls)	0.040	0.003	14.21
	Hearing difficulty/problems with background noise	257,925 (86,495 cases and 171,430 controls)	0.054	0.003	18.79
	Hearing aid user	165,560 (7,872 cases and 157,688 controls)	0.017	0.003	5.55
	Hearing loss ordinal trait	153,099	0.054	0.004	13.5

Table 2: LD-independent loci associated with hearing difficulties reaching genome-wide significance ($p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) in the meta-analysis of UK Biobank (UKB), Nurses' Health Studies (NHS; I and II), and Health Professional Follow-up Study (HPFS). The results of the replication analysis in Million Veteran Program (MVP) are also reported. Abbreviations: chromosome (CHR), position (POS); base pairs (bp); Effect Allele Frequency (EAF); Odds Ratio (OR), P value (P).

rsID	CHR	POS (bp)	Effect Allele	Other Allele	UKB-NHS-HPFS meta-analysis		MVP Replication	
					OR	P	OR	P
rs36062310	22	50,988,105	A	G	1.15	2.75×10^{-32}	1.08	4.80×10^{-6}
rs6871548	5	73,076,024	T	C	1.05	2.30×10^{-25}	1.04	1.23×10^{-8}
rs34993346	11	89,046,097	A	G	0.95	1.38×10^{-24}	1.00	0.872
rs2254303	6	43,276,390	A	G	1.05	1.19×10^{-23}	1.04	5.23×10^{-11}
rs10901863	10	126,812,270	T	C	1.05	6.21×10^{-23}	1.06	1.17×10^{-11}
rs739138	22	38,122,462	A	G	0.95	4.70×10^{-19}	0.96	6.21×10^{-8}
rs67307131	11	118,480,223	T	C	0.96	3.12×10^{-18}	0.97	2.83×10^{-7}
rs9493627	6	133,789,728	A	G	1.04	1.03×10^{-17}	1.06	1.91×10^{-19}
rs11073804	15	89,252,012	A	T	0.95	5.60×10^{-17}	0.91	3.50×10^{-28}
rs6662164	1	46,146,230	A	T	1.04	6.59×10^{-17}	1.04	7.44×10^{-9}
rs72622588	3	182,003,490	T	G	0.95	1.53×10^{-16}	0.97	0.002
rs1566128	14	52,514,981	A	G	1.04	1.02×10^{-15}	1.04	3.98×10^{-11}
rs6545432	2	54,817,683	A	G	1.04	1.05×10^{-15}	1.04	2.37×10^{-8}
rs11041717	11	8,054,933	A	C	0.96	7.31×10^{-15}	0.98	0.071
rs2877561	3	121,712,051	A	C	1.04	1.62×10^{-14}	1.03	4.95×10^{-4}
rs13147559	4	17,524,570	C	G	0.95	3.81×10^{-14}	0.99	0.596
rs2296506	6	158,507,981	A	G	1.03	1.70×10^{-13}	1.02	3.36×10^{-4}
rs13171669	5	148,601,243	A	G	0.97	1.15×10^{-12}	0.98	0.007
rs12156228	8	141,701,299	T	G	0.97	3.67×10^{-12}	0.97	6.31×10^{-4}
rs222836	17	7,133,162	A	G	0.97	1.13×10^{-11}	0.98	7.37×10^{-4}
rs4948502	10	63,839,417	T	C	1.03	1.26×10^{-11}	1.01	0.229
rs11238325	7	50,853,151	T	C	1.04	1.88×10^{-11}	1.04	5.65×10^{-6}
rs35094336	8	82,670,771	A	G	1.06	2.07×10^{-11}	1.03	0.021
rs7712395	5	2,559,538	T	C	1.05	3.64×10^{-11}	1.04	6.45×10^{-5}
rs143282422	10	73,377,112	A	G	1.16	4.43×10^{-11}	1.22	8.30×10^{-11}
rs6675438	1	165,112,224	A	T	1.03	8.82×10^{-11}	1.03	1.62×10^{-4}
rs57167368	10	80,521,351	A	G	0.96	9.91×10^{-11}	0.97	0.001
rs72930998	18	52,632,968	T	C	0.97	2.03×10^{-10}	0.98	0.028
rs1171114	6	84,227,646	T	C	0.97	2.69×10^{-10}	0.98	0.018
rs2354376	7	138,487,145	A	C	1.03	3.17×10^{-10}	1.01	0.100
rs717973	2	208,091,112	A	G	0.97	4.61×10^{-10}	0.99	0.072
rs7819550	8	74,206,582	A	G	1.04	6.96×10^{-10}	1.05	3.92×10^{-9}
rs72818515	10	76,060,718	A	C	1.03	7.08×10^{-10}	1.01	0.186
rs112725535	1	6,494,086	A	G	0.96	7.85×10^{-10}	0.99	0.318

rs11022697	11	13,178,285	C	G	0.97	1.17×10^{-9}	0.97	1.15×10^{-5}
rs34073570	5	103,998,895	CT	C	0.97	1.32×10^{-9}	0.99	0.316
rs61863078	10	94,777,108	A	G	1.03	1.54×10^{-9}	1.00	0.777
rs111935448	16	30,919,807	T	C	1.04	1.75×10^{-9}	0.99	0.218
rs58919600	5	92,970,519	T	C	1.04	1.86×10^{-9}	1.03	0.002
rs11085064	19	4,209,152	A	G	1.04	2.84×10^{-9}	1.03	9.49×10^{-4}
rs9783279	11	68,972,992	A	C	0.97	2.97×10^{-9}	1.00	0.872
rs8102051	19	2,370,476	A	C	1.03	3.38×10^{-9}	1.01	0.429
rs5800853	12	109,790,748	CAG	C	1.03	4.87×10^{-9}	1.02	0.017
rs1928176	6	21,968,899	A	G	0.97	5.44×10^{-9}	0.99	0.028
rs9530470	13	76,416,638	A	G	0.97	5.64×10^{-9}	0.99	0.051
rs148512269	2	227,596,034	T	G	1.11	9.83×10^{-9}	1.05	0.133
rs61734651	20	61,451,332	T	C	1.06	1.30×10^{-8}	1.03	0.028
rs8063057	16	53,812,433	T	C	1.03	1.64×10^{-8}	1.01	0.081
rs566673	11	66,401,373	T	G	0.97	1.80×10^{-8}	1.01	0.277
rs78229182	6	151128784	T	C	1.05	2.07×10^{-8}	0.98	0.106
rs73204028	7	115,092,852	T	C	0.97	2.20×10^{-8}	0.98	0.012
rs766262445 (MVP LD-proxy: rs9536378)	13	53,830,039	CT(A)	C	1.03	2.63×10^{-8}	1.00	0.787
rs2273654	10	102,689,217	T	C	0.97	4.01×10^{-8}	0.99	0.425
rs35624969	7	72,991,592	T	C	0.97	4.66×10^{-8}	0.99	0.218