Methylation risk scores are associated with a collection of phenotypes within electronic health record systems

Mike Thompson ^{†1}, Brian L. Hill ^{†1}, Nadav Rakocz¹, Jeffrey N. Chiang², IPH³, Sriram Sankararaman^{1,2,4}, Ira Hofer⁵, Maxime Cannesson⁵, Noah Zaitlen⁶, and Eran Halperin^{1,2,3,4,5,7}

*mjthompson@ucla.edu, brian.l.hill@cs.ucla.edu, ehalperin@cs.ucla.edu**,

^{*}Corresponding Author

[†]Denotes equal contribution

¹Department of Computer Science, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

²Department of Computational Medicine, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

³Institute of Precision Health, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

⁴Department of Human Genetics, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

⁵Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

⁶Department of Neurology, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

⁷OptumLabs, Minnetonka, MN, USA

Abstract

Inference of clinical phenotypes is a fundamental task in precision medicine, and has therefore been heavily investigated in recent years in the context of electronic health records (EHR) using a large arsenal of machine learning techniques, as well as in the context of genetics using polygenic risk scores (PRS). In this work, we considered the epigenetic analog of PRS, methylation risk scores (MRS), a linear combination of methylation states. Since methylation states are influenced by both environmental and genetic factors, we hypothesized that MRS would complement PRS and EHR-based machine-learning methods, improving overall prediction accuracy. To evaluate this hypothesis, we performed the largest assessment of methylation risk scores in clinical datasets to be conducted to date. We measured methylation across a large cohort ($n=831$) of diverse samples in the UCLA Health biobank, for which both genetic and complete EHR data are available. We constructed MRS for 607 phenotypes spanning diagnoses, clinical lab tests, and medication prescriptions. When added to a baseline set of predictive features, MRS significantly improved the imputation of 139 outcomes, whereas the PRS improved only 22 (median improvement for methylation 10.74%, 141.52%, and 15.46% in medications, labs and diagnosis codes, respectively, whereas genotypes only improved the labs at a median increase of 18.42%). We added significant MRS to state-of-the-art EHR imputation methods that leverage the entire set of medical records, and found that including MRS as a medical feature in the algorithm significantly improves EHR imputation in 37% of lab tests examined (median R^2 increase 47.6%). Finally, we replicated several MRS in multiple external studies of methylation (minimum p-value of 2.72×10^{-7}) and replicated 22 of 30 tested MRS internally in two separate cohorts of different ethnicity. In summary, our work provides a comprehensive evaluation of MRS in comparison to PRS and EHR imputation on the largest dataset consisting of methylation, genotype, and EHR data. Our publicly available results and weights show promise for methylation risk scores as clinical and scientific tools.

1 Introduction

Widespread adoption of electronic health record systems coupled with an increasing interest in hospital biobanking systems has spurred research efforts spanning machine-learning and genomics communities[1–7]. These efforts have produced increasingly accurate imputation (current state) and prediction (future state) of patient phenotypes from medical records [8, 9] and polygenic risk scores [1–3, 10–14], and are already being investigated in translational contexts [15–18]. For example, recent work has shown that machine learning can leverage high-dimensional data to aid in the prediction of a multitude of clinical phenotypes including cardiac function and arrhythmia [19–21], post-operative complications [8, 9], sepsis [22], breast cancer [11, 23], and prostate cancer [24]. Nonetheless, a genetics-based predictor such as the polygenic risk score may be limited in predictive utility as it does not account for changes in disease risk—for example, due to age, or changes in environment—throughout one’s lifespan [13].

In this work we examine the potential for epigenetic information to improve phenotype inference in combined biobank-EHR systems. As DNA methylation, henceforth referred to as simply “methylation”, is affected by both genetics and environment—such as lifestyle choices, diet, exercise, and smoking status—it captures multi-factorial information about predispositions to clinical conditions [25–31]. Moreover, methylation is readily available for use in existing biobanks that collect DNA samples, and recent advancements in methylation profiling technologies have enabled an abundance of large-scale studies of methylation and its role as a biomarker for a variety of phenotypes and health-related outcomes [25, 31–37]. It is therefore a natural candidate for an extension of PRS, and we hypothesized that methylation can be used to complement genetics as a clinical prediction tool. To that end, we have generated and evaluated methylation risk scores (MRS), which are linear combinations of CpG methylation states[25].

To comprehensively investigate the utility of MRS and characterize its properties, we conducted a study of 607 EHR-derived phenotypes spanning medications (e.g. vasopressors, glucocorticosteroids, fluoroquinolones), labs (e.g. creatinine, glucose, prothrombin time), and diagnoses (e.g. T2D, bacterial

pneumonia, anemia) that were available for a sufficient number of patients in the cohort. The cohort contained 831 patients—to the best of our knowledge, the largest epigenetic biobank dataset to date (including genetics, methylation, and EHR)—from the UCLA Health ATLAS cohort across a wide range of ages (18-90), racial and ethnic groups, and overall health (including patients ascertained on kidney and heart disease, with matched controls), with corresponding genetic and EHR data. This provides the opportunity to study the potential contribution of methylation to larger biobanks and in multiple clinical contexts. We find that the MRS-based imputations were more informative compared to PRS in 84 (92%) medications, 32 (94%) labs, and 123 (82%) diagnoses, more than doubling the imputation accuracy in over half of the outcomes considered. We also show that the MRS improves the imputation accuracy over PRS for cases in which the PRS is trained on very large external biobanks (roughly 3 orders of magnitude larger), as opposed to 831 samples that are available in this study. We observe that MRS improves over PRS learned from large biobanks in 40% of the tested phenotypes. Further, as our cohort was ethnically diverse, we performed replicability analyses within each racial and ethnic subset of our data. We broadly showed the replicability of the five best-imputed (by MRS) medications, labs, and diagnoses—46% and 100% of which replicated in (n=118) non-white Hispanic-Latino- and (n=543) white non-Hispanic-Latino-identifying individuals respectively. Finally, we demonstrate the ability of MRS to transfer between methylation arrays and cohorts by conducting an association study of kidney-related MRS in an external diabetic nephropathy EWAS [38], where the minimum replication p-value was 2.72×10^{-7} .

These results provide evidence for the utility of methylation in phenotype imputation in general, and in biobank settings in particular. However, the promise of clinical translation of genomic risk scores, including PRS or MRS, is highly dependent on the clinical context of the patient. There is a large body of work investigating phenotype imputation and prediction in clinical settings using EHR data alone, typically with machine learning techniques, without any genomic data. To the best of our knowledge, the question of whether genomic data can be used to complement such algorithms has not been studied. Since the application of MRS or PRS to clinical data without taking into account the EHR data provides a limited clinical utility, this is a natural question.

Here, we demonstrate that MRS can be used in conjunction with EHR data to improve the imputation of clinical data of patients. Critically, most machine learning approaches rely on imputation because of the inability of such algorithms to process missing data, making accurate imputation a crucial step. We found that the combination of MRS with a gold standard imputation approach—SoftImpute [39]—for clinical data imputation, provides improved accuracy (R^2) in 37.3% of the examined phenotypes with a median increase of 47.6%. This result provides the potential to improve machine learning algorithms that use the EHR data, by complementing the data with methylation information for the patients.

In summary, our results quantify the contribution of methylation information in clinical settings, both in isolation and in conjunction with the EHR data, and they demonstrate the potential utility of epigenetic biobanks in clinical settings.

2 Results

Risk model description Analogous to the PRS[40, 41], we defined the MRS by a linear combination of m CpG site beta values c and weights w :

$$\text{MRS} = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i c_i \quad (1)$$

To ensure the methylation risk score added predictive value over commonly captured features (e.g. age and sex), we created a baseline predictive model that included patients' age, sex, reference-based methylation cell-type composition estimates [42], self-reported race-ethnicity, self-reported smoking status, and the first ten genetic principal components [27] (see Supplementary Table S1 for cohort demographic data). We

fit the baseline model using a linear or logistic regression model depending on whether the outcome was continuous or binary. We compared the baseline model to models that included the baseline features as well as either methylation or genotype data. For both the MRS and PRS, we used regression with LASSO, elastic net, and ridge regularization over the genomic features while treating the baseline features as fixed covariates. We fit all models using 10-fold double cross-validation, wherein each training set an additional cross-validation was performed for hyperparameter selection, then this training-set cross-validated model was used to predict the held-out test set. We tested for significance using an association test (via linear regression) between the cross-validated predicted outcome (i.e. the concatenated predictor across all folds) and the true outcome. For full details see Methods.

Methylation risk scores significantly outperform the baseline and PRS models From our EHR database, we extracted diagnosis codes, medication orders, and the most recent lab results, all of which occurred before the methylation samples were collected. We aggregated the ICD codes into higher-level phenotypes according to the phenotype code (Phecode) mapping proposed by Denny et al. [43, 44] and grouped individual medications by pharmaceutical subclass to increase generalizability and power.

We trained penalized linear models to predict clinical phenotypes for which there was a sufficient number of patient data available, which included 168 medication subclasses, 69 lab values, and 370 Phecodes. Using a Bonferroni-adjusted association test, the baseline and MRS models significantly imputed the usage of 69 and 88 medications, 18 and 33 labs, and 106 and 139 Phecodes respectively (Figure S1). We compared the performance of the MRS to a model that used both the PRS and baseline features on the same set of individuals, which significantly imputed the usage of 53 medications, 20 lab results, and 93 Phecodes. Notably, the baseline model imputed a greater number of medications and Phecodes than models that leveraged a PRS, which suggests that including genomic features may either add noise or our sample size may not have been sufficient to discover their effects for certain outcomes. We also show in Figure S2 that the baseline model gains some of its predictive power from genomics-derived features like ancestry PCs or estimated cell counts, and therefore a PRS or MRS may not offer a substantial improvement over these features for certain outcomes under the current sample sizes.

Next, we investigated outcomes for which genomics-based predictors add predictive power to the baseline features and, in such cases, the extent to which their inclusion improves predictive accuracy. On the outcomes for which the genomics-based predictors produced statistically significant imputations, we conducted a likelihood ratio test comparing an association test of the true outcome using the cross-validated baseline predictor alone, to a model that included the cross-validated baseline predictor as well as the cross-validated predictor that included both baseline and genomic features (Methods). The methylation significantly improved the baseline predictor for 54 medications, 29 labs, and 56 Phecodes, and led to a median increase of 10.74%, 141.52%, and 15.46% over the baseline predictor's accuracy (AUC, R^2) in each outcome, respectively (Figure 1). The genotypes significantly improved the baseline predictor for 8 medications, 3 labs, and 11 Phecodes, and led to a median increase of 18.42% over the baseline in the R^2 of the labs, but a median decrease of 1.75% and 0.94% in AUC of the medications and Phecodes respectively (Figure 1). We note that our internal sample size is likely underpowered to discover small genetic effects and therefore suggest the contributions made by the genotypes may be due to additional ancestry signal that was not captured by the first few genetic PCs.

The medications that improved the greatest using methylation corresponded to drugs often prescribed to individuals with neutropenia (hematopoietic growth factors, AUC baseline .706 95% CI [.661,.748] to AUC methylation .840 [.807,.871]) or chronic kidney disease (phosphate binder agents AUC from .731 [.683, .777] to .876 [.842, .907]). The lab panels best improved with the addition of the methylation-based predictor included those related to kidney function as well as cell counts (Urea nitrogen baseline adjusted R^2 .032 [.007,.057] compared to .443 [.377,.509] with methylation, hemoglobin .107 [.063,.151] to .289 [.232,.346]). The addition of the genotype-based predictor improved the imputation of hematocrit (adjusted R^2 from .077 [.041,.114] to .092 [.052,.132]) and total protein (adjusted R^2 .094 [.047,.141] to .111 [.060,.162]), both of which are influenced by ancestry [45, 46]. In the context

Figure 1. MRS increases imputation accuracy on a variety of outcomes (Top) The performance of the PRS (blue) and MRS (green) imputations on the y-axis with the baseline model performance on the x-axis. The performance of binary phenotypes (Phecodes, medications) is measured using area under the ROC curve (AUC) and the performance of continuous phenotypes (lab results) is measured using proportion of variance explained (R^2). Shown is the performance on the union of outcomes that were significantly improved over the baseline model by either the MRS or PRS and that were significantly imputed their corresponding predictor (72 Phecodes, 59 medications, and 31 labs). (Bottom) The disease incidence as a function of the PRS (blue) and MRS (green) binned by deciles (left, middle); and the observed Urea Nitrogen lab result value plotted against its imputed value (right).

of Phecodes, methylation greatly increased the imputation of advanced renal disease over the baseline and genotype models (for example, AUC baseline .720 [.673,.762] to 0.898 [.867,.927] with methylation), and the genotype model increased the imputation of actinic keratosis (AUC from .694 [.631,.747] to .728 [.672,.784]).

Overall, when looking at the intersection of medications significantly imputed by either the methylation and genotypes or methylation and baseline, 92% were better imputed by methylation sites than genotypes (median 9.13% increase) and 78% were better imputed by methylation compared to the baseline (median 6.81% increase). Methylation improved the baseline imputation accuracy by over 15% for 14 medications. In the context of significantly imputed lab values, methylation explained more variability than the baseline (median 398% increase) and genotype (median 274% increase) predictors in 97% and 94% of the respective union of significantly imputed labs. For 22 labs, the percent increase of imputation accuracy was greater than 15% over the baseline model. Methylation was more accurate than the baseline (median 3.48% increase) or genotypes (median 6.58% increase) for 70% and 83% of each respective union of Phecodes. For 29 Phecodes, the methylation offered over a 15% increase in predictive accuracy compared to the baseline model. For a substantial proportion of outcomes, the MRS predictor added

statistically significant predictive value over the PRS predictor (Figure S3). This was generally not true when comparing whether the PRS added predictive value over the MRS. For the imputation performance on the full list of phenotypes, see Supplemental Tables S2, S3, and S4. To see the number of CpGs selected for each MRS, see Supplemental Tables S5, S6, and S7.

Importantly, cell-type composition, age, sex, BMI, smoking status and ancestry provide sufficient power for the imputation of many EHR outcomes. We show explicitly in Supplementary Figure S4 that genomics derived features such as cell-type composition and ancestry PCs likely contribute to accurate imputation of several outcomes. In our analyses, we directly compared the power gained by methylation over the aforementioned set of baseline features. However, we note that obtaining these baseline features may be unnecessary as the methylation alone may capture their signal [27, 30, 32, 47, 48]. Further, previous reports have suggested that approaches that fit all methylation probes simultaneously with regularization may perform better when excluding latent confounders, such as cell type composition [49]. We therefore suggest that using the methylation alone is sufficient to replicate a substantial proportion of the associations generated from the baseline features alone.

Using methylation risk scores improves imputation approaches Due to significant heterogeneity in patient populations, the diagnosis and treatment process can vary widely between patients, causing many variables to be left unobserved. This sparse structure in the data must be reconciled before performing many downstream analyses, and the imputation accuracy of these unobserved variables is therefore crucial to subsequent steps. A commonly-used approach for imputation is matrix completion, for example, SoftImpute [39], where the data matrix is reconstructed from a low-rank representation. Often, one would jointly use demographic information, diagnosis codes, lab results, and medications to generate an estimate of the unobserved EHR values using an imputation method such as SoftImpute, and therefore we used this as our baseline imputation estimate [50].

To investigate whether methylation can add additional useful information to the imputation, we included the MRS values as part of imputation procedure and compared the performance to the estimates that do not take methylation data into account (see Methods). Specifically, we included cross-validated MRS values for diagnosis codes, lab results, medications, and demographics that were significantly imputed as 261 additional features (i.e. columns of the input matrix) in the imputation procedure. We randomly removed a subset of the observed lab results, including other labs that are ordered as part of the same lab panel(s), and imputed the masked values using the remaining observed values. The imputed values were then compared to the held-out, masked values to assess the quality of the imputation. In Figure 2, we show the imputation accuracy (R^2 between the masked true and imputed values) for labs where the addition of cross-validated MRS to the baseline SoftImpute procedure explained significantly more variability. Of the 67 lab results considered, 25 (37.3%) were significantly better imputed by including the MRS values. Including the MRS values led to a median increase of 47.6% (95% CI 17.3%-90.9%) in the imputation R^2 values.

Methylation risk scores will improve with larger sample sizes In this study, our analyses of imputation accuracy were performed on 831 individuals' methylation and genetic features. For many phenotypes, the genetic effects are relatively small and require large sample sizes to identify associations between genomic features and the outcome of interest. Consequently, in many biobanks the number of individuals with measured genomic features is several orders of magnitude larger than our sample size [1–3]. While the methylation data provided sufficient power to significantly impute numerous outcomes, there may remain much power to be gained by increasing the number of methylation samples to numbers approaching biobank-scale.

To determine the role of sample size in our imputation accuracy, we performed an experiment in which we downsampled the number of individuals in our data and trained models on the subsampled data. From the set of outcomes most accurately imputed by methylation and that also significantly improved the baseline's imputation, we chose 10 medications, labs, and Phecodes on which to perform 10-fold cross-

Figure 2. Improvement in lab result imputation performance by including MRS For lab results that were significantly better imputed using a matrix completion imputation procedure that included the MRS values, we compare the quality of the imputed values (R^2) using only the EHR data (SoftImpute) to the values generated when including the MRS values in addition to the EHR data (SoftImpute+MRS).

validation. For each sample size, we repeated the procedure 20 times to attempt to mitigate variance due to ascertainment effect. Though we selected features that had high accuracy using the full set of data, our results suggest that our models may become more accurate as the sample size increases (Figure 3; Figures S6,S7,S8). We further posit that there may be additional outcomes that will be significantly imputed as the number of methylation samples increases.

Comparing MRS to UKBiobank PRS As expected, due to a small sample size and the likely small effects of SNPs on phenotypes, the PRS developed using the UCLA cohort did not add substan-

Figure 3. Imputation accuracy may improve with additional samples We downsampled the number of individuals to evaluate the imputation performance as a function of sample size using a well-imputed medication, lab value, and Phecode. The performance is significantly affected by the number of individuals, suggesting that there is additional power to be gained with the addition of more methylation samples.

tial predictive power over the baseline features. Studies leveraging biobanks with sample sizes several magnitudes larger than the cohort at UCLA however, have shown non-zero heritability for a variety of phenotypes [1, 51–53]. Therefore, we sought to compare the MRS and PRS generated with the UCLA data to a polygenic risk score created using the UKBiobank data [54]. To do so, we obtained the genotype weights corresponding to 10 polygenic risk scores trained on the UKBiobank (Table S10) [52–55] data and imputed the external risk scores into our health record system using PLINK [56]. We included in the comparison labs that were significantly imputed by the baseline model and excluded labs that corresponded to cell counts or labs for which the internal PRS outperformed the external PRS (indicating a mismatch in the phenotypes or cryptic population structure that was unaccounted for by principal components). While the external polygenic risk score improved substantially the imputation performance relative to the internal polygenic risk score, it did not significantly outperform the methylation for any of the tested phenotypes (Figure 4). The methylation remained the best predictor in general—even when trained on fewer than 1000 samples—significantly outperforming the other models in the imputation of urea nitrogen, creatinine, hemoglobin, hematocrit, and albumin. The externally-derived polygenic risk score greatly outperformed both the internally-derived PRS and the MRS when predicting glycated hemoglobin (HGBA1C) and HDL levels, however the improvement was not significant. For detailed information on the external PRS and accession numbers, see Supplementary Table S10.

Similarly to the analyses in which we examined whether predictors that leverage genomics offered predictive value over the baseline predictor, we examined whether our internal MRS and the externally trained PRS offer information that is complementary to the other. To do so, we measured the accuracy when using the MRS, external PRS, both risk scores, and as well as both risk scores and their interaction on the same set of labs as our original analysis. None of the models significantly outperformed the MRS alone (Figure S10). However, there was a significant interaction effect between the MRS and external PRS on creatinine ($p=9.16e-05$), as well as a nominally significant interaction effect on mean corpuscular hemoglobin ($p=1.45e-02$). As the interaction terms improved the accuracy for both outcomes, there may be added value in leveraging both MRS and PRS for imputation tasks, especially those that take advantage of non-linear effects.

Figure 4. Labs as imputed by methylation, genotypes, and an externally-trained polygenic risk score The cross-validated R^2 between the true and imputed lab value on 541 unrelated patients of non-Hispanic-Latino white-identifying individuals using a baseline predictor as well as a baseline predictor with methylation, genotypes, and a PRS externally-trained from UKBiobank summary statistics. HDL corresponds to high-density lipoprotein cholesterol and HGBA1C to glycated hemoglobin.

Evaluation of methylation risk scores across ancestral populations Previous reports have suggested that a significant confounder to the application and versatility of polygenic risk scores is population structure, where a population-specific bias is induced that affects generalizability of PRS to different ancestries [57–59]. The collection of samples analyzed throughout this study is ethnically heterogeneous—individuals were self-identified as non-Hispanic/Latino European, Hispanic/Latino, Black, or Asian. Methylation data is also influenced by differences in population [60], and in particular the first several methylation principal components sufficiently capture population structure in European and African groups [61, 62]). Consequently, we examined the performance of the methylation risk scores within and across ancestral populations.

Primarily, after training the models on the entire heterogeneous set of samples, we examined the predictive performance within each ancestral population. When we examined the top 10 best-imputed (by MRS across the entire set of individuals) lab panels, medications, and Phecodes, only 10 of the entire 180 possible comparisons ($\binom{4}{2}$ comparisons across 30 outcomes) displayed significant differences between the predictive performance within each population separately (Figures 5, S11, S12).

In a second replication analysis we trained predictive models within ancestral groupings separately. As the individuals self-identified as either Black or Asian comprised less than 100 individuals in both groupings, we focused our analyses on Hispanic/Latino- and white-non-Hispanic/Latino-identifying individuals. We retrained models for the top 5 best-imputed (by MRS) medications, lab panels, and unique Phecodes on the Hispanic/Latino individuals and white non-Hispanic/Latino individuals alone and treated a prediction as significant if its association p-value was lower than .01. Creatinine,

Figure 5. Best methylation-imputed Phecodes within ancestral populations. After training a model on the entire heterogeneous population of individuals, we evaluated the predictive performance within each population separately. We observed only 6 (of 60) significant differences between self-reported ancestral groupings.

hemoglobin, and urea nitrogen replicated across both groupings, however, hematocrit and mean corpuscular hemoglobin did not replicate in the Latino/Hispanic grouping (Table 1). In the context of medications, CMV agents, osmotic diuretics, phosphate binder agents, hematopoietic growth factors, and immunosuppressive agents replicated within the white non-Hispanic/Latino population but only CMV and immunosuppressive agents replicated within the Hispanic/Latino population (Table 1). Finally, Phecodes corresponding to immunity deficiency, hypertensive renal disease and end-stage renal failure replicated within both groupings, however, neutropenia and anemia replicated only within the white non-Hispanic/Latino set of individuals (Table 1).

Replication of methylation risk scores across external datasets To evaluate the transferability of the MRS to a different population, we performed several experiments in which we imputed the MRS into external datasets. Primarily, we focused on imputation of kidney-related outcomes as they were the most accurately imputed in our own cohort. To do so, we leveraged a dataset that used the HumanMethylation27k array to measure the methylation of 194 individuals who had Type 1 Diabetes, 49.7% of whom had nephropathy (cases) [63]. We re-trained the models for a Phecode corresponding chronic renal disease as well as labs corresponding to creatinine and urea nitrogen on our in-house data, limiting our analysis to the 27,000 sites that belonged to the external dataset. The imputed chronic renal disease was significantly associated with nephropathy in the external dataset ($p=8.32e-05$, $AUC=.684$ [.615,.758]). Further, both of the imputed values for creatinine and urea nitrogen were significantly associated with nephropathy ($p=5.11e-07$, $AUC=.739$ [.670,.808] and $p=3.71e-05$, $AUC=.693$ [.619,.767], respectively). Importantly, when limiting our internal analysis to sites only on the 27k array, the association signal

Outcome	Metric	Accuracy, p-value Hispanic/Latino (n=118)	Accuracy, p-value white, non- Hispanic/Latino (n=543)	Accuracy, p-value all ethnicities (n=833)
Creatinine	R^2	.217, 4.63e-07	.356, 7.47e-46	.457, 1.27e-95
Hematocrit	R^2	.045, 2.91e-02	.188, 1.87e-21	.246, 1.14e-42
Hemoglobin	R^2	.096, 1.21e-03	.204, 2.54e-23	.283, 3.02e-50
Mean corpuscular hemoglobin	R^2	.050, 2.12e-02	.122, 9.70e-14	.208, 7.04e-35
Urea nitrogen	R^2	.289, 2.97e-09	.349, 7.61e-44	.435, 2.50e-87
CMV Agents	AUC	.874, 9.27e-07	.875, 3.47e-16	.905, 1.72e-38
Osmotic Diuretics	AUC	.530, 0.841	.842, 2.27e-12	.848, 6.37e-34
Phosphate binder agents	AUC	.608, 0.321	.819, 7.76e-17	.876, 1.11e-50
Hematopoietic growth factors	AUC	.567, 0.476	.780, 1.51e-19	.840, 1.75e-45
Immunosuppressive agents	AUC	.721, 1.43e-04	.823, 6.36e-22	.828, 9.44e-41
Neutropenia	AUC	.689, 5.60e-02	.800, 7.68e-10	.836, 1.11e-19
Immunity deficiency	AUC	.889, 4.06e-09	.818, 3.26e-19	.821, 9.74e-33
Anemia	AUC	.637, 9.75e-02	.698, 3.13e-08	.789, 1.40e-32
Hypertensive renal disease	AUC	.715, 1.35e-04	.688, 6.74e-10	.801, 1.45e-42
End-stage renal failure	AUC	.677, 1.80e-03	.868, 2.51e-29	.898, 5.46e-72

Table 1. Replication statistics within ethnic groupings. Predictive accuracy (R^2 and AUC) for MRS trained within only Latino/Hispanic- or white-non-Latino/Hispanic-identifying individuals compared to the accuracy trained on the entire, cross-ethnic cohort.

decreased (for chronic renal disease from $p=6.81e-51$ to $p=3.13e-29$, creatinine $p=1.27e-95$ to $p=3.14e-62$, and urea nitrogen $p=2.50e-87$ to $p=8.44e-34$). However, likely due to correlation between CpGs, the association tests for outcomes trained on the smaller set of sites were still significant.

Second, we expanded our replication analyses to include phenotypes that were unrelated to kidney function. In these analyses, we revisited epigenome-wide association studies (EWAS) of Schizophrenia [64] and Rheumatoid Arthritis [65] and imputed commonly prescribed medications for each dataset—for Schizophrenia we used phenothiazines, and for Rheumatoid Arthritis we used glucocorticosteroids. To ensure our MRS captured medication intake status and were not merely serving as proxies for the disease, we re-trained our models while conditioning on the trait of interest. The imputed phenothiazine intake was significantly associated with Schizophrenia case-control status ($p=8.71e-04$, AUC=.568 [.527,.611]) and the imputed glucocorticosteroids usage was significantly associated with Rheumatoid Arthritis case-control status ($p=2.72e-07$, AUC=.626 [.584,.669]). Weights for both medications were trained on CpGs corresponding to those present on the HumanMethylation450k array and also included their corresponding disease in the baseline set of covariates. Accordingly, the association signal of phenothiazines dropped from $1.14e-07$ to $3.99e-05$ and the performance of glucocorticoids dropped from $1.35e-16$ to $1.82e-15$ when compared to the MRS trained on the set of EPIC array CpGs and with the baseline features as covariates.

3 Methods

Electronic Health Record Data De-identified electronic health record data for this study was extracted from the perioperative data warehouse (PDW), a custom-built, robust data warehouse containing all patients who have undergone surgery at UCLA Health since the implementation of UCLA’s EMR (EPIC Systems, Madison, WI, USA) in March 2013. The PDW, which has been described previously [66], has a two-stage design. First, data are extracted from EPIC’s Clarity database into 29 tables organised around three distinct concepts: patients, surgical procedures, and health system encounters. Then, these data are used to populate a series of 4000 distinct measures and metrics such as procedure duration, admission ICD codes, lab results, and medication orders.

Patient Ascertainment Methylation and genotype samples were collected using blood from 831 patients as part of the UCLA ATLAS precision health initiative between October 26, 2016 and December 10, 2018 [67]. The samples were collected from patients before undergoing surgery with general anesthesia at UCLA Health, and the patients had not undergone surgery in the 30 days prior to blood sample collection. Of these patients, 302 were selected for inclusion based on the presence of acute kidney injury (AKI), defined as an Acute Kidney Injury Network (AKIN) classification of one or greater, after undergoing surgery. An additional 348 patients were risk-matched controls, with either glomerular filtration rate (GFR) less than or equal to 38 (210 patients), or GFR greater than 38 and a propensity risk score that matched case patients (348 patients). The propensity score was created using available EHR features such as age, weight, BMI, and other preoperative features that were measured in the hospital. Within the control group, we also performed a similar procedure ascertained on whether individuals were a heart attack case. Controls for heart attack patients were also selected using propensity scoring. Demographics of the patient population are further described in Table S1.

Medication Usage For each medication, a patient was labeled as using a medication if the electronic health record contained a medication order that occurred before the methylation sample collection date. Medications were grouped by pharmaceutical subclass using the Generic Product Identifier (GPI) hierarchical classification system codes. Any medications that were ordered in fewer than 5% of the patients were excluded from the analysis. In total, 168 pharmaceutical subclasses were considered in our analysis. The number of patients using medications from each subclass is shown in Supplemental Table S8. In Supplemental Table S9, we show for each pharmaceutical subclass the specific medication that patients in our cohort received.

Lab Results The most recent lab result prior to the methylation sample collection was extracted from the PDW for each patient. Any labs with a result date that occurred more than 365 days before the methylation sample collection date were excluded from the analyses. Additionally, labs for which there were less than 50 patients with valid results were excluded. We were left with a total of 69 lab values on which to run our models.

Diagnosis Codes International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) and International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes are a standard set of diagnosis codes, primarily used for billing purposes. While these codes provide a standardized methodology for describing a diagnosis, they are very specific. To map these specific diagnosis codes into meaningful, distinct diseases/traits, Denny et al. aggregated the ICD codes into phenotype codes (Phecodes) [43, 44]. Specifically, for each patient, we queried all diagnoses prior to the methylation sample collection date, and used the Phecode (version 1.2) mapping to aggregate ICD-9 and ICD-10 codes to unique, meaningful phenotypes. If a patient’s diagnosis record had both ICD-9 and ICD-10 labels, the ICD-10 to Phecode mapping was used instead of the ICD-9 to Phecode mapping. Each Phecode was treated as a binary variable, indicating the presence or absence of a relevant diagnosis code at any point in time before sample collection. We

excluded rare Phecodes (occurrence less than 5% of the patients) and, in total, our cohort contained 370 unique Phecode phenotypes.

Preprocessing of genotype data for cross-validation We measured the genotypes for 831 individuals based on their DNA sampled from whole blood using the ATLAS genotype array. We preprocessed the genotype data using Beagle (d20) [68], PLINK (1.07) [56], and GCTA (1.93.2) [69]. We restricted the genotypes to autosomal variants, removed rare variants ($MAF < .05$), and filtered for variants that met Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium with p-value threshold 10^{-6} . We also removed individuals and variants with more than 1% missing values. For the purpose of running cross-validation, we used Beagle to impute only any remaining missing values, but did not impute to an external dataset. We show that with our sample size and phenotypes evaluated, using genotypes imputed to an external reference does not significantly improve our results (Figure S14). In total we were left with 292,808 SNPs. To obtain principal components, we ran PCA using plink on the chipped genotypes.

Preprocessing and imputation of genotype data for comparison to external models We used a version of the ATLAS genotype data that was imputed to an external dataset, as detailed in [67]. Briefly, after performing quality control, genotypes were uploaded the Michigan Imputation Server [70]. The server phases the genotype data using Eagle v2.4 [71] and performs imputation using the TOPMed Freeze5 imputation panel [72] using minimac4[73]. We applied the same quality control and filters to the imputed genotypes as we did the chipped genotypes, and we were left with a total of 5,574,956 SNPs.

Preprocessing of methylation array data We measured methylation data for 831 individuals based on their DNA sampled from whole blood using the EPIC Illumina array. To generate beta-normalized methylation levels at each CpG, we ran the default pipeline of ENmix (1.22.0) [74] on the the raw probe data (IDAT files), which performs background correction, RELIC dye bias correction, and RCP probe-type bias adjustment. We removed from our analysis CpGs that coincided with SNP loci as well as CpGs on the sex chromosome. We also filtered out outlier samples, defined as having a PC score more than 4 standard deviations away from the average PC score in the first two principal components. In the imputation tasks, we removed sites with low variability (standard deviation < 0.02) leading to a total of 269,471 sites.

Imputation using baseline medical features To establish a baseline level of imputation performance, we constructed a set of features derived from basic patient information. We trained a simple linear (or logistic) model with 10-fold cross validation using an intercept and patients' age, sex, BMI, methylation-based cell-type proportions (from the reference-based method of Houseman et al. [42]), self-reported ancestry, first ten genetic principal components, and smoking status (never, former or current). Importantly, we wished to establish how well an outcome (medication, Phecode, or lab value) could be imputed by using covariates (e.g. ancestry, age, smoking status) that are known to be captured by genomics.

Imputation using a single penalized linear model After establishing a baseline level of imputation performance, we performed penalized logistic and linear regression using either individuals' methylation, genotypes, or both. More concretely, we fit 10-fold cross-validation using LASSO, elastic net and ridge regularization under the following two models:

$$y = \alpha_G + G\beta_G + C\beta_C + \varepsilon_G \quad (2)$$

$$y = \alpha_M + M\beta_M + C\beta_C + \varepsilon_M \quad (3)$$

where y corresponds to the outcome, α the model-specific intercept, G the $n \times s$ genotypes, M the $n \times c$ methylation data, β the vector of length- s or $-c$ effect sizes for the given explanatory variable,

C and β_C the covariates from the baseline model and their corresponding effect sizes, and ε the length n noise vector. We refer to models (2) and (3) as the PRS and MRS respectively, and note that they also include the baseline features. After fitting all three penalized linear models for a given datatype and outcome, we selected a final model as determined by the model with the highest cross-validated metric (AUC or R^2 if the outcome was binary or continuous, respectively). We fit all penalized models using package *bigstatsr*[41]. We share MRS weights for outcomes that were significantly imputed at https://github.com/cozygene/EHR_MRS_UCLA. We also include details on the number of CpGs selected for each MRS in these analyses in Supplemental Tables S5, S6, and S7.

Imputing lab results using EHR data and MRS values with softImpute Imputing a partially-observed matrix of values is often formulated as a matrix-completion problem. In a matrix completion problem, the observed values of the matrix are used to estimate the values of the unobserved values by assuming that there is some underlying structure that is responsible for generating the data. For example, in the popular SoftImpute method [39], the data is assumed to be well-approximated by a low-rank representation, and the error between the observed values and the reconstructed values is minimized through a convex optimization procedure. However, since the unobserved values are, by definition, not observed, and therefore cannot be used to assess the imputation performance, the primary method for measuring the performance involves masking (removing) observed values and comparing the imputed values to these held-out, true values.

The EHR data used in the imputation procedure included demographic information, diagnosis codes, medication usage, and lab results, which were extracted from the EHR database using the previously described criteria. In addition to the EHR data, we also ran the imputation procedure while including relevant MRS values. Specifically, we included the MRS values for demographics, diagnosis codes, medication usage, and lab results that were imputed at a statistically significant level. These MRS values were added as additional observed features to the EHR matrix.

To estimate the imputation performance, we randomly masked 10% of the observed lab result values, and performed the imputation procedure (SoftImpute matrix completion) to generate estimates of the missing values. However, since labs are most often ordered in panels, for example a metabolic panel, if a lab is missing then typically other labs that are part of the same panel are also missing. We simulated a more realistic missingness scenario by, instead of masking out values only from a specific lab l , masking out all labs that are ordered as a panel that include lab l . This masking procedure was done per lab, using 10-fold cross-validation, such that 10% of the non-missing values of a particular lab result (and its associated lab panels) were masked (removed), and the remaining 90% of the observed values were used to complete the matrix. Matrix completion was performed using the SoftImpute algorithm, as implemented in the *fancyimpute* [75] python package (version 0.5.5). The proportion of variance explained (R^2) of the true lab values by the imputed lab values was used to measure the imputation performance. Confidence intervals were derived using bootstrapping.

Hypothesis testing To determine whether an imputation was significant or whether one predictor offered significant additional explanatory signal, we conducted our hypothesis tests using a linear (logistic) regression framework. Primarily, after running cross-validation or generating a single predictor $\hat{y}$ for an outcome y , we would test whether the imputation was significant by comparing it to y :

$$y = \alpha + \hat{y}\beta + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

Where Equation (4) corresponded to linear regression when the outcome was continuous, and logistic regression when the outcome was binary, α was the intercept, and β was an effect size indicating association of the predictor with the outcome. Notably, by building our testing framework as a linear model, we can easily extend it to include additional predictors in order to test whether the additional predictors significantly improve the fit of the regression—or more simply, whether predictor $\hat{y}_j$ offers additional predictive power over $\hat{y}_i$ by conducting a likelihood ratio test of the following nested models:

$$y = \alpha_i + \hat{y}_i \beta_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (5)$$

$$y = \alpha_{ij} + \hat{y}_i \beta_i + \hat{y}_j \beta_j + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (6)$$

Where i and j index either the baseline, MRS, or PRS models. We corrected for multiple hypothesis tests within each outcome and method by using a Bonferroni adjustment at α level .05.

Imputing external polygenic risk scores into the ATLAS cohort We compared our in-house built risk scores to risk scores learned in the UKBiobank dataset[51, 53]. In both [51, 53] the authors construct their PRS using penalized regression akin to as we have done in our analyses. Notably, using penalized regression on individual-level genotypes allows one to automatically, optimally control for shrinkage and variable selection at the step of model generation[41, 76]. This is in contrast with many commonly used polygenic risk score tools such as LDpred[77] or PRSCS[78], that attempt to perform shrinkage or variable selection post-hoc on the level of summary statistics. After downloading the PRS from the PGS catalog[55] listed in Supplementary Table S10, we imputed PRS into our cohort using our imputed genotypes using the score function of Plink. To account for population structure, we limited our analysis to individuals who self-identified as white, and passed filtering using manual inspection of principal components (Figure S9).

Ethical approval and patient consent Retrospective data collection and analysis was approved by the UCLA IRB. All research was conducted in accordance with the tenets set forth in the Declaration of Helsinki.

Data availability The MRS weights for outcomes that were significantly imputed are located at: https://github.com/cozygene/EHR_MRS_UCLA. The raw UCLA datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to institutional restrictions on data sharing and privacy concerns.

4 Discussion

In this study, we provide a comprehensive investigation of the utility of methylation risk scores in a clinical setting. We used (to our knowledge) the largest methylation biobank cohort produced to date, which includes methylation, genotype, and comprehensive EHR data for all patients. We find that the MRS improved imputation performance over a baseline model by 10.65%, 156.31%, and 14.59% when predicting medication usage, lab panel values, and diagnosis codes respectively. These contributions are significantly more substantial than those obtained by PRS.

The vision of genomic biobanks is that the genomic data will be translated into improved clinical diagnosis and treatment decisions [12, 13, 79]. In practice, clinical decisions are not expected to be based solely on genomic information, but rather on the combination of the genomic, medical, and demographic information of the patient. While previous studies have used a limited number of key features as a baseline for imputation of a phenotype (e.g., age, sex, and major comorbidities) [50, 80–82], to the best of our knowledge, these studies did not take into account the entire familial-genetic or environmental history of the patients. Thus, the question of whether genomic data (methylation or genetics) can be used to improve imputation over the EHR data is critical in order to claim clinical relevance. Our results demonstrate that adding MRS to existing EHR-based imputation frameworks improve imputation accuracy by over 29% in a clinical context.

It is well appreciated that PRS are sensitive to the studied population, and it is often the case that a PRS developed for one ethnic group performs poorly on others [57, 59]. It is therefore important to evaluate the population effect on MRS performance. For this reason, we measured the transferability

of our results across different populations, and we observe that the accuracy of the MRS was robust to population structure. This is likely driven by the diversity of the training cohort used, but also due to the fact that we are under-powered to discover subtle differences in imputation accuracy due to our sample sizes. Nonetheless, since we observed very few large differences in accuracy across populations, we are hopeful that our results will inspire future investigations to continue to recruit diverse cohorts and to examine these differences at length with greater sample sizes.

While our study was focused on methylation, there are many other possibilities for the introduction of genomic data in clinical settings. First and foremost, genetic data has been heavily studied by others and large biobanks including genetic data of patients already exists. However, other measurements such as RNA, microbiome, metabolomics, or proteomics may also be relevant. Some of these have logistic and cost considerations at scale. One of the advantages of methylation is that DNA biobanks already exist in large numbers, and the cost of measuring methylation is close to that of measuring genetic data. Moreover, different genomic measurements may provide different snapshots of the patient's data, risk, or health status. Methylation, for example, is known to capture one's smoking status[26], and may therefore be particularly useful for cases in which researchers intend to use self-reported features that may suffer from patient recall bias or honesty. Tangentially, while polygenic risk scores provide a lifetime risk for a patient, methylation risk scores may provide the current risk of the patient over the last few months [83–85], and other genomic information may provide risk with the resolution of days or hours (e.g., RNA or certain metabolomics [86–89]). Nonetheless, owing to the dynamic nature of methylation, it is currently unclear what the range or duration of the methylation risk score are. Furthermore, while methylation patterns are associated with outcomes, it is generally unknown if they cause a disease or are a response to a disease [90].

To assist the research community in investigating methylation in the context of disease, we provide the MRS predictors for all significantly predicted outcomes at https://github.com/cozygene/EHR_MRS_UCLA. While our samples were ascertained on kidney and heart disease, we show that our weights successfully replicated across three internal datasets, including studies of Rheumatoid Arthritis and Schizophrenia. Consequently, our weights may be used by researchers and clinicians in different ways. For example, in many epigenome-wide association studies (EWAS), in which associations between specific methylation CpG sites and a phenotype are studied, one may wish to account for patients' comorbidities and medications, which are often not available to the study. Using the MRS database, the researchers leveraging EWAS will be able to incorporate such covariates into their model.

There are multiple potential next steps for the examination of methylation in clinical contexts. First, in this work we focused our attention on the imputation of the phenotypes, or in other words, the inference as to whether the patient is currently diagnosed with a disease. We hope that our findings will be able to be translated to the inference of future clinical events, i.e., prediction of future deterioration or disease occurrence. Second, our analyses did not focus on generating models for a specific patient demographic (e.g. only senior patients) and we were limited to methylation collected from blood samples. As methylation is known to vary across age and tissue type, models may be improved by focusing on individuals of a specific demographic, or by assaying a tissue relevant for a given phenotype (e.g. liver tissue for metabolic disorders). Third, although our evaluation is across the largest dataset which includes both EHR, methylation, and genotype data, the sample size of our study is still moderate compared to genetic studies that are performed on biobanks. Indeed, we demonstrate that for some of the phenotypes, an increase in sample size will likely lead to a substantially improved imputation accuracy (Figure 3). Moreover, larger sample size data may be able to reveal the quantity or contribution of genetics versus methylation to the MRS imputation accuracy [49]. In light of our results, as well as the fact that many biobanks have already obtained blood or DNA samples, we recommend that future biobanks consider measuring methylation in addition to the genotypes across a large number of patients.

Competing Interests I.H. is the president of Clarity Healthcare Analytics Inc, a company that assists hospitals with extracting and using data from their electronic medical records. The company currently owns the rights to the PDW software that was used to extract data from the electronic health record. I.H. receives research funding from Merck Pharmaceuticals. M.C. is a consultant for Edwards Lifesciences (Irvine, CA) and Masimo Corp (Irvine, CA), and has funded research from Edwards Lifesciences and Masimo Corp. He is also the founder of Sironis and he owns patents and receives royalties for closed loop hemodynamic management technologies that have been licensed to Edwards Lifesciences. E.H. is senior vice president of AI/ML at OptumLabs (Minnetonka, MN). The other authors declare no competing interests concerning this article.

Author Contribution IPH, E.H., N.Z., B.H., and M.T. conceived of study. M.T. and B.H. performed data analysis under significant contribution and input from S.S., N.R., J.N.C., M.C. and I.H. IPH, N.R., E.H., M.C., I.H., J.N.C. contributed to data acquisition and design. All authors contributed to manuscript writing.

References

- [1] Cathie Sudlow, John Gallacher, et al. “UK Biobank: An Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a Wide Range of Complex Diseases of Middle and Old Age”. In: *PLOS Medicine* 12.3 (Mar. 2015), e1001779–.
- [2] Catherine A McCarty, Russell A Wilke, et al. “Marshfield Clinic Personalized Medicine Research Project (PMRP): design, methods and recruitment for a large population-based biobank”. In: *Personalized Medicine* 2.1 (2005), pp. 49–79.
- [3] D M Roden, J M Pulley, et al. “Development of a large-scale de-identified DNA biobank to enable personalized medicine.” In: *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 84.3 (2008), pp. 362–369.
- [4] Lisa Bastarache, Jacob J. Hughey, et al. “Phenotype risk scores identify patients with unrecognized Mendelian disease patterns”. In: *Science* 359.6381 (2018), pp. 1233–1239.
- [5] Tim Hulsen, Saumya S. Jamuar, et al. “From Big Data to Precision Medicine”. In: *Frontiers in Medicine* 6 (2019), p. 34.
- [6] Huiying Liang, Brian Y. Tsui, et al. “Evaluation and accurate diagnoses of pediatric diseases using artificial intelligence”. In: *Nature Medicine* 25.3 (2019), pp. 433–438.
- [7] Michelle M. Clark, Amber Hildreth, et al. “Diagnosis of genetic diseases in seriously ill children by rapid whole-genome sequencing and automated phenotyping and interpretation”. In: *Science Translational Medicine* 11.489 (2019).
- [8] Kristin M Corey, Sehj Kashyap, et al. “Development and validation of machine learning models to identify high-risk surgical patients using automatically curated electronic health record data (Pythia): A retrospective, single-site study”. In: *PLOS Medicine* 15.11 (Nov. 2018), e1002701–e1002701. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002701>.
- [9] Brian L. Hill, Robert Brown, et al. “An automated machine learning-based model predicts postoperative mortality using readily-extractable preoperative electronic health record data”. English. In: *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 123.6 (Dec. 2019). Publisher: Elsevier, pp. 877–886. ISSN: 0007-0912, 1471-6771. DOI: 10.1016/j.bja.2019.07.030. URL: [https://bjanaesthesia.org/article/S0007-0912\(19\)30646-4/abstract](https://bjanaesthesia.org/article/S0007-0912(19)30646-4/abstract) (visited on 05/26/2021).
- [10] Amit V Khera, Mark Chaffin, et al. “Genome-wide polygenic scores for common diseases identify individuals with risk equivalent to monogenic mutations.” In: *Nat Genet* 50.9 (2018), pp. 1219–1224.
- [11] Nasim Mavaddat, Kyriaki Michailidou, et al. “Polygenic Risk Scores for Prediction of Breast Cancer and Breast Cancer Subtypes.” In: *Am J Hum Genet* 104.1 (2019), pp. 21–34.
- [12] Cathryn M Lewis and Saskia P Hagenaars. “Progressing Polygenic Medicine in Psychiatry Through Electronic Health Records.” In: *JAMA Psychiatry* 76.5 (2019), pp. 470–472.
- [13] Cathryn M. Lewis and Evangelos Vassos. “Polygenic risk scores: from research tools to clinical instruments”. In: *Genome Medicine* 12.1 (2020), p. 44.
- [14] Miklos D. Kertai, Jonathan D. Mosley, et al. “Predictive Accuracy of a Polygenic Risk Score for Postoperative Atrial Fibrillation After Cardiac Surgery”. In: *Circulation: Genomic and Precision Medicine* 14.2 (2021), e003269.
- [15] Feras Hatib, Zhongping Jian, et al. “Machine-learning Algorithm to Predict Hypotension Based on High-fidelity Arterial Pressure Waveform Analysis”. In: *Anesthesiology* 129.4 (Oct. 2018), pp. 663–674. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0000000000002300>.

- 577 [16] Marije Wijnberge, Bart F. Geerts, et al. “Effect of a Machine Learning–Derived Early Warning
578 System for Intraoperative Hypotension vs Standard Care on Depth and Duration of Intraoperative
579 Hypotension During Elective Noncardiac Surgery: The HYPE Randomized Clinical Trial”. en. In:
580 *JAMA* (Feb. 2020). DOI: 10.1001/jama.2020.0592. URL: [https://jamanetwork.com/journals/
581 jama/fullarticle/2761469](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2761469) (visited on 02/19/2020).
- 582 [17] Varun Gulshan, Lily Peng, et al. “Development and Validation of a Deep Learning Algorithm
583 for Detection of Diabetic Retinopathy in Retinal Fundus Photographs”. en. In: *JAMA* 316.22
584 (Dec. 2016), pp. 2402–2410. ISSN: 0098-7484. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2016.17216. URL: [https :
585 //jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2588763](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2588763) (visited on 05/20/2019).
- 586 [18] Emma Beede, Elizabeth Baylor, et al. “A Human-Centered Evaluation of a Deep Learning System
587 Deployed in Clinics for the Detection of Diabetic Retinopathy”. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI
588 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI ’20. New York, NY, USA: Association
589 for Computing Machinery, Apr. 2020, pp. 1–12. ISBN: 978-1-4503-6708-0. DOI: 10.1145/3313831.
590 3376718. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376718> (visited on 05/25/2021).
- 591 [19] Amirata Ghorbani, David Ouyang, et al. “Deep learning interpretation of echocardiograms”. en.
592 In: *npj Digital Medicine* 3.1 (Jan. 2020). Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, pp. 1–10.
593 ISSN: 2398-6352. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-019-0216-8. URL: [https://www.nature.com/articles/
594 s41746-019-0216-8](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41746-019-0216-8) (visited on 05/14/2021).
- 595 [20] Antônio H. Ribeiro, Manoel Horta Ribeiro, et al. “Automatic diagnosis of the 12-lead ECG using
596 a deep neural network”. en. In: *Nature Communications* 11.1 (Apr. 2020). Number: 1 Publisher:
597 Nature Publishing Group, p. 1760. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-020-15432-4. URL:
598 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-15432-4> (visited on 02/25/2021).
- 599 [21] Awni Y Hannun, Pranav Rajpurkar, et al. “Cardiologist-level arrhythmia detection and classifi-
600 cation in ambulatory electrocardiograms using a deep neural network”. In: *Nature Medicine* 25.1
601 (2019), pp. 65–69. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-018-0268-3. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-
602 018-0268-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0268-3).
- 603 [22] Matthieu Komorowski, Leo A Celi, et al. “The Artificial Intelligence Clinician learns optimal treat-
604 ment strategies for sepsis in intensive care”. In: *Nature Medicine* (2018). DOI: 10.1038/s41591-
605 018-0213-5. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0213-5>.
- 606 [23] Paige Maas, Myrto Barrdahl, et al. “Breast Cancer Risk From Modifiable and Nonmodifiable
607 Risk Factors Among White Women in the United States”. In: *JAMA Oncology* 2.10 (Oct. 2016),
608 pp. 1295–1302.
- 609 [24] Fredrick R Schumacher, Ali Amin Al Olama, et al. “Association analyses of more than 140,000 men
610 identify 63 new prostate cancer susceptibility loci.” In: *Nat Genet* 50.7 (2018), pp. 928–936.
- 611 [25] Anke Hüls and Darina Czamara. “Methodological challenges in constructing DNA methylation risk
612 scores”. In: *Epigenetics* 15.1-2 (2020), pp. 1–11.
- 613 [26] Ken Lee and Zdenka Pausova. “Cigarette smoking and DNA methylation”. In: *Frontiers in Ge-
614 netics* 4 (2013), p. 132. ISSN: 1664-8021. DOI: 10.3389/fgene.2013.00132. URL: [https://www.
615 frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fgene.2013.00132](https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fgene.2013.00132).
- 616 [27] Joshua M Galanter, Christopher R Gignoux, et al. “Differential methylation between ethnic sub-
617 groups reflects the effect of genetic ancestry and environmental exposures”. In: *eLife* 6 (2017),
618 e20532.
- 619 [28] Elizabeth Hibler, Lei Huang, et al. “Impact of a diet and activity health promotion intervention on
620 regional patterns of DNA methylation”. In: *Clinical Epigenetics* 11.1 (2019), p. 133.
- 621 [29] Alexandra J White, Dale P Sandler, et al. “Recreational and household physical activity at different
622 time points and DNA global methylation.” In: *Eur J Cancer* 49.9 (2013), pp. 2199–2206.

- [30] Fang Fang Zhang, Alfredo Morabia, et al. “Dietary Patterns Are Associated with Levels of Global Genomic DNA Methylation in a Cancer-Free Population”. In: *The Journal of Nutrition* 141.6 (Apr. 2011), pp. 1165–1171.
- [31] Katherine J Dick, Christopher P Nelson, et al. “DNA methylation and body-mass index: a genome-wide analysis”. In: *The Lancet* 383.9933 (2014), pp. 1990–1998.
- [32] Victor V Levenson. “DNA methylation as a universal biomarker”. In: *Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics* 10.4 (May 2010), pp. 481–488.
- [33] Katarzyna Kamińska, Ewelina Nalejska, et al. “Prognostic and Predictive Epigenetic Biomarkers in Oncology”. In: *Molecular Diagnosis & Therapy* 23.1 (2019), pp. 83–95.
- [34] Audrey Y. Chu, Adrienne Tin, et al. “Epigenome-wide association studies identify DNA methylation associated with kidney function”. In: *Nature Communications* 8.1 (2017), p. 1286.
- [35] Yun Liu, Martin J Aryee, et al. “Epigenome-wide association data implicate DNA methylation as an intermediary of genetic risk in rheumatoid arthritis”. In: *Nature Biotechnology* 31 (Jan. 2013), 142 EP –.
- [36] Vardhman K. Rakyan, Huriya Beyan, et al. “Identification of Type 1 Diabetes–Associated DNA Methylation Variable Positions That Precede Disease Diagnosis”. In: *PLOS Genetics* 7.9 (Sept. 2011), pp. 1–9.
- [37] Jimmy L Huynh, Paras Garg, et al. “Epigenome-wide differences in pathology-free regions of multiple sclerosis–affected brains”. In: *Nature Neuroscience* 17.1 (2014), pp. 121–130.
- [38] Christopher G. Bell, Andrew E. Teschendorff, et al. “Genome-wide DNA methylation analysis for diabetic nephropathy in type 1 diabetes mellitus”. In: *BMC Medical Genomics* 3.1 (Aug. 2010), p. 33. ISSN: 1755-8794. DOI: 10.1186/1755-8794-3-33. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1755-8794-3-33> (visited on 05/04/2021).
- [39] Rahul Mazumder, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. “Spectral Regularization Algorithms for Learning Large Incomplete Matrices”. In: *Journal of machine learning research : JMLR* 11 (Mar. 2010), pp. 2287–2322. ISSN: 1532-4435. URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3087301/>.
- [40] Frank Dudbridge. “Power and Predictive Accuracy of Polygenic Risk Scores”. en. In: *PLOS Genetics* 9.3 (Mar. 2013). Publisher: Public Library of Science, e1003348. ISSN: 1553-7404. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1003348. URL: <https://journals.plos.org/plosgenetics/article?id=10.1371/journal.pgen.1003348> (visited on 05/03/2021).
- [41] Florian Privé, Hugues Aschard, et al. “Efficient analysis of large-scale genome-wide data with two R packages: bigstatsr and bigsnpr”. In: *Bioinformatics* 34.16 (Mar. 2018), pp. 2781–2787.
- [42] Eugene Andres Houseman, William P. Accomando, et al. “DNA methylation arrays as surrogate measures of cell mixture distribution”. en. In: *BMC Bioinformatics* 13.1 (May 2012), p. 86. ISSN: 1471-2105. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2105-13-86. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-13-86> (visited on 03/02/2021).
- [43] Joshua C. Denny, Marylyn D. Ritchie, et al. “PheWAS: demonstrating the feasibility of a phenome-wide scan to discover gene–disease associations”. en. In: *Bioinformatics* 26.9 (May 2010). Publisher: Oxford Academic, pp. 1205–1210. ISSN: 1367-4803. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btq126. URL: <https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/26/9/1205/201211> (visited on 11/24/2020).
- [44] Joshua C. Denny, Lisa Bastarache, et al. “Systematic comparison of phenome-wide association study of electronic medical record data and genome-wide association study data”. en. In: *Nature Biotechnology* 31.12 (Dec. 2013). Number: 12 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, pp. 1102–1111. ISSN: 1546-1696. DOI: 10.1038/nbt.2749. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/nbt.2749> (visited on 11/10/2020).

- [45] Ernest Beutler and Carol West. "Hematologic differences between African-Americans and whites: the roles of iron deficiency and alpha-thalassemia on hemoglobin levels and mean corpuscular volume." In: *Blood* 106.2 (2005), pp. 740–745.
- [46] Eunjung Lim, Jill Miyamura, and John J Chen. "Racial/Ethnic-Specific Reference Intervals for Common Laboratory Tests: A Comparison among Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and White." In: *Hawaii J Med Public Health* 74.9 (2015), pp. 302–310.
- [47] Steve Horvath. "DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types". In: *Genome Biology* 14.10 (2013), p. 3156.
- [48] Paula Singmann, Doron Shem-Tov, et al. "Characterization of whole-genome autosomal differences of DNA methylation between men and women". In: *Epigenetics & Chromatin* 8.1 (2015), p. 43. ISSN: 1756-8935. DOI: 10.1186/s13072-015-0035-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13072-015-0035-3>.
- [49] Daniel Trejo Banos, Daniel L. McCartney, et al. "Bayesian reassessment of the epigenetic architecture of complex traits". In: *Nature Communications* 11.1 (2020), p. 2865.
- [50] Brett K. Beaulieu-Jones, Daniel R. Lavage, et al. "Characterizing and Managing Missing Structured Data in Electronic Health Records: Data Analysis". EN. In: *JMIR Medical Informatics* 6.1 (Feb. 2018). Company: JMIR Medical Informatics Distributor: JMIR Medical Informatics Institution: JMIR Medical Informatics Label: JMIR Medical Informatics Publisher: JMIR Publications Inc., Toronto, Canada, e8960. DOI: 10.2196/medinform.8960. URL: <https://medinform.jmir.org/2018/1/e11> (visited on 02/10/2021).
- [51] Yosuke Tanigawa, Junyang Qian, et al. "Significant Sparse Polygenic Risk Scores across 813 traits in UK Biobank". In: *medRxiv* (2021).
- [52] Dragana Vuckovic, Erik L. Bao, et al. "The Polygenic and Monogenic Basis of Blood Traits and Diseases". In: *Cell* 182.5 (2020), 1214–1231.e11.
- [53] Nasa Sinnott-Armstrong, Yosuke Tanigawa, et al. "Genetics of 35 blood and urine biomarkers in the UK Biobank". In: *Nature Genetics* 53.2 (2021), pp. 185–194.
- [54] Cathie Sudlow, John Gallacher, et al. "UK Biobank: An Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a Wide Range of Complex Diseases of Middle and Old Age". en. In: *PLOS Medicine* 12.3 (Mar. 2015). Publisher: Public Library of Science, e1001779. ISSN: 1549-1676. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001779. URL: <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1001779> (visited on 04/30/2021).
- [55] Samuel A. Lambert, Laurent Gil, et al. "The Polygenic Score Catalog as an open database for reproducibility and systematic evaluation". In: *Nature Genetics* 53.4 (2021), pp. 420–425.
- [56] Shaun Purcell, Benjamin Neale, et al. "PLINK: A Tool Set for Whole-Genome Association and Population-Based Linkage Analyses". In: *American Journal of Human Genetics* 81.3 (Sept. 2007), pp. 559–575. ISSN: 0002-9297. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1950838/> (visited on 03/15/2021).
- [57] L. Duncan, H. Shen, et al. "Analysis of polygenic risk score usage and performance in diverse human populations". en. In: *Nature Communications* 10.1 (July 2019). Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, p. 3328. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-019-11112-0. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-019-11112-0> (visited on 05/04/2021).
- [58] Sini Kerminen, Alicia R. Martin, et al. "Geographic Variation and Bias in the Polygenic Scores of Complex Diseases and Traits in Finland". en. In: *The American Journal of Human Genetics* 104.6 (June 2019), pp. 1169–1181. ISSN: 0002-9297. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajhg.2019.05.001. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0002929719301879> (visited on 05/04/2021).

- 715 [59] Alicia R. Martin, Masahiro Kanai, et al. “Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health disparities”. en. In: *Nature Genetics* 51.4 (Apr. 2019). Number: 4 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, pp. 584–591. ISSN: 1546-1718. DOI: 10.1038/s41588-019-0379-x. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41588-019-0379-x> (visited on 05/04/2021).
- 716
- 717
- 718
- 719 [60] Elinor Rahmani, Liat Shenhav, et al. “Genome-wide methylation data mirror ancestry information”. In: *Epigenetics & Chromatin* 10.1 (Jan. 2017), p. 1. ISSN: 1756-8935. DOI: 10.1186/s13072-016-0108-y. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13072-016-0108-y> (visited on 12/04/2020).
- 720
- 721
- 722 [61] Richard T. Barfield, Lynn M. Almli, et al. “Accounting for Population Stratification in DNA Methylation Studies”. en. In: *Genetic Epidemiology* 38.3 (2014). eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/gepi.21789>. pp. 231–241. ISSN: 1098-2272. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/gepi.21789>. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/gepi.21789> (visited on 12/16/2020).
- 723
- 724
- 725
- 726 [62] Erika L. Moen, Xu Zhang, et al. “Genome-Wide Variation of Cytosine Modifications Between European and African Populations and the Implications for Complex Traits”. en. In: *Genetics* 194.4 (Aug. 2013). Publisher: Genetics Section: Investigations, pp. 987–996. ISSN: 0016-6731, 1943-2631. DOI: 10.1534/genetics.113.151381. URL: <https://www.genetics.org/content/194/4/987> (visited on 12/16/2020).
- 727
- 728
- 729
- 730
- 731 [63] Christopher G Bell, Andrew E Teschendorff, et al. “Genome-wide DNA methylation analysis for diabetic nephropathy in type 1 diabetes mellitus.” In: *BMC Med Genomics* 3 (2010), p. 33.
- 732
- 733 [64] Eilis Hannon, Emma Dempster, et al. “An integrated genetic-epigenetic analysis of schizophrenia: evidence for co-localization of genetic associations and differential DNA methylation.” In: *Genome Biol* 17.1 (2016), p. 176.
- 734
- 735
- 736 [65] Yun Liu, Martin J Aryee, et al. “Epigenome-wide association data implicate DNA methylation as an intermediary of genetic risk in rheumatoid arthritis.” In: *Nat Biotechnol* 31.2 (2013), pp. 142–147.
- 737
- 738
- 739 [66] Ira S Hofer, Eilon Gabel, et al. “A Systematic Approach to Creation of a Perioperative Data Warehouse”. In: *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 122.6 (2016). ISSN: 0003-2999. URL: https://journals.lww.com/anesthesia-analgesia/Fulltext/2016/06000/A_Systematic_Approach_to_Creation_of_a.25.aspx.
- 740
- 741
- 742
- 743 [67] Ruth Johnson, Yi Ding, et al. “Leveraging genomic diversity for discovery in an EHR-linked biobank: the UCLA ATLAS Community Health Initiative”. In: *medRxiv* (2021).
- 744
- 745 [68] Sharon R. Browning and Brian L. Browning. “Rapid and Accurate Haplotype Phasing and Missing-Data Inference for Whole-Genome Association Studies By Use of Localized Haplotype Clustering”. English. In: *The American Journal of Human Genetics* 81.5 (Nov. 2007). Publisher: Elsevier, pp. 1084–1097. ISSN: 0002-9297, 1537-6605. DOI: 10.1086/521987. URL: [https://www.cell.com/ajhg/abstract/S0002-9297\(07\)63882-8](https://www.cell.com/ajhg/abstract/S0002-9297(07)63882-8) (visited on 03/22/2021).
- 746
- 747
- 748
- 749
- 750 [69] Jian Yang, S. Hong Lee, et al. “GCTA: A Tool for Genome-wide Complex Trait Analysis”. In: *American Journal of Human Genetics* 88.1 (Jan. 2011), pp. 76–82. ISSN: 0002-9297. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajhg.2010.11.011. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3014363/> (visited on 03/22/2021).
- 751
- 752
- 753
- 754 [70] Sayantan Das, Lukas Forer, et al. “Next-generation genotype imputation service and methods.” In: *Nat Genet* 48.10 (2016), pp. 1284–1287.
- 755
- 756 [71] Po-Ru Loh, Petr Danecek, et al. “Reference-based phasing using the Haplotype Reference Consortium panel”. In: *Nature Genetics* 48.11 (2016), pp. 1443–1448.
- 757
- 758 [72] Daniel Taliun, Daniel N. Harris, et al. “Sequencing of 53,831 diverse genomes from the NHLBI TOPMed Program”. In: *Nature* 590.7845 (2021), pp. 290–299.
- 759
- 760 [73] Christian Fuchsberger, Gonçalo R Abecasis, and David A Hinds. “minimac2: faster genotype imputation.” In: *Bioinformatics* 31.5 (2015), pp. 782–784.
- 761

- 762 [74] Zongli Xu, Liang Niu, et al. "ENmix: a novel background correction method for Illumina Human-
763 Methylation450 BeadChip". In: *Nucleic Acids Research* 44.3 (Feb. 2016), e20. ISSN: 0305-1048. DOI:
764 10.1093/nar/gkv907. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4756845/>
765 (visited on 03/22/2021).
- 766 [75] Alex Rubinsteyn, Sergey Feldman, et al. "hammerlab/fancyimpute: Version 0.2.0". In: (Sept. 2017).
767 DOI: 10.5281/ZENODO.886614. URL: <https://zenodo.org/record/886614#.Wtfm0C-ZNTY>
768 (visited on 04/18/2018).
- 769 [76] Gad Abraham, Adam Kowalczyk, et al. "SparSNP: fast and memory-efficient analysis of all SNPs
770 for phenotype prediction." In: *BMC Bioinformatics* 13 (2012), p. 88.
- 771 [77] Bjarni J Vilhjálmsson, Jian Yang, et al. "Modeling Linkage Disequilibrium Increases Accuracy of
772 Polygenic Risk Scores". In: *American journal of human genetics* 97.4 (Oct. 2015), pp. 576–592.
- 773 [78] Tian Ge, Chia-Yen Chen, et al. "Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and continuous shrink-
774 age priors". In: *Nature Communications* 10.1 (2019), p. 1776.
- 775 [79] Daniel W Belsky. "Translating Polygenic Analysis for Prevention: From Who to How". In: *Circu-
776 lation. Cardiovascular genetics* 10.3 (June 2017), e001798.
- 777 [80] Ali Jazayeri, Ou Stella Liang, and Christopher C. Yang. "Imputation of Missing Data in Electronic
778 Health Records Based on Patients' Similarities". In: *Journal of Healthcare Informatics Research* 4.3
779 (2020), pp. 295–307.
- 780 [81] Riccardo Miotto, Li Li, et al. "Deep Patient: An Unsupervised Representation to Predict the Future
781 of Patients from the Electronic Health Records". In: *Scientific Reports* 6.1 (2016), p. 26094.
- 782 [82] Tao Zheng, Wei Xie, et al. "A machine learning-based framework to identify type 2 diabetes through
783 electronic health records". In: *International Journal of Medical Informatics* 97 (2017), pp. 120–127.
- 784 [83] Elinor Rahmani, Noah Zaitlen, et al. "Sparse PCA corrects for cell type heterogeneity in epigenome-
785 wide association studies". In: *Nature Methods* 13 (Mar. 2016). Publisher: Nature Publishing Group,
786 a division of Macmillan Publishers Limited. All Rights Reserved., p. 443. URL: [http://dx.doi.
787 org/10.1038/nmeth.3809](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3809).
- 788 [84] Steve Horvath. "DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types". In: *Genome Biology* 14.10
789 (Dec. 2013), p. 3156. ISSN: 1474-760X. DOI: 10.1186/gb-2013-14-10-r115. URL: [https://doi.
790 org/10.1186/gb-2013-14-10-r115](https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2013-14-10-r115) (visited on 05/03/2021).
- 791 [85] Kara N Fitzgerald, Romilly Hodges, et al. "Potential reversal of epigenetic age using a diet and
792 lifestyle intervention: a pilot randomized clinical trial". In: *Aging* 13.7 (Apr. 2021), pp. 9419–9432.
- 793 [86] Jiajia Li, Gregory R. Grant, et al. "Chapter Sixteen - Considerations for RNA-seq Analysis of
794 Circadian Rhythms". In: *Circadian Rhythms and Biological Clocks, Part A*. Ed. by Amita Sehgal.
795 Vol. 551. Methods in Enzymology. Academic Press, 2015, pp. 349–367.
- 796 [87] Alexessander Couto Alves, Craig A. Glastonbury, et al. "Fasting and time of day independently
797 modulate circadian rhythm relevant gene expression in adipose and skin tissue". In: *BMC Genomics*
798 19.1 (2018), p. 659.
- 799 [88] Romanas Chaleckis, Itsuo Murakami, et al. "Individual variability in human blood metabolites iden-
800 tifies age-related differences". In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113.16 (2016),
801 pp. 4252–4259.
- 802 [89] Gad Asher and Paolo Sassone-Corsi. "Time for food: the intimate interplay between nutrition,
803 metabolism, and the circadian clock." In: *Cell* 161.1 (2015), pp. 84–92.
- 804 [90] Caroline L Relton and George Davey Smith. "Two-step epigenetic Mendelian randomization: a
805 strategy for establishing the causal role of epigenetic processes in pathways to disease." In: *Int J
806 Epidemiol* 41.1 (2012), pp. 161–176.

Figure S1. Significantly predicted outcomes per data type. Total number of significantly predicted outcomes when using the baseline alone, as well as including either set of genomic features in addition to the baseline. We used an association test of the cross-validated predictors and the true outcome and adjusted for multiple testing using Bonferroni correction at a nominal threshold of 0.05.

Figure S2. Significantly predicted medications prescribed within one year of collection date or EHR history. Total number of significantly predicted medications when using the baseline alone, as well as including either set of genomic features in addition to the baseline. We used an association test of the cross-validated predictors and the true outcome and adjusted for multiple testing using Bonferroni correction at a nominal threshold of 0.05. Using a patient's entire EHR history to generate their list of medications resulted in more significant associations than using just the year prior to sample collection date.

Figure S3. Number of outcomes significantly improved when adding the corresponding predictor. Similarly to the tests in which we surveyed whether the MRS or PRS predictors added predictive power over the baseline predictor, we conducted an analysis in which we examined whether the MRS predictor adds predictive power over the PRS predictor (Green “Methylation”), and whether the PRS predictor adds predictive power over the MRS predictor (Blue “Genotypes”). The MRS predictor improved the performance of the PRS predictor for a substantial number of outcomes

Figure S4. Significantly predicted outcomes across baseline models. Total number of significantly predicted outcomes when using the baseline model with and without variables derived from genomics (ancestry principal components, methylation-estimated cell-type composition estimates). We used an association test of the cross-validated predictors and the true outcome and adjusted for multiple testing using Bonferroni correction at a nominal threshold of 0.05.

Figure S5. Significantly-predicted outcomes per data type The top 10 methylation-predicted (Left) medications, (Middle) labs, and (Right) Phecodes, with Baseline and Genotype prediction performance results for comparison.

		Missing	Overall
n			831
Age, mean (SD)		0	61.0 (15.8)
Sex, n (%)	F	0	352 (42.4)
	M		479 (57.6)
BMI, mean (SD)		1	27.2 (6.6)
AKIN Classification, n (%)	0.0	0	537 (64.6)
	1.0		189 (22.7)
	2.0		27 (3.2)
	3.0		78 (9.4)
GFR > 38, n (%)	False	0	375 (45.1)
	True		456 (54.9)
Heart Attack, n (%)	False	601	146 (63.5)
	True		84 (36.5)
Self-Reported Ethnicity, n (%)	Cuban	0	2 (0.2)
	Hispanic or Latino		116 (14.0)
	Hispanic/Spanish origin Other		14 (1.7)
	Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano/a		37 (4.5)
	Not Hispanic or Latino		655 (78.8)
	Patient Refused		5 (0.6)
	Puerto Rican		2 (0.2)
Self-Reported Race, n (%)	American Indian	0	2 (0.2)
	Asian		73 (8.8)
	Black		72 (8.7)
	Declined to Specify		6 (0.7)
	Other Race		132 (15.9)
	Pacific Islander		3 (0.4)
	Unknown		1 (0.1)
	White or Caucasian		542 (65.2)

Table S1. Cohort patient demographics. AKIN is the Acute Kidney Injury Network Classification, BMI is Body Mass Index, GFR is glomerular filtration rate.

Table S2. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting medication usage, grouped by pharmaceutical subclass, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Pharmaceutical Subclass	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
CMV Agents	0.80 (0.75-0.85)	0.90 (0.86-0.94)	0.79 (0.74-0.84)
Phosphate Binder Agents	0.73 (0.68-0.77)	0.88 (0.84-0.91)	0.74 (0.70-0.78)
Osmotic Diuretics	0.74 (0.69-0.78)	0.85 (0.81-0.88)	0.73 (0.68-0.78)
Hematopoietic Growth Factors	0.70 (0.66-0.75)	0.84 (0.81-0.87)	0.70 (0.66-0.75)
B-Complex w/ Folic Acid	0.69 (0.64-0.74)	0.84 (0.79-0.87)	0.67 (0.62-0.72)
Immunosuppressive Agents	0.77 (0.72-0.81)	0.83 (0.79-0.86)	0.76 (0.70-0.80)
Metabolic Modifiers	0.69 (0.63-0.74)	0.81 (0.77-0.86)	0.70 (0.63-0.75)
Prostatic Hypertrophy Agents	0.76 (0.72-0.79)	0.78 (0.74-0.81)	0.76 (0.71-0.79)
Antacids - Bicarbonate	0.78 (0.71-0.85)	0.78 (0.71-0.83)	0.75 (0.69-0.81)
Anti-infectives - Throat	0.72 (0.67-0.77)	0.77 (0.71-0.82)	0.72 (0.66-0.78)
Cycloplegic Mydriatics	0.76 (0.71-0.82)	0.75 (0.68-0.81)	0.76 (0.69-0.82)
Thrombolytic Enzymes	0.67 (0.60-0.74)	0.75 (0.68-0.81)	0.63 (0.56-0.70)
Plasma Proteins	0.67 (0.62-0.72)	0.74 (0.69-0.78)	0.66 (0.61-0.71)
Potassium Removing Agents	0.64 (0.59-0.70)	0.74 (0.69-0.79)	0.62 (0.56-0.67)
Cephalosporins - 4th Generation	0.67 (0.59-0.74)	0.73 (0.64-0.80)	0.65 (0.57-0.74)
Gallstone Solubilizing Agents	0.59 (0.50-0.69)	0.72 (0.64-0.79)	0.50 (0.41-0.59)
Imidazole-Related Antifungals	0.69 (0.64-0.73)	0.72 (0.67-0.77)	0.68 (0.63-0.73)
HMG CoA Reductase Inhibitors	0.72 (0.67-0.75)	0.72 (0.68-0.75)	0.71 (0.68-0.74)
Alkalinizers	0.70 (0.62-0.76)	0.71 (0.63-0.78)	0.68 (0.59-0.75)
Bone Density Regulators	0.70 (0.63-0.75)	0.71 (0.65-0.75)	0.70 (0.64-0.76)
Parenteral Therapy Supplies	0.52 (0.45-0.59)	0.71 (0.65-0.76)	0.60 (0.54-0.66)
Vasodilators	0.54 (0.49-0.59)	0.70 (0.66-0.75)	0.48 (0.43-0.52)
Salicylates	0.69 (0.65-0.72)	0.70 (0.66-0.73)	0.68 (0.64-0.72)
Ophthalmic Local Anesthetics	0.69 (0.63-0.76)	0.69 (0.63-0.76)	0.68 (0.61-0.76)
Proton Pump Inhibitors	0.62 (0.58-0.66)	0.69 (0.66-0.73)	0.61 (0.57-0.66)
Impotence Agents	0.70 (0.64-0.75)	0.68 (0.62-0.74)	0.67 (0.60-0.73)
Ophthalmic Steroids	0.70 (0.64-0.75)	0.68 (0.62-0.73)	0.68 (0.62-0.74)
Diabetic Supplies	0.64 (0.58-0.69)	0.67 (0.62-0.72)	0.62 (0.56-0.67)
Phosphate	0.65 (0.57-0.72)	0.67 (0.60-0.74)	0.60 (0.52-0.66)
Loop Diuretics	0.63 (0.60-0.67)	0.67 (0.63-0.71)	0.63 (0.59-0.67)
Antiseptics - Mouth/Throat	0.63 (0.57-0.68)	0.67 (0.62-0.73)	0.62 (0.54-0.67)
Anti-infective Agents - Misc.	0.61 (0.56-0.65)	0.67 (0.62-0.72)	0.60 (0.55-0.65)
Specialty Vitamins Products	0.60 (0.52-0.68)	0.67 (0.58-0.75)	0.61 (0.52-0.69)
Anti-infective Misc. - Combinations	0.64 (0.59-0.68)	0.67 (0.62-0.72)	0.62 (0.57-0.66)
Iron	0.66 (0.62-0.71)	0.67 (0.62-0.71)	0.66 (0.61-0.71)
Cephalosporins - 3rd Generation	0.62 (0.57-0.66)	0.66 (0.63-0.71)	0.61 (0.57-0.65)
Glucocorticosteroids	0.59 (0.55-0.63)	0.66 (0.63-0.70)	0.58 (0.54-0.62)
Antihistamines - Ethanolamines	0.62 (0.58-0.65)	0.66 (0.62-0.70)	0.62 (0.58-0.66)
Fluoroquinolones	0.54 (0.50-0.58)	0.66 (0.62-0.70)	0.52 (0.48-0.57)
Calcium	0.61 (0.57-0.65)	0.66 (0.62-0.71)	0.60 (0.56-0.64)
Benzodiazepines	0.61 (0.57-0.66)	0.66 (0.62-0.70)	0.61 (0.56-0.64)
Biguanides	0.67 (0.62-0.71)	0.66 (0.61-0.71)	0.65 (0.60-0.70)
Local Anesthetic Combinations	0.57 (0.53-0.62)	0.66 (0.61-0.70)	0.56 (0.52-0.61)

Continued on next page

Table S2. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting medication usage, grouped by pharmaceutical subclass, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Pharmaceutical Subclass	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Ophthalmics - Misc.	0.66 (0.60-0.72)	0.66 (0.60-0.71)	0.65 (0.60-0.70)
Antacid Combinations	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.66 (0.61-0.70)	0.62 (0.56-0.67)
Dibenzapines	0.62 (0.56-0.68)	0.66 (0.58-0.72)	0.58 (0.52-0.63)
Nitrates	0.64 (0.61-0.68)	0.66 (0.61-0.70)	0.63 (0.59-0.67)
Insulin	0.63 (0.58-0.67)	0.66 (0.61-0.69)	0.62 (0.57-0.66)
Liquid Vehicles	0.59 (0.51-0.67)	0.65 (0.58-0.73)	0.58 (0.51-0.66)
Alternative Medicine - M's	0.55 (0.49-0.61)	0.65 (0.59-0.71)	0.59 (0.52-0.64)
5-HT3 Receptor Antagonists	0.57 (0.53-0.60)	0.65 (0.61-0.69)	0.55 (0.51-0.60)
Antiperistaltic Agents	0.55 (0.48-0.62)	0.65 (0.57-0.73)	0.51 (0.44-0.58)
Analgesics Other	0.59 (0.55-0.63)	0.65 (0.61-0.68)	0.58 (0.54-0.62)
Carbohydrates	0.61 (0.57-0.65)	0.65 (0.61-0.69)	0.59 (0.54-0.64)
Laxatives - Miscellaneous	0.61 (0.57-0.65)	0.65 (0.61-0.68)	0.59 (0.55-0.64)
Alpha-Beta Blockers	0.57 (0.52-0.61)	0.65 (0.60-0.69)	0.57 (0.53-0.61)
Saline Laxatives	0.59 (0.54-0.63)	0.64 (0.60-0.70)	0.58 (0.54-0.62)
Potassium	0.59 (0.55-0.63)	0.64 (0.60-0.68)	0.58 (0.54-0.62)
Stimulant Laxatives	0.60 (0.56-0.64)	0.64 (0.60-0.68)	0.60 (0.56-0.64)
Urinary Anti-infectives	0.60 (0.53-0.67)	0.64 (0.55-0.71)	0.51 (0.42-0.58)
Calcium Channel Blockers	0.59 (0.56-0.63)	0.64 (0.60-0.67)	0.60 (0.56-0.63)
Glycopeptides	0.60 (0.56-0.65)	0.64 (0.59-0.68)	0.59 (0.54-0.63)
Magnesium	0.58 (0.54-0.62)	0.64 (0.60-0.67)	0.57 (0.53-0.61)
Heparins And Heparinoid-Like Agents	0.62 (0.58-0.65)	0.64 (0.60-0.67)	0.61 (0.57-0.64)
Bicarbonates	0.60 (0.53-0.67)	0.63 (0.56-0.70)	0.61 (0.53-0.68)
Electrolyte Mixtures	0.58 (0.55-0.62)	0.63 (0.60-0.67)	0.57 (0.54-0.61)
Thyroid Hormones	0.64 (0.58-0.69)	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.63 (0.58-0.68)
Antihypertensive Combinations	0.64 (0.56-0.70)	0.63 (0.57-0.71)	0.59 (0.50-0.67)
Folic Acid/Folates	0.61 (0.54-0.67)	0.63 (0.58-0.69)	0.60 (0.55-0.66)
Diagnostic Radiopharmaceuticals	0.58 (0.54-0.62)	0.63 (0.60-0.67)	0.57 (0.52-0.61)
Surfactant Laxatives	0.60 (0.57-0.64)	0.63 (0.58-0.66)	0.60 (0.56-0.64)
Thiazides and Thiazide-Like Diuretics	0.65 (0.61-0.71)	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.63 (0.58-0.67)
Expectorants	0.57 (0.47-0.65)	0.63 (0.54-0.72)	0.44 (0.36-0.52)
Platelet Aggregation Inhibitors	0.64 (0.59-0.68)	0.63 (0.58-0.67)	0.62 (0.58-0.67)
Antiflatulents	0.56 (0.50-0.61)	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.54 (0.48-0.60)
Vasopressors	0.57 (0.53-0.61)	0.62 (0.59-0.65)	0.55 (0.52-0.60)
Opioid Antagonists	0.60 (0.54-0.65)	0.62 (0.58-0.67)	0.60 (0.54-0.65)
Antibiotics - Topical	0.55 (0.50-0.60)	0.62 (0.58-0.67)	0.50 (0.45-0.56)
Antidiarrheal/Probiotic Agents - Misc.	0.56 (0.49-0.63)	0.62 (0.55-0.69)	0.51 (0.43-0.59)
Serotonin-Norepinephrine Reuptake Inhibitors (S...	0.68 (0.61-0.74)	0.62 (0.54-0.70)	0.66 (0.58-0.73)
Phenothiazines	0.52 (0.46-0.56)	0.62 (0.56-0.66)	0.46 (0.41-0.50)
Beta Blockers Cardio-Selective	0.54 (0.51-0.58)	0.61 (0.58-0.65)	0.53 (0.49-0.57)
Misc. Nutritional Substances	0.55 (0.49-0.59)	0.61 (0.56-0.67)	0.54 (0.49-0.59)
Alpha-2 Receptor Antagonists (Tetracyclics)	0.66 (0.56-0.75)	0.61 (0.51-0.70)	0.67 (0.58-0.75)
Bronchodilators - Anticholinergics	0.63 (0.58-0.67)	0.61 (0.56-0.67)	0.61 (0.56-0.66)
Tetracyclines	0.51 (0.45-0.59)	0.61 (0.56-0.67)	0.40 (0.35-0.46)

Continued on next page

Table S2. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting medication usage, grouped by pharmaceutical subclass, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Pharmaceutical Subclass	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Antacids - Calcium Salts	0.58 (0.53-0.63)	0.61 (0.56-0.66)	0.55 (0.48-0.60)
Penicillin Combinations	0.57 (0.52-0.61)	0.61 (0.56-0.65)	0.55 (0.51-0.60)
Gout Agents	0.65 (0.60-0.69)	0.61 (0.54-0.66)	0.63 (0.57-0.68)
Radiographic Contrast Media	0.61 (0.57-0.64)	0.61 (0.57-0.64)	0.60 (0.56-0.63)
Sodium	0.47 (0.43-0.52)	0.61 (0.56-0.65)	0.54 (0.48-0.59)
Diagnostic Tests	0.60 (0.55-0.65)	0.61 (0.55-0.66)	0.57 (0.52-0.63)
Sympathomimetics	0.59 (0.55-0.62)	0.61 (0.57-0.65)	0.57 (0.53-0.61)
Antiarrhythmics Type III	0.56 (0.48-0.62)	0.60 (0.53-0.67)	0.53 (0.46-0.61)
Antihistamines-Topical	0.48 (0.41-0.57)	0.60 (0.53-0.68)	0.39 (0.31-0.47)
Antidotes and Specific Antagonists	0.39 (0.33-0.46)	0.60 (0.54-0.67)	0.59 (0.52-0.65)
Coumarin Anticoagulants	0.62 (0.57-0.68)	0.60 (0.55-0.66)	0.58 (0.52-0.62)
Bacterial Vaccines	0.56 (0.51-0.62)	0.60 (0.55-0.65)	0.56 (0.52-0.61)
Genitourinary Irrigants	0.41 (0.36-0.46)	0.60 (0.55-0.65)	0.54 (0.49-0.59)
Anesthetics Topical Oral	0.63 (0.57-0.69)	0.60 (0.53-0.66)	0.60 (0.54-0.67)
Cobalamins	0.60 (0.54-0.65)	0.60 (0.55-0.66)	0.57 (0.52-0.63)
Posterior Pituitary Hormones	0.56 (0.50-0.62)	0.59 (0.53-0.66)	0.50 (0.43-0.56)
Gastrointestinal Stimulants	0.52 (0.47-0.57)	0.59 (0.55-0.65)	0.53 (0.48-0.57)
Antiadrenergic Antihypertensives	0.55 (0.48-0.60)	0.59 (0.54-0.65)	0.49 (0.43-0.54)
Angiotensin II Receptor Antagonists	0.61 (0.56-0.66)	0.59 (0.55-0.63)	0.58 (0.54-0.62)
Antitussives	0.50 (0.43-0.56)	0.59 (0.53-0.65)	0.50 (0.44-0.55)
B-Complex Vitamins	0.49 (0.41-0.57)	0.59 (0.47-0.67)	0.48 (0.40-0.56)
Cephalosporins - 1st Generation	0.55 (0.51-0.59)	0.59 (0.55-0.63)	0.53 (0.49-0.58)
Diagnostic Drugs	0.59 (0.54-0.63)	0.59 (0.54-0.63)	0.59 (0.54-0.63)
Potassium Sparing Diuretics	0.60 (0.53-0.66)	0.58 (0.52-0.66)	0.57 (0.50-0.64)
Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs)	0.59 (0.55-0.64)	0.58 (0.53-0.64)	0.57 (0.52-0.62)
Anesthetics - Misc.	0.53 (0.49-0.56)	0.58 (0.55-0.62)	0.52 (0.49-0.55)
Irrigation Solutions	0.58 (0.50-0.64)	0.58 (0.51-0.64)	0.55 (0.47-0.62)
Lozenges	0.58 (0.50-0.65)	0.58 (0.49-0.66)	0.51 (0.43-0.60)
Aminoglycosides	0.55 (0.48-0.62)	0.58 (0.50-0.64)	0.45 (0.38-0.54)
Non-Barbiturate Hypnotics	0.55 (0.51-0.59)	0.57 (0.53-0.61)	0.53 (0.49-0.57)
Ophthalmic Anti-infectives	0.61 (0.56-0.66)	0.57 (0.53-0.63)	0.61 (0.54-0.66)
Antiarrhythmics Type I-B	0.54 (0.50-0.58)	0.57 (0.54-0.62)	0.51 (0.48-0.55)
Oil Soluble Vitamins	0.57 (0.53-0.61)	0.57 (0.53-0.61)	0.59 (0.56-0.64)
Direct Factor Xa Inhibitors	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	0.57 (0.51-0.63)	0.57 (0.51-0.63)
H-2 Antagonists	0.52 (0.48-0.57)	0.57 (0.53-0.62)	0.50 (0.47-0.55)
Multivitamins	0.51 (0.46-0.55)	0.57 (0.52-0.62)	0.52 (0.47-0.57)
Hemostatics - Topical	0.57 (0.50-0.63)	0.57 (0.50-0.64)	0.53 (0.47-0.58)
Artificial Tears and Lubricants	0.56 (0.48-0.63)	0.57 (0.51-0.64)	0.58 (0.51-0.65)
Anti-inflammatory Agents - Topical	0.58 (0.52-0.65)	0.57 (0.51-0.64)	0.58 (0.51-0.64)
Opioid Agonists	0.58 (0.53-0.62)	0.57 (0.53-0.61)	0.55 (0.51-0.60)
Leukotriene Modulators	0.55 (0.46-0.63)	0.57 (0.48-0.66)	0.50 (0.40-0.57)
Antianxiety Agents - Misc.	0.58 (0.52-0.65)	0.57 (0.50-0.64)	0.53 (0.46-0.60)
Local Anesthetics - Amides	0.58 (0.53-0.62)	0.57 (0.53-0.61)	0.56 (0.51-0.60)

Continued on next page

Table S2. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting medication usage, grouped by pharmaceutical subclass, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Pharmaceutical Subclass	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Water Soluble Vitamins	0.57 (0.52-0.62)	0.57 (0.52-0.62)	0.56 (0.51-0.61)
Nondepolarizing Muscle Relaxants	0.56 (0.52-0.60)	0.57 (0.52-0.61)	0.54 (0.51-0.58)
Urinary Antispasmodic - Antimuscarinics (Antich...	0.59 (0.51-0.66)	0.57 (0.49-0.64)	0.59 (0.51-0.66)
Bulk Laxatives	0.53 (0.46-0.61)	0.56 (0.50-0.64)	0.53 (0.45-0.61)
Antiemetics - Anticholinergic	0.53 (0.46-0.60)	0.56 (0.50-0.63)	0.45 (0.39-0.51)
Aminopenicillins	0.55 (0.49-0.60)	0.56 (0.51-0.62)	0.54 (0.48-0.59)
Serotonin Modulators	0.53 (0.48-0.58)	0.56 (0.51-0.61)	0.53 (0.48-0.59)
Viral Vaccines	0.56 (0.51-0.61)	0.56 (0.51-0.60)	0.52 (0.47-0.57)
Laxative Combinations	0.57 (0.52-0.63)	0.56 (0.50-0.61)	0.55 (0.50-0.61)
Antimyasthenic/Cholinergic Agents	0.54 (0.50-0.59)	0.56 (0.50-0.60)	0.52 (0.46-0.58)
Azithromycin	0.59 (0.54-0.63)	0.55 (0.51-0.60)	0.57 (0.53-0.63)
Local Anesthetics - Topical	0.54 (0.49-0.58)	0.55 (0.51-0.60)	0.52 (0.47-0.56)
ACE Inhibitors	0.51 (0.47-0.55)	0.55 (0.50-0.60)	0.48 (0.43-0.52)
Herpes Agents	0.53 (0.45-0.59)	0.55 (0.48-0.62)	0.48 (0.41-0.55)
Influenza Agents	0.51 (0.44-0.58)	0.54 (0.48-0.61)	0.45 (0.38-0.53)
Beta Blockers Non-Selective	0.52 (0.44-0.59)	0.54 (0.45-0.64)	0.59 (0.50-0.69)
Sulfonylureas	0.59 (0.51-0.66)	0.54 (0.47-0.62)	0.61 (0.55-0.69)
Nasal Steroids	0.56 (0.51-0.60)	0.54 (0.50-0.59)	0.51 (0.46-0.57)
Antispasmodics	0.56 (0.52-0.60)	0.54 (0.50-0.58)	0.56 (0.52-0.59)
Cough/Cold/Allergy Combinations	0.58 (0.52-0.65)	0.54 (0.48-0.61)	0.55 (0.49-0.63)
Cephalosporins - 2nd Generation	0.52 (0.44-0.59)	0.54 (0.47-0.62)	0.49 (0.42-0.56)
Opioid Combinations	0.53 (0.49-0.57)	0.54 (0.50-0.58)	0.50 (0.46-0.53)
Anticonvulsants - Misc.	0.54 (0.49-0.58)	0.54 (0.50-0.58)	0.51 (0.47-0.55)
Multiple Vitamins w/ Minerals	0.58 (0.51-0.65)	0.54 (0.47-0.59)	0.54 (0.49-0.60)
Protamine	0.53 (0.46-0.61)	0.54 (0.44-0.64)	0.50 (0.39-0.59)
Lincosamides	0.52 (0.46-0.59)	0.53 (0.47-0.59)	0.52 (0.44-0.59)
Hemostatics - Systemic	0.46 (0.37-0.55)	0.53 (0.44-0.62)	0.54 (0.47-0.62)
Antihistamines - Non-Sedating	0.54 (0.47-0.60)	0.52 (0.46-0.57)	0.53 (0.46-0.58)
Acne Products	0.59 (0.49-0.66)	0.50 (0.41-0.60)	0.41 (0.33-0.50)
Miscellaneous Contrast Media	0.49 (0.46-0.53)	0.50 (0.46-0.54)	0.53 (0.49-0.57)
Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Agents (NSAIDs)	0.52 (0.49-0.57)	0.49 (0.45-0.53)	0.53 (0.48-0.57)
Toxoid Combinations	0.55 (0.49-0.63)	0.49 (0.42-0.57)	0.55 (0.48-0.63)
Corticosteroids - Topical	0.51 (0.46-0.56)	0.49 (0.43-0.53)	0.43 (0.38-0.47)
Tricyclic Agents	0.53 (0.44-0.61)	0.48 (0.39-0.56)	0.58 (0.51-0.65)
Central Muscle Relaxants	0.52 (0.48-0.57)	0.48 (0.43-0.52)	0.48 (0.43-0.53)
Depolarizing Muscle Relaxants	0.53 (0.47-0.58)	0.46 (0.40-0.51)	0.49 (0.43-0.54)
Antifungals - Topical	0.50 (0.44-0.55)	0.45 (0.40-0.50)	0.48 (0.43-0.54)
Cardiac Glycosides	0.52 (0.42-0.60)	0.43 (0.33-0.52)	0.54 (0.46-0.63)
Alternative Medicine - C's	0.53 (0.47-0.60)	0.37 (0.30-0.44)	0.51 (0.45-0.60)

Table S3. Mean (95% confidence interval) R^2 for predicting the most recent lab result using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping. Activated Partial Thromboplastin Time (APTT); Point of care (POC); Pulmonary function test (PFT); Forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1)

Lab Test	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Troponin	0.65 (0.53-0.74)	0.62 (0.51-0.72)	0.60 (0.50-0.70)
Creatinine	0.08 (0.01-0.13)	0.43 (0.38-0.47)	0.09 (0.04-0.13)
Troponin interpretation	0.46 (0.31-0.62)	0.41 (0.26-0.54)	0.33 (0.20-0.48)
Urea nitrogen	0.01 (-0.04-0.05)	0.40 (0.35-0.45)	0.03 (-0.00-0.05)
Absolute eosinophil count	-0.06 (-0.10-0.03)	0.33 (0.27-0.40)	-0.01 (-0.02-0.00)
Hemoglobin	0.10 (0.04-0.15)	0.28 (0.23-0.33)	0.10 (0.05-0.14)
Neutrophil percent (auto)	0.23 (0.12-0.32)	0.26 (0.18-0.33)	0.22 (0.13-0.30)
PFT FEV1 (pre)	0.12 (-0.18-0.36)	0.26 (0.07-0.38)	0.18 (-0.02-0.32)
Hematocrit	0.07 (0.02-0.11)	0.24 (0.20-0.28)	0.07 (0.04-0.11)
Mean corpuscular hemoglobin	0.07 (0.01-0.13)	0.20 (0.15-0.26)	0.08 (0.04-0.12)
Mean corpuscular volume	0.09 (0.03-0.14)	0.18 (0.12-0.24)	0.09 (0.04-0.13)
Absolute lymphocyte count	0.06 (-0.04-0.17)	0.17 (0.08-0.33)	0.10 (0.03-0.23)
Platelet count (auto)	-0.00 (-0.05-0.05)	0.16 (0.12-0.21)	0.02 (-0.00-0.04)
Absolute neutrophil count	0.08 (0.01-0.13)	0.15 (0.10-0.20)	0.08 (0.04-0.11)
Albumin	0.07 (0.01-0.13)	0.14 (0.08-0.18)	0.08 (0.04-0.12)
Chloride	-0.01 (-0.05-0.03)	0.13 (0.09-0.18)	0.01 (-0.01-0.03)
Absolute immature granulocyte count	-0.09 (-0.25-0.01)	0.13 (0.05-0.20)	-0.00 (-0.04-0.02)
Absolute monocyte count	0.08 (0.00-0.14)	0.12 (0.06-0.17)	0.07 (0.01-0.13)
White blood cell count	-0.01 (-0.07-0.04)	0.11 (0.05-0.19)	0.02 (-0.01-0.05)
Neutrophils absolute (prelim).	0.07 (0.01-0.13)	0.11 (0.06-0.18)	0.08 (0.03-0.13)
HgbA1C	-0.07 (-0.15-0.01)	0.11 (0.06-0.17)	-0.01 (-0.04-0.01)
Total protein	0.09 (0.03-0.14)	0.11 (0.06-0.16)	0.08 (0.04-0.12)
Sodium	-0.00 (-0.04-0.04)	0.10 (0.07-0.14)	0.03 (0.00-0.05)
Ferritin	-0.21 (-0.39-0.07)	0.10 (0.04-0.15)	-0.02 (-0.05-0.00)
Sedimentation rate erythrocyte	-0.10 (-0.38-0.12)	0.10 (-0.01-0.18)	0.08 (-0.01-0.17)
Iron binding capacity	-0.10 (-0.19-0.00)	0.09 (0.03-0.14)	-0.00 (-0.03-0.03)
Absolute basophil count	-0.10 (-0.25-0.02)	0.07 (0.05-0.11)	-0.01 (-0.02-0.00)
Glucose	-0.02 (-0.07-0.02)	0.07 (0.04-0.10)	0.01 (-0.01-0.02)
Qrs.duration	-0.04 (-0.11-0.02)	0.05 (0.00-0.08)	0.01 (-0.01-0.02)
Cholesterol HDL	0.03 (-0.07-0.12)	0.04 (-0.03-0.10)	0.06 (0.00-0.12)
Hematocrit OSL	-0.31 (-0.81-0.09)	0.04 (-0.13-0.19)	-0.05 (-0.22-0.08)
Cholesterol	-0.05 (-0.11-0.02)	0.03 (-0.02-0.08)	0.01 (-0.02-0.04)
Ventricular rate	-0.06 (-0.14-0.01)	0.03 (-0.00-0.06)	0.02 (-0.01-0.04)
Anion gap	-0.04 (-0.07-0.01)	0.02 (-0.00-0.05)	-0.00 (-0.02-0.01)
Alanine aminotransferase	-0.05 (-0.09-0.02)	0.02 (0.01-0.04)	-0.01 (-0.01-0.00)
R axis	-0.03 (-0.10-0.03)	0.01 (-0.01-0.04)	0.00 (-0.02-0.03)
Magnesium	-0.11 (-0.19-0.04)	0.01 (-0.02-0.05)	-0.00 (-0.03-0.02)
Alkaline phosphatase	-0.02 (-0.07-0.02)	0.01 (-0.01-0.03)	0.00 (-0.01-0.01)
T.axis	-0.08 (-0.19-0.01)	0.01 (-0.02-0.04)	-0.00 (-0.01-0.01)
Cholesterol LDL (calculated)	-0.10 (-0.22-0.02)	0.01 (-0.02-0.04)	-0.01 (-0.03-0.01)
Potassium	-0.03 (-0.07-0.00)	0.01 (-0.01-0.02)	-0.01 (-0.02-0.01)
Aspartate aminotransferase	-0.02 (-0.07-0.03)	0.01 (-0.01-0.03)	0.00 (-0.02-0.02)

Continued on next page

Table S3. Mean (95% confidence interval) R^2 for predicting the most recent lab result using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping. Activated Partial Thromboplastin Time (APTT); Point of care (POC); Pulmonary function test (PFT); Forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1)

Lab Test	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
International normalized ratio (INR)	-0.02 (-0.06-0.02)	0.01 (-0.01-0.03)	0.00 (-0.02-0.02)
Bilirubin total	-0.05 (-0.16-0.01)	0.01 (-0.02-0.02)	-0.00 (-0.02-0.00)
Prothrombin time	-0.02 (-0.10-0.02)	0.01 (-0.01-0.03)	0.00 (-0.01-0.02)
QT interval	-0.07 (-0.12-0.01)	0.00 (-0.02-0.02)	0.01 (-0.01-0.02)
Glucose (POC)	-0.08 (-0.21-0.02)	0.00 (-0.03-0.03)	0.00 (-0.04-0.04)
X saturation	-0.18 (-0.30-0.06)	0.00 (-0.04-0.04)	-0.01 (-0.03-0.00)
PR interval	-0.05 (-0.15-0.03)	0.00 (-0.04-0.03)	-0.00 (-0.03-0.02)
Brain natriuretic peptide (BNP)	-0.51 (-1.38-0.03)	0.00 (-0.08-0.05)	0.03 (-0.07-0.11)
Glucose whole blood	-0.24 (-0.49-0.09)	-0.00 (-0.03-0.03)	-0.03 (-0.08-0.00)
Atrial rate	-0.05 (-0.13-0.01)	-0.00 (-0.02-0.01)	-0.00 (-0.02-0.02)
P axis	-0.04 (-0.10-0.01)	-0.00 (-0.02-0.02)	-0.00 (-0.02-0.02)
QtC calculation (bezet)	-0.07 (-0.14-0.01)	-0.00 (-0.02-0.02)	-0.00 (-0.02-0.01)
PFT FEV1 (pre) (percent ref)	-0.31 (-0.58-0.06)	-0.00 (-0.06-0.04)	-0.03 (-0.07-0.01)
Blood lactate	-0.29 (-0.64-0.02)	-0.01 (-0.08-0.05)	0.00 (-0.06-0.05)
APTT	-0.05 (-0.12-0.01)	-0.01 (-0.02-0.00)	-0.01 (-0.03-0.00)
Triglycerides	-0.13 (-0.23-0.05)	-0.01 (-0.03-0.01)	-0.01 (-0.03-0.00)
Thyroid stimulating hormone (TSH)	-0.13 (-0.37-0.05)	-0.01 (-0.04-0.01)	-0.02 (-0.04-0.00)
Calcium	-0.05 (-0.08-0.02)	-0.01 (-0.02-0.00)	-0.02 (-0.03-0.00)
Iron	-0.13 (-0.26-0.00)	-0.02 (-0.06-0.03)	-0.02 (-0.05-0.01)
Urea nitrogen (OSL)	-0.61 (-1.93-0.00)	-0.04 (-0.17-0.05)	-0.04 (-0.22-0.03)
Bilirubin conjugated	-0.57 (-1.25-0.17)	-0.06 (-0.18-0.00)	-0.06 (-0.17-0.03)
C reactive protein (CRP)	-0.44 (-1.14-0.13)	-0.06 (-0.24-0.01)	-0.01 (-0.08-0.02)
Left ventricular ejection fraction	-1.80 (-3.29-0.91)	-0.06 (-0.21-0.01)	-0.07 (-0.28-0.03)
Hemoglobin (OSL)	-2.66 (-12.80-0.23)	-0.07 (-0.37-0.02)	-0.09 (-0.45-0.02)
Chloride (OSL)	-1.96 (-4.43-0.46)	-0.19 (-0.70-0.03)	-0.17 (-0.65-0.04)
Sodium (OSL)	-304.86 (-2851.16-0.13)	-2.03 (-16.23-0.02)	-1.57 (-16.42-0.01)
Potassium (OSL).	-178.77 (-828.09-0.14)	-2.33 (-8.10-0.02)	-2.42 (-8.14-0.02)

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
End stage renal disease	0.72 (0.68-0.76)	0.90 (0.87-0.92)	0.72 (0.67-0.77)
Renal dialysis	0.73 (0.67-0.77)	0.88 (0.85-0.91)	0.72 (0.68-0.76)
Cirrhosis of liver without mention of alcohol	0.69 (0.63-0.76)	0.86 (0.82-0.89)	0.68 (0.62-0.75)
Morbid obesity	0.86 (0.79-0.92)	0.85 (0.78-0.90)	0.86 (0.79-0.91)
Cancer of prostate	0.82 (0.76-0.86)	0.85 (0.78-0.89)	0.78 (0.73-0.83)
Hyperplasia of prostate	0.85 (0.81-0.88)	0.84 (0.82-0.87)	0.84 (0.81-0.88)
Neutropenia	0.60 (0.51-0.67)	0.84 (0.79-0.88)	0.42 (0.36-0.49)
Obesity	0.84 (0.80-0.87)	0.84 (0.80-0.87)	0.84 (0.80-0.87)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Menopausal and postmenopausal disorders	0.84 (0.80-0.87)	0.83 (0.79-0.87)	0.82 (0.78-0.86)
Tobacco use disorder	0.79 (0.72-0.84)	0.83 (0.77-0.88)	0.77 (0.72-0.82)
Noninflammatory female genital disorders	0.80 (0.77-0.83)	0.82 (0.78-0.85)	0.78 (0.74-0.81)
Chronic renal failure [CKD]	0.63 (0.59-0.68)	0.82 (0.78-0.85)	0.63 (0.58-0.66)
Immunity deficiency	0.76 (0.70-0.80)	0.82 (0.77-0.86)	0.75 (0.70-0.80)
Poisoning by primarily systemic agents	0.63 (0.55-0.71)	0.82 (0.74-0.88)	0.55 (0.46-0.62)
Kidney replaced by transplant	0.74 (0.69-0.79)	0.81 (0.77-0.86)	0.72 (0.67-0.78)
Decreased white blood cell count	0.66 (0.59-0.71)	0.81 (0.76-0.86)	0.62 (0.56-0.68)
Anemia in chronic kidney disease	0.71 (0.65-0.76)	0.81 (0.77-0.85)	0.71 (0.65-0.77)
Portal hypertension	0.70 (0.63-0.76)	0.80 (0.73-0.86)	0.68 (0.60-0.75)
Disorders involving the immune mechanism	0.76 (0.72-0.80)	0.80 (0.76-0.84)	0.75 (0.70-0.79)
Hypertensive chronic kidney disease	0.62 (0.57-0.66)	0.80 (0.76-0.84)	0.59 (0.55-0.64)
Renal failure	0.62 (0.58-0.66)	0.80 (0.76-0.83)	0.60 (0.57-0.64)
Disorders resulting from impaired renal function	0.68 (0.62-0.74)	0.79 (0.74-0.84)	0.68 (0.61-0.73)
Antineoplastic and immunosuppressive drugs caus...	0.67 (0.59-0.75)	0.79 (0.71-0.87)	0.48 (0.41-0.58)
Anemia of chronic disease	0.70 (0.65-0.73)	0.79 (0.76-0.82)	0.70 (0.65-0.74)
Overweight, obesity and other hyperalimentation	0.79 (0.75-0.83)	0.79 (0.75-0.83)	0.79 (0.75-0.83)
Liver abscess and sequelae of chronic liver dis...	0.72 (0.64-0.79)	0.78 (0.72-0.84)	0.66 (0.58-0.73)
Osteoarthritis	0.78 (0.73-0.82)	0.78 (0.73-0.82)	0.77 (0.73-0.81)
Liver replaced by transplant	0.68 (0.61-0.77)	0.76 (0.70-0.82)	0.64 (0.56-0.74)
Secondary hyperparathyroidism (of renal origin)	0.67 (0.60-0.73)	0.76 (0.71-0.82)	0.65 (0.57-0.71)
Osteoarthritis NOS	0.77 (0.72-0.82)	0.76 (0.71-0.81)	0.76 (0.72-0.81)
Disorders of phosphorus metabolism	0.73 (0.65-0.80)	0.76 (0.69-0.82)	0.71 (0.63-0.78)
Abnormal involuntary movements	0.39 (0.31-0.49)	0.76 (0.68-0.82)	0.54 (0.44-0.62)
Fluid overload	0.66 (0.61-0.73)	0.76 (0.70-0.81)	0.68 (0.62-0.75)
Erectile dysfunction [ED]	0.72 (0.65-0.78)	0.76 (0.70-0.82)	0.72 (0.64-0.77)
Osteoarthritis; localized	0.76 (0.71-0.82)	0.76 (0.70-0.82)	0.74 (0.68-0.80)
Coagulation defects	0.68 (0.62-0.75)	0.74 (0.67-0.80)	0.64 (0.56-0.72)
Acid-base balance disorder	0.66 (0.60-0.72)	0.73 (0.68-0.79)	0.64 (0.58-0.71)
Osteoarthritis, localized, primary	0.75 (0.69-0.81)	0.73 (0.66-0.78)	0.75 (0.69-0.80)
Respiratory failure, insufficiency, arrest	0.61 (0.55-0.67)	0.73 (0.68-0.78)	0.56 (0.48-0.64)
Ascites (non malignant)	0.73 (0.66-0.80)	0.73 (0.65-0.79)	0.73 (0.66-0.79)
Degenerative skin conditions and other dermatoses	0.72 (0.67-0.76)	0.73 (0.68-0.78)	0.70 (0.65-0.75)
Hypertensive heart and/or renal disease	0.56 (0.51-0.61)	0.72 (0.69-0.77)	0.58 (0.53-0.63)
Altered mental status	0.62 (0.53-0.71)	0.72 (0.64-0.81)	0.59 (0.50-0.68)
Arthropathy NOS	0.72 (0.66-0.78)	0.72 (0.66-0.78)	0.71 (0.65-0.77)
Cataract	0.73 (0.68-0.77)	0.72 (0.67-0.76)	0.72 (0.67-0.76)
Nephritis and nephropathy in diseases classifie...	0.69 (0.61-0.76)	0.71 (0.64-0.78)	0.70 (0.63-0.77)
Family history	0.64 (0.56-0.71)	0.71 (0.65-0.79)	0.66 (0.56-0.75)
Purpura and other hemorrhagic conditions	0.61 (0.53-0.68)	0.71 (0.65-0.78)	0.61 (0.54-0.67)
Chronic liver disease and cirrhosis	0.61 (0.55-0.68)	0.71 (0.65-0.77)	0.62 (0.55-0.68)
Osteoporosis NOS	0.72 (0.64-0.79)	0.71 (0.64-0.78)	0.71 (0.64-0.78)
Splenomegaly	0.65 (0.59-0.71)	0.71 (0.63-0.77)	0.65 (0.57-0.73)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Hyperpotassemia	0.66 (0.61-0.71)	0.71 (0.66-0.75)	0.64 (0.59-0.69)
Disorders of calcium/phosphorus metabolism	0.67 (0.58-0.73)	0.71 (0.65-0.76)	0.65 (0.59-0.72)
Other disorders of metabolism	0.57 (0.48-0.65)	0.71 (0.63-0.77)	0.52 (0.43-0.59)
Viral infection	0.68 (0.61-0.75)	0.70 (0.64-0.77)	0.66 (0.58-0.73)
Acute renal failure	0.60 (0.55-0.64)	0.70 (0.66-0.74)	0.57 (0.53-0.62)
Essential hypertension	0.67 (0.64-0.71)	0.70 (0.66-0.74)	0.67 (0.64-0.70)
Seborrheic keratosis	0.70 (0.65-0.75)	0.70 (0.65-0.75)	0.68 (0.63-0.73)
Diverticulosis and diverticulitis	0.72 (0.65-0.78)	0.70 (0.64-0.75)	0.68 (0.60-0.75)
Hyperlipidemia	0.70 (0.66-0.74)	0.70 (0.66-0.73)	0.70 (0.66-0.74)
Thrombocytopenia	0.62 (0.56-0.69)	0.70 (0.64-0.76)	0.63 (0.56-0.69)
Type 2 diabetes	0.66 (0.62-0.71)	0.69 (0.65-0.73)	0.65 (0.62-0.69)
Other ill-defined and unknown causes of morbidi...	0.72 (0.65-0.78)	0.69 (0.63-0.77)	0.68 (0.60-0.75)
Osteoporosis	0.72 (0.65-0.78)	0.69 (0.62-0.76)	0.68 (0.61-0.76)
Poisoning by hormones and synthetic substitutes	0.60 (0.51-0.70)	0.69 (0.61-0.77)	0.56 (0.47-0.65)
Renal failure NOS	0.61 (0.55-0.69)	0.69 (0.60-0.76)	0.56 (0.48-0.62)
Type 2 diabetes with neurological manifestations	0.67 (0.60-0.74)	0.69 (0.62-0.76)	0.65 (0.56-0.73)
Polyneuropathy in diabetes	0.64 (0.57-0.71)	0.69 (0.60-0.77)	0.62 (0.53-0.70)
Respiratory failure	0.65 (0.58-0.72)	0.69 (0.61-0.76)	0.61 (0.53-0.68)
Other immunological findings	0.65 (0.56-0.73)	0.69 (0.61-0.77)	0.62 (0.54-0.71)
Deep vein thrombosis [DVT]	0.67 (0.59-0.74)	0.69 (0.63-0.76)	0.61 (0.53-0.69)
Carditis	0.60 (0.51-0.69)	0.69 (0.61-0.76)	0.41 (0.34-0.50)
Other disorders of the kidney and ureters	0.56 (0.51-0.60)	0.69 (0.65-0.72)	0.54 (0.49-0.60)
Skin cancer	0.71 (0.66-0.75)	0.69 (0.63-0.74)	0.69 (0.64-0.75)
Other non-epithelial cancer of skin	0.71 (0.65-0.76)	0.68 (0.63-0.74)	0.68 (0.64-0.74)
Cardiac pacemaker/device in situ	0.43 (0.36-0.51)	0.68 (0.62-0.75)	0.61 (0.53-0.69)
Type 2 diabetes with renal manifestations	0.63 (0.57-0.68)	0.68 (0.62-0.74)	0.65 (0.58-0.71)
Ischemic Heart Disease	0.68 (0.64-0.72)	0.68 (0.64-0.72)	0.67 (0.64-0.71)
Protein-calorie malnutrition	0.67 (0.59-0.73)	0.68 (0.62-0.74)	0.65 (0.59-0.71)
Nephritis and nephropathy without mention of gl...	0.59 (0.52-0.66)	0.68 (0.63-0.74)	0.61 (0.54-0.67)
Coronary atherosclerosis	0.68 (0.65-0.72)	0.68 (0.65-0.72)	0.68 (0.64-0.71)
Disorders of diaphragm	0.66 (0.59-0.73)	0.68 (0.60-0.75)	0.64 (0.56-0.71)
Myocardial infarction	0.66 (0.60-0.72)	0.68 (0.63-0.73)	0.65 (0.60-0.71)
Other and unspecified coagulation defects	0.59 (0.52-0.67)	0.68 (0.60-0.75)	0.50 (0.43-0.58)
Intestinal infection	0.66 (0.58-0.74)	0.68 (0.60-0.75)	0.62 (0.52-0.72)
Chronic Kidney Disease, Stage IV	0.55 (0.48-0.62)	0.68 (0.61-0.75)	0.49 (0.43-0.55)
Sensorineural hearing loss	0.71 (0.62-0.79)	0.68 (0.58-0.77)	0.67 (0.58-0.76)
Other arthropathies	0.70 (0.64-0.76)	0.68 (0.61-0.74)	0.69 (0.63-0.76)
Diverticulosis	0.71 (0.62-0.79)	0.68 (0.59-0.77)	0.70 (0.60-0.78)
Pneumonia	0.67 (0.62-0.73)	0.67 (0.63-0.72)	0.66 (0.60-0.71)
Glaucoma	0.67 (0.61-0.74)	0.67 (0.61-0.73)	0.65 (0.59-0.72)
Postinflammatory pulmonary fibrosis	0.66 (0.57-0.75)	0.67 (0.59-0.75)	0.59 (0.51-0.68)
Hypertension	0.65 (0.61-0.69)	0.67 (0.64-0.71)	0.64 (0.60-0.68)
Sleep apnea	0.66 (0.61-0.73)	0.67 (0.61-0.72)	0.67 (0.61-0.72)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Aortic aneurysm	0.68 (0.61-0.74)	0.67 (0.58-0.75)	0.65 (0.57-0.73)
Septicemia	0.66 (0.60-0.72)	0.67 (0.63-0.73)	0.63 (0.57-0.69)
Disorders of lipid metabolism	0.67 (0.63-0.70)	0.67 (0.63-0.71)	0.67 (0.64-0.71)
Iron deficiency anemia secondary to blood loss ...	0.51 (0.44-0.59)	0.67 (0.59-0.74)	0.49 (0.42-0.56)
Actinic keratosis	0.69 (0.62-0.75)	0.67 (0.60-0.73)	0.73 (0.67-0.79)
Other anemias	0.62 (0.58-0.66)	0.67 (0.63-0.71)	0.62 (0.58-0.66)
Abnormal movement	0.65 (0.59-0.71)	0.67 (0.61-0.73)	0.63 (0.57-0.69)
Disorders of fluid, electrolyte, and acid-base ...	0.62 (0.58-0.67)	0.67 (0.62-0.71)	0.63 (0.59-0.67)
Acidosis	0.64 (0.58-0.68)	0.67 (0.61-0.72)	0.61 (0.54-0.67)
Sepsis	0.63 (0.58-0.69)	0.67 (0.61-0.72)	0.60 (0.53-0.65)
Atherosclerosis	0.53 (0.47-0.60)	0.66 (0.61-0.73)	0.45 (0.39-0.52)
Nephritis; nephrosis; renal sclerosis	0.56 (0.49-0.63)	0.66 (0.61-0.72)	0.58 (0.51-0.63)
Osteoporosis, osteopenia and pathological fracture	0.64 (0.59-0.68)	0.66 (0.62-0.71)	0.63 (0.59-0.68)
Other disorders of intestine	0.58 (0.49-0.66)	0.66 (0.57-0.74)	0.51 (0.43-0.60)
Tachycardia NOS	0.62 (0.55-0.68)	0.66 (0.60-0.72)	0.59 (0.52-0.66)
Iron deficiency anemias, unspecified or not due...	0.67 (0.61-0.72)	0.66 (0.61-0.71)	0.70 (0.63-0.76)
Other retinal disorders	0.63 (0.55-0.71)	0.66 (0.57-0.73)	0.57 (0.49-0.64)
Effects radiation NOS	0.64 (0.55-0.71)	0.66 (0.58-0.74)	0.59 (0.52-0.69)
Diabetes mellitus	0.65 (0.61-0.69)	0.66 (0.62-0.70)	0.64 (0.61-0.68)
Other disorders of eye	0.69 (0.64-0.75)	0.66 (0.59-0.72)	0.69 (0.62-0.76)
Disorders of vitreous body	0.67 (0.60-0.75)	0.66 (0.59-0.73)	0.69 (0.62-0.76)
Emphysema	0.66 (0.58-0.73)	0.66 (0.58-0.72)	0.62 (0.54-0.71)
Senile cataract	0.69 (0.64-0.73)	0.66 (0.60-0.72)	0.67 (0.61-0.71)
Nonrheumatic aortic valve disorders	0.66 (0.61-0.71)	0.66 (0.60-0.71)	0.65 (0.60-0.70)
Hypotension	0.63 (0.58-0.69)	0.66 (0.60-0.71)	0.61 (0.55-0.66)
Electrolyte imbalance	0.64 (0.60-0.68)	0.66 (0.61-0.70)	0.62 (0.58-0.67)
Atherosclerosis of aorta	0.67 (0.62-0.72)	0.66 (0.60-0.71)	0.65 (0.60-0.70)
Sepsis and SIRS	0.65 (0.59-0.71)	0.65 (0.60-0.71)	0.63 (0.57-0.69)
Acute posthemorrhagic anemia	0.67 (0.62-0.72)	0.65 (0.59-0.70)	0.66 (0.61-0.70)
Urinary tract infection	0.62 (0.57-0.67)	0.65 (0.61-0.70)	0.62 (0.57-0.66)
Other chronic ischemic heart disease, unspecified	0.70 (0.62-0.77)	0.65 (0.58-0.72)	0.67 (0.60-0.74)
Nausea and vomiting	0.53 (0.48-0.59)	0.65 (0.61-0.69)	0.47 (0.41-0.52)
Chronic Kidney Disease, Stage III	0.58 (0.52-0.63)	0.65 (0.60-0.70)	0.55 (0.49-0.62)
Fever of unknown origin	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.65 (0.59-0.71)	0.63 (0.55-0.69)
Acute pain	0.59 (0.53-0.65)	0.65 (0.60-0.71)	0.58 (0.52-0.64)
Obstructive sleep apnea	0.65 (0.59-0.71)	0.65 (0.58-0.72)	0.65 (0.58-0.71)
Alcoholism	0.60 (0.49-0.70)	0.65 (0.57-0.74)	0.52 (0.41-0.62)
Secondary malignant neoplasm	0.56 (0.48-0.65)	0.65 (0.57-0.72)	0.66 (0.58-0.73)
Cystitis and urethritis	0.59 (0.53-0.66)	0.65 (0.57-0.72)	0.55 (0.47-0.63)
Angina pectoris	0.64 (0.59-0.70)	0.65 (0.58-0.70)	0.59 (0.53-0.65)
Urinary incontinence	0.65 (0.59-0.73)	0.65 (0.57-0.73)	0.63 (0.56-0.69)
Hypercholesterolemia	0.64 (0.59-0.68)	0.65 (0.60-0.69)	0.63 (0.57-0.67)
Articular cartilage disorder	0.64 (0.57-0.69)	0.65 (0.58-0.71)	0.61 (0.54-0.68)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Aortic valve disease	0.65 (0.59-0.70)	0.64 (0.59-0.70)	0.56 (0.50-0.61)
Enthesopathy	0.66 (0.58-0.72)	0.64 (0.57-0.71)	0.63 (0.55-0.71)
Heart failure with preserved EF [Diastolic hear...	0.66 (0.58-0.74)	0.64 (0.56-0.73)	0.55 (0.47-0.63)
Hemorrhage of gastrointestinal tract	0.66 (0.57-0.75)	0.64 (0.57-0.72)	0.50 (0.40-0.58)
Bacterial infection NOS	0.62 (0.56-0.68)	0.64 (0.59-0.70)	0.60 (0.54-0.65)
Osteopenia or other disorder of bone and cartilage	0.64 (0.59-0.69)	0.64 (0.59-0.69)	0.63 (0.58-0.68)
Disorders of protein plasma/amino-acid transpor...	0.65 (0.57-0.74)	0.64 (0.57-0.72)	0.62 (0.55-0.69)
Cardiac shunt/ heart septal defect	0.62 (0.54-0.71)	0.64 (0.55-0.72)	0.54 (0.44-0.63)
Hyposmolality and/or hyponatremia	0.61 (0.56-0.66)	0.64 (0.59-0.69)	0.60 (0.56-0.65)
Heart valve disorders	0.64 (0.59-0.68)	0.64 (0.60-0.68)	0.62 (0.57-0.67)
Disorders of mineral metabolism	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.64 (0.59-0.69)	0.62 (0.56-0.68)
Pain in joint	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.64 (0.59-0.68)	0.61 (0.57-0.65)
Pulmonary collapse; interstitial and compensato...	0.60 (0.54-0.66)	0.64 (0.57-0.71)	0.55 (0.49-0.62)
Other forms of chronic heart disease	0.49 (0.40-0.57)	0.64 (0.56-0.71)	0.49 (0.41-0.58)
Other venous embolism and thrombosis	0.57 (0.51-0.64)	0.64 (0.58-0.71)	0.55 (0.48-0.61)
Complications of transplants and reattached limbs	0.63 (0.55-0.72)	0.63 (0.54-0.72)	0.61 (0.51-0.69)
Edema	0.59 (0.53-0.64)	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.58 (0.53-0.63)
Benign neoplasm of colon	0.59 (0.53-0.64)	0.63 (0.58-0.69)	0.58 (0.53-0.65)
Symptoms concerning nutrition, metabolism, and ...	0.61 (0.56-0.67)	0.63 (0.57-0.69)	0.59 (0.53-0.66)
Other disorders of bladder	0.62 (0.55-0.70)	0.63 (0.55-0.70)	0.59 (0.51-0.66)
Chronic pulmonary heart disease	0.57 (0.50-0.63)	0.63 (0.57-0.70)	0.55 (0.47-0.61)
Diseases of the larynx and vocal cords	0.49 (0.40-0.58)	0.63 (0.56-0.70)	0.40 (0.32-0.48)
Chronic airway obstruction	0.64 (0.58-0.70)	0.63 (0.56-0.69)	0.61 (0.55-0.69)
Candidiasis	0.63 (0.56-0.70)	0.63 (0.56-0.69)	0.61 (0.54-0.68)
Neoplasm of uncertain behavior	0.58 (0.49-0.66)	0.63 (0.55-0.70)	0.41 (0.33-0.50)
Shortness of breath	0.62 (0.57-0.67)	0.63 (0.58-0.67)	0.61 (0.56-0.65)
Degeneration of intervertebral disc	0.63 (0.57-0.70)	0.62 (0.56-0.69)	0.61 (0.54-0.67)
Symptoms involving respiratory system and other...	0.54 (0.45-0.64)	0.62 (0.54-0.70)	0.62 (0.52-0.70)
Peripheral vascular disease	0.65 (0.59-0.70)	0.62 (0.57-0.67)	0.61 (0.55-0.66)
Heart failure NOS	0.55 (0.50-0.61)	0.62 (0.56-0.68)	0.49 (0.44-0.55)
Cardiomegaly	0.52 (0.48-0.57)	0.62 (0.58-0.67)	0.49 (0.45-0.54)
Congenital anomalies of great vessels	0.64 (0.59-0.70)	0.62 (0.57-0.68)	0.63 (0.58-0.70)
Pleurisy; pleural effusion	0.60 (0.56-0.65)	0.62 (0.58-0.67)	0.58 (0.54-0.63)
Mixed hyperlipidemia	0.63 (0.57-0.68)	0.62 (0.56-0.68)	0.61 (0.55-0.66)
Other aneurysm	0.63 (0.55-0.71)	0.62 (0.54-0.69)	0.60 (0.53-0.67)
Abnormality of gait	0.69 (0.61-0.75)	0.62 (0.56-0.69)	0.66 (0.59-0.73)
Atrial fibrillation and flutter	0.64 (0.59-0.69)	0.62 (0.57-0.66)	0.63 (0.59-0.68)
Infection/inflammation of internal prosthetic d...	0.59 (0.51-0.67)	0.62 (0.54-0.71)	0.60 (0.51-0.68)
Occlusion and stenosis of precerebral arteries	0.69 (0.61-0.76)	0.62 (0.54-0.70)	0.58 (0.51-0.66)
Other chronic nonalcoholic liver disease	0.60 (0.55-0.67)	0.62 (0.56-0.68)	0.61 (0.54-0.68)
Bacteremia	0.61 (0.54-0.70)	0.61 (0.53-0.70)	0.58 (0.48-0.67)
Bacterial pneumonia	0.64 (0.55-0.72)	0.61 (0.52-0.70)	0.66 (0.58-0.74)
Atrial fibrillation	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.61 (0.56-0.66)	0.59 (0.53-0.65)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Substance addiction and disorders	0.62 (0.52-0.70)	0.61 (0.55-0.68)	0.57 (0.49-0.67)
Contusion	0.50 (0.41-0.59)	0.61 (0.53-0.69)	0.49 (0.40-0.58)
Inflammation of the eye	0.65 (0.58-0.71)	0.61 (0.51-0.69)	0.59 (0.52-0.67)
Congestive heart failure (CHF) NOS	0.59 (0.54-0.65)	0.61 (0.55-0.67)	0.53 (0.47-0.58)
Other tests	0.54 (0.46-0.62)	0.61 (0.53-0.68)	0.59 (0.50-0.65)
Other diseases of blood and blood-forming organs	0.58 (0.50-0.66)	0.61 (0.53-0.70)	0.47 (0.38-0.56)
Blood in stool	0.54 (0.46-0.64)	0.61 (0.51-0.68)	0.39 (0.32-0.47)
Iron deficiency anemias	0.63 (0.56-0.70)	0.61 (0.54-0.67)	0.60 (0.53-0.67)
Other hypertensive complications	0.62 (0.55-0.67)	0.60 (0.55-0.66)	0.62 (0.55-0.69)
Hypertensive heart disease	0.61 (0.54-0.67)	0.60 (0.53-0.67)	0.68 (0.61-0.74)
Hypovolemia	0.56 (0.48-0.66)	0.60 (0.51-0.69)	0.47 (0.37-0.55)
Insulin pump user	0.59 (0.53-0.65)	0.60 (0.53-0.66)	0.58 (0.51-0.65)
Primary/intrinsic cardiomyopathies	0.55 (0.50-0.61)	0.60 (0.53-0.68)	0.46 (0.40-0.51)
Peripheral enthesopathies and allied syndromes	0.61 (0.55-0.68)	0.60 (0.54-0.66)	0.57 (0.51-0.63)
Other diseases of lung	0.55 (0.50-0.60)	0.60 (0.54-0.65)	0.52 (0.47-0.57)
Dermatophytosis / Dermatomycosis	0.60 (0.54-0.67)	0.60 (0.53-0.68)	0.60 (0.53-0.65)
Shock	0.59 (0.50-0.66)	0.60 (0.52-0.69)	0.51 (0.42-0.59)
Heart valve replaced	0.56 (0.49-0.63)	0.60 (0.53-0.67)	0.51 (0.43-0.57)
Pain	0.56 (0.52-0.61)	0.60 (0.56-0.64)	0.55 (0.50-0.59)
Dizziness and giddiness (Light-headedness and v...	0.61 (0.54-0.67)	0.60 (0.53-0.65)	0.59 (0.53-0.64)
Nonrheumatic mitral valve disorders	0.58 (0.53-0.64)	0.60 (0.54-0.65)	0.56 (0.51-0.62)
Diseases of white blood cells	0.52 (0.42-0.59)	0.60 (0.53-0.66)	0.41 (0.35-0.48)
Peripheral vascular disease, unspecified	0.60 (0.54-0.65)	0.59 (0.53-0.65)	0.59 (0.53-0.65)
Cystitis	0.61 (0.53-0.69)	0.59 (0.50-0.67)	0.55 (0.48-0.62)
Diseases of esophagus	0.58 (0.53-0.62)	0.59 (0.55-0.63)	0.54 (0.49-0.58)
Other disorders of synovium, tendon, and bursa	0.61 (0.54-0.69)	0.59 (0.52-0.66)	0.61 (0.54-0.69)
GERD	0.57 (0.53-0.62)	0.59 (0.55-0.64)	0.55 (0.50-0.60)
Other biliary tract disease	0.63 (0.54-0.71)	0.59 (0.51-0.67)	0.59 (0.50-0.68)
Inflammatory and toxic neuropathy	0.53 (0.45-0.61)	0.59 (0.52-0.64)	0.43 (0.36-0.52)
Other disorders of liver	0.60 (0.53-0.65)	0.59 (0.53-0.64)	0.56 (0.49-0.63)
Other infectious and parasitic diseases	0.50 (0.40-0.59)	0.59 (0.49-0.66)	0.57 (0.46-0.66)
Open wounds of head; neck; and trunk	0.44 (0.36-0.54)	0.58 (0.48-0.69)	0.47 (0.38-0.57)
Cerebrovascular disease	0.57 (0.52-0.63)	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	0.53 (0.47-0.60)
Abnormal electrocardiogram [ECG] [EKG]	0.49 (0.44-0.54)	0.58 (0.54-0.64)	0.46 (0.41-0.50)
Generalized anxiety disorder	0.53 (0.46-0.60)	0.58 (0.49-0.67)	0.51 (0.43-0.59)
Lymphadenitis	0.56 (0.48-0.62)	0.58 (0.51-0.65)	0.53 (0.46-0.60)
Secondary diabetes mellitus	0.63 (0.55-0.72)	0.58 (0.50-0.66)	0.67 (0.58-0.76)
Myalgia and myositis unspecified	0.52 (0.46-0.58)	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	0.45 (0.39-0.50)
Hypopotassemia	0.55 (0.46-0.63)	0.58 (0.50-0.67)	0.51 (0.43-0.58)
Other symptoms/disorders or the urinary system	0.57 (0.53-0.62)	0.58 (0.53-0.62)	0.56 (0.51-0.61)
Benign neoplasm of skin	0.59 (0.54-0.64)	0.58 (0.52-0.63)	0.57 (0.52-0.63)
Other disorders of circulatory system	0.44 (0.39-0.50)	0.58 (0.52-0.65)	0.61 (0.54-0.67)
Dysuria	0.52 (0.45-0.59)	0.58 (0.51-0.66)	0.45 (0.39-0.53)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Disorder of skin and subcutaneous tissue NOS	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	0.58 (0.52-0.63)	0.53 (0.47-0.61)
Pulmonary heart disease	0.53 (0.47-0.58)	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	0.56 (0.50-0.63)
Secondary malignancy of lymph nodes	0.61 (0.52-0.68)	0.58 (0.48-0.69)	0.50 (0.41-0.60)
Gastrointestinal hemorrhage	0.60 (0.52-0.67)	0.58 (0.51-0.65)	0.56 (0.49-0.62)
Other abnormal blood chemistry	0.53 (0.49-0.58)	0.58 (0.53-0.63)	0.49 (0.44-0.54)
Cardiac conduction disorders	0.54 (0.50-0.60)	0.58 (0.53-0.62)	0.52 (0.47-0.57)
Nevus, non-neoplastic	0.58 (0.49-0.66)	0.58 (0.48-0.66)	0.47 (0.39-0.54)
Congestive heart failure; nonhypertensive	0.57 (0.52-0.62)	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	0.53 (0.48-0.58)
Malaise and fatigue	0.59 (0.54-0.64)	0.57 (0.53-0.62)	0.56 (0.51-0.61)
Abnormal findings examination of lungs	0.54 (0.49-0.60)	0.57 (0.52-0.62)	0.50 (0.45-0.55)
Chronic pain	0.58 (0.54-0.63)	0.57 (0.53-0.62)	0.57 (0.52-0.62)
Asthma	0.57 (0.50-0.65)	0.57 (0.50-0.64)	0.50 (0.42-0.57)
Hypothyroidism	0.58 (0.51-0.63)	0.57 (0.51-0.62)	0.54 (0.48-0.60)
Hearing loss	0.60 (0.55-0.66)	0.57 (0.51-0.62)	0.60 (0.53-0.66)
Depression	0.55 (0.49-0.61)	0.57 (0.50-0.63)	0.51 (0.46-0.56)
Other peripheral nerve disorders	0.55 (0.49-0.62)	0.57 (0.51-0.64)	0.50 (0.42-0.58)
Frequency of urination and polyuria	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	0.57 (0.49-0.65)	0.53 (0.46-0.62)
Pericarditis	0.53 (0.44-0.62)	0.57 (0.49-0.65)	0.51 (0.44-0.59)
Retention of urine	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	0.57 (0.49-0.64)	0.52 (0.44-0.59)
Spinal stenosis	0.60 (0.53-0.67)	0.57 (0.50-0.63)	0.56 (0.48-0.64)
Other headache syndromes	0.45 (0.38-0.51)	0.57 (0.51-0.63)	0.50 (0.45-0.56)
Other alveolar and parietoalveolar pneumonopathy	0.62 (0.51-0.71)	0.56 (0.47-0.66)	0.56 (0.46-0.66)
Spinal stenosis of lumbar region	0.61 (0.54-0.68)	0.56 (0.47-0.65)	0.54 (0.47-0.63)
Proteinuria	0.53 (0.45-0.60)	0.56 (0.49-0.63)	0.50 (0.42-0.59)
Cardiomyopathy	0.52 (0.46-0.59)	0.56 (0.50-0.63)	0.46 (0.40-0.53)
Mitral valve disease	0.56 (0.50-0.63)	0.56 (0.50-0.62)	0.58 (0.52-0.64)
Visual disturbances	0.53 (0.44-0.59)	0.56 (0.49-0.65)	0.58 (0.50-0.65)
Insomnia	0.52 (0.46-0.59)	0.56 (0.49-0.61)	0.53 (0.46-0.58)
Cough	0.57 (0.53-0.62)	0.56 (0.52-0.61)	0.56 (0.53-0.61)
Diseases of hair and hair follicles	0.44 (0.35-0.53)	0.56 (0.48-0.65)	0.49 (0.38-0.58)
Other symptoms of respiratory system	0.58 (0.54-0.62)	0.56 (0.52-0.61)	0.56 (0.52-0.60)
Back pain	0.58 (0.53-0.63)	0.56 (0.51-0.60)	0.55 (0.51-0.60)
Neurological disorders	0.55 (0.47-0.61)	0.56 (0.48-0.62)	0.54 (0.47-0.62)
Dermatophytosis	0.59 (0.52-0.67)	0.56 (0.49-0.62)	0.56 (0.48-0.63)
Alcohol-related disorders	0.65 (0.54-0.76)	0.56 (0.45-0.64)	0.58 (0.48-0.68)
Pulmonary congestion and hypostasis	0.63 (0.56-0.70)	0.56 (0.48-0.65)	0.59 (0.50-0.67)
Mood disorders	0.55 (0.49-0.60)	0.56 (0.50-0.61)	0.49 (0.44-0.55)
Cancer, suspected or other	0.57 (0.51-0.64)	0.56 (0.50-0.63)	0.60 (0.53-0.66)
Hypotension NOS	0.57 (0.50-0.62)	0.56 (0.50-0.61)	0.52 (0.46-0.59)
Other dyspnea	0.57 (0.52-0.61)	0.56 (0.50-0.62)	0.53 (0.48-0.58)
Heart failure with reduced EF [Systolic or comb...	0.59 (0.53-0.66)	0.56 (0.48-0.63)	0.56 (0.50-0.63)
Migraine	0.58 (0.49-0.67)	0.56 (0.47-0.66)	0.55 (0.45-0.66)
Abnormal findings on exam of gastrointestinal t...	0.55 (0.49-0.65)	0.56 (0.47-0.64)	0.49 (0.41-0.60)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Sleep disorders	0.57 (0.51-0.63)	0.56 (0.51-0.61)	0.52 (0.46-0.57)
Other local infections of skin and subcutaneous...	0.57 (0.48-0.66)	0.56 (0.47-0.64)	0.53 (0.43-0.63)
Anxiety disorder	0.53 (0.47-0.59)	0.56 (0.51-0.61)	0.46 (0.41-0.52)
Hemangioma and lymphangioma, any site	0.56 (0.47-0.65)	0.56 (0.47-0.66)	0.45 (0.36-0.55)
Hypothyroidism NOS	0.60 (0.55-0.66)	0.55 (0.50-0.60)	0.58 (0.52-0.63)
Spondylosis and allied disorders	0.56 (0.50-0.63)	0.55 (0.49-0.62)	0.53 (0.46-0.59)
Abdominal hernia	0.50 (0.45-0.55)	0.55 (0.49-0.61)	0.46 (0.40-0.51)
Cardiac pacemaker in situ	0.42 (0.34-0.52)	0.55 (0.46-0.64)	0.55 (0.47-0.64)
Cerebral ischemia	0.45 (0.36-0.54)	0.55 (0.46-0.63)	0.46 (0.38-0.53)
Malignant neoplasm, other	0.52 (0.44-0.59)	0.55 (0.48-0.62)	0.46 (0.40-0.53)
Dermatophytosis of nail	0.59 (0.52-0.68)	0.55 (0.46-0.65)	0.46 (0.37-0.55)
Cardiac dysrhythmias	0.56 (0.51-0.60)	0.55 (0.50-0.59)	0.55 (0.50-0.59)
Cyst of kidney, acquired	0.53 (0.45-0.60)	0.55 (0.47-0.62)	0.46 (0.38-0.53)
Impacted cerumen	0.55 (0.46-0.63)	0.55 (0.46-0.62)	0.44 (0.36-0.51)
Abnormal heart sounds	0.56 (0.51-0.62)	0.55 (0.48-0.62)	0.49 (0.43-0.56)
Neoplasm of uncertain behavior of skin	0.58 (0.52-0.65)	0.55 (0.47-0.62)	0.57 (0.50-0.63)
Palpitations	0.49 (0.43-0.55)	0.54 (0.47-0.62)	0.51 (0.45-0.58)
Dysphagia	0.53 (0.46-0.59)	0.54 (0.46-0.61)	0.55 (0.48-0.62)
Abnormal glucose	0.55 (0.50-0.61)	0.54 (0.48-0.59)	0.50 (0.45-0.55)
Functional digestive disorders	0.49 (0.40-0.57)	0.54 (0.45-0.63)	0.68 (0.58-0.78)
Syncope and collapse	0.43 (0.36-0.50)	0.54 (0.46-0.62)	0.51 (0.42-0.60)
Pruritus and related conditions	0.47 (0.37-0.55)	0.54 (0.44-0.63)	0.69 (0.61-0.75)
Allergic rhinitis	0.56 (0.49-0.63)	0.54 (0.46-0.61)	0.57 (0.52-0.64)
Esophagitis, GERD and related diseases	0.56 (0.51-0.60)	0.54 (0.49-0.59)	0.53 (0.49-0.58)
Cardiac congenital anomalies	0.46 (0.39-0.53)	0.54 (0.46-0.61)	0.53 (0.44-0.61)
Major depressive disorder	0.55 (0.48-0.63)	0.54 (0.45-0.61)	0.50 (0.42-0.57)
Hemorrhoids	0.63 (0.56-0.71)	0.54 (0.46-0.62)	0.55 (0.46-0.64)
Premature beats	0.55 (0.48-0.63)	0.53 (0.47-0.59)	0.56 (0.48-0.63)
Ill-defined descriptions and complications of h...	0.57 (0.50-0.62)	0.53 (0.46-0.60)	0.49 (0.42-0.57)
Abnormal results of function study of liver	0.60 (0.51-0.69)	0.53 (0.44-0.62)	0.54 (0.45-0.62)
Chronic sinusitis	0.42 (0.36-0.49)	0.53 (0.46-0.61)	0.46 (0.39-0.54)
Hepatomegaly	0.51 (0.44-0.59)	0.53 (0.46-0.60)	0.51 (0.42-0.58)
Diaphragmatic hernia	0.56 (0.49-0.63)	0.53 (0.46-0.60)	0.53 (0.46-0.60)
Thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis...	0.51 (0.44-0.59)	0.53 (0.47-0.61)	0.48 (0.42-0.55)
Nonspecific chest pain	0.51 (0.46-0.55)	0.53 (0.48-0.57)	0.44 (0.39-0.49)
Spondylosis without myelopathy	0.55 (0.48-0.62)	0.53 (0.45-0.60)	0.48 (0.41-0.55)
Atopic/contact dermatitis due to other or unspe...	0.55 (0.50-0.62)	0.53 (0.47-0.60)	0.56 (0.50-0.63)
Noninfectious gastroenteritis	0.47 (0.39-0.56)	0.53 (0.45-0.60)	0.53 (0.45-0.60)
Voice disturbance	0.53 (0.46-0.62)	0.53 (0.43-0.61)	0.35 (0.26-0.43)
Chronic kidney disease, Stage I or II	0.49 (0.43-0.56)	0.53 (0.45-0.61)	0.41 (0.35-0.48)
Other specified cardiac dysrhythmias	0.56 (0.51-0.62)	0.53 (0.46-0.58)	0.52 (0.47-0.58)
Nonrheumatic tricuspid valve disorders	0.50 (0.41-0.57)	0.53 (0.45-0.60)	0.45 (0.37-0.53)
Transient cerebral ischemia	0.45 (0.37-0.53)	0.52 (0.44-0.60)	0.62 (0.54-0.68)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Intervertebral disc disorders	0.57 (0.51-0.63)	0.52 (0.46-0.58)	0.55 (0.49-0.60)
Nonspecific findings on examination of blood	0.45 (0.37-0.51)	0.52 (0.45-0.60)	0.53 (0.44-0.59)
Superficial cellulitis and abscess	0.59 (0.52-0.65)	0.52 (0.45-0.59)	0.59 (0.53-0.66)
Other abnormal glucose	0.51 (0.46-0.57)	0.52 (0.48-0.57)	0.43 (0.38-0.48)
Vitamin D deficiency	0.56 (0.51-0.62)	0.52 (0.47-0.58)	0.53 (0.47-0.59)
Rheumatic disease of the heart valves	0.50 (0.42-0.57)	0.52 (0.46-0.59)	0.44 (0.38-0.51)
Cancer of urinary organs (incl. kidney and blad...	0.54 (0.46-0.63)	0.52 (0.42-0.62)	0.45 (0.37-0.53)
Symptoms and disorders of the joints	0.57 (0.50-0.64)	0.52 (0.45-0.60)	0.58 (0.49-0.66)
Empyema and pneumothorax	0.56 (0.48-0.64)	0.52 (0.41-0.60)	0.52 (0.44-0.60)
Varicose veins	0.54 (0.47-0.63)	0.52 (0.43-0.63)	0.39 (0.32-0.47)
Other disorders of biliary tract	0.57 (0.50-0.66)	0.52 (0.42-0.61)	0.49 (0.39-0.59)
Sciatica	0.47 (0.39-0.55)	0.52 (0.44-0.59)	0.49 (0.41-0.58)
Abdominal pain	0.54 (0.50-0.59)	0.52 (0.47-0.57)	0.55 (0.50-0.60)
Swelling of limb	0.57 (0.51-0.63)	0.52 (0.46-0.58)	0.54 (0.49-0.61)
Circulatory disease NEC	0.47 (0.40-0.54)	0.51 (0.45-0.57)	0.50 (0.44-0.57)
Sprains and strains	0.60 (0.53-0.67)	0.51 (0.43-0.59)	0.52 (0.45-0.60)
Gout	0.55 (0.46-0.63)	0.51 (0.43-0.60)	0.56 (0.48-0.65)
Hematuria	0.56 (0.49-0.63)	0.51 (0.43-0.57)	0.50 (0.43-0.57)
Arrhythmia (cardiac) NOS	0.53 (0.46-0.59)	0.50 (0.43-0.58)	0.54 (0.47-0.62)
Dyschromia and Vitiligo	0.58 (0.51-0.65)	0.50 (0.41-0.58)	0.49 (0.43-0.57)
Elevated white blood cell count	0.52 (0.44-0.59)	0.50 (0.43-0.58)	0.37 (0.30-0.43)
Encounter for long-term (current) use of antico...	0.53 (0.46-0.61)	0.50 (0.45-0.58)	0.50 (0.41-0.57)
Anxiety disorders	0.54 (0.50-0.60)	0.50 (0.44-0.55)	0.50 (0.44-0.55)
Allergy/adverse effect of penicillin	0.53 (0.45-0.61)	0.50 (0.42-0.60)	0.55 (0.45-0.64)
Diseases of sebaceous glands	0.49 (0.41-0.59)	0.50 (0.42-0.58)	0.61 (0.54-0.68)
Rash and other nonspecific skin eruption	0.54 (0.48-0.61)	0.50 (0.43-0.56)	0.45 (0.39-0.52)
Acute upper respiratory infections of multiple ...	0.52 (0.45-0.57)	0.49 (0.44-0.55)	0.53 (0.48-0.59)
Hypercalcemia	0.58 (0.48-0.67)	0.49 (0.41-0.57)	0.46 (0.38-0.55)
Other upper respiratory disease	0.49 (0.43-0.56)	0.49 (0.42-0.57)	0.51 (0.43-0.58)
Abnormal serum enzyme levels	0.48 (0.42-0.55)	0.49 (0.41-0.56)	0.47 (0.39-0.55)
Paroxysmal ventricular tachycardia	0.49 (0.43-0.58)	0.49 (0.41-0.57)	0.43 (0.36-0.52)
Sinoatrial node dysfunction (Bradycardia)	0.60 (0.50-0.69)	0.49 (0.40-0.56)	0.64 (0.55-0.72)
Vitamin deficiency	0.54 (0.49-0.59)	0.49 (0.43-0.54)	0.51 (0.46-0.56)
Other disorders of arteries and arterioles	0.46 (0.39-0.53)	0.49 (0.42-0.57)	0.44 (0.38-0.52)
Gout and other crystal arthropathies	0.53 (0.43-0.61)	0.49 (0.41-0.56)	0.57 (0.50-0.66)
Chronic ulcer of skin	0.49 (0.42-0.58)	0.49 (0.40-0.57)	0.41 (0.33-0.48)
Swelling, mass, or lump in head and neck [Space...	0.46 (0.38-0.54)	0.49 (0.40-0.58)	0.59 (0.50-0.66)
Cardiac and circulatory congenital anomalies	0.50 (0.42-0.56)	0.48 (0.42-0.54)	0.40 (0.32-0.47)
Nonspecific abnormal findings on radiological a...	0.54 (0.45-0.63)	0.48 (0.40-0.57)	0.50 (0.41-0.58)
Erythematous conditions	0.57 (0.49-0.67)	0.48 (0.39-0.58)	0.51 (0.41-0.60)
Poisoning by antibiotics	0.51 (0.43-0.59)	0.48 (0.39-0.57)	0.59 (0.50-0.68)
Solitary pulmonary nodule	0.53 (0.45-0.60)	0.48 (0.42-0.54)	0.43 (0.34-0.50)
Disorders of refraction and accommodation; blin...	0.59 (0.51-0.70)	0.48 (0.39-0.59)	0.49 (0.39-0.60)

Continued on next page

Table S4. Mean (95% confidence interval) area under the ROC curve for predicting patient diagnoses, grouped into Phecode phenotypes, using the baseline, methylation data, and genotype data. Confidence intervals determined using bootstrapping.

Phecode Phenotype	Baseline	Methylation	Genotypes
Disturbance of skin sensation	0.50 (0.43-0.58)	0.47 (0.40-0.56)	0.49 (0.41-0.58)
Paroxysmal tachycardia, unspecified	0.41 (0.34-0.49)	0.47 (0.38-0.55)	0.40 (0.32-0.49)
Disease of tricuspid valve	0.45 (0.38-0.54)	0.47 (0.38-0.55)	0.55 (0.48-0.64)
Other symptoms involving abdomen and pelvis	0.56 (0.47-0.62)	0.47 (0.39-0.55)	0.55 (0.47-0.61)
Other specified diseases of hair and hair folli...	0.39 (0.31-0.47)	0.47 (0.38-0.56)	0.52 (0.43-0.61)
Other dyschromia	0.56 (0.48-0.63)	0.46 (0.38-0.54)	0.50 (0.42-0.58)
Valvular heart disease/ heart chambers	0.48 (0.41-0.56)	0.45 (0.37-0.54)	0.54 (0.45-0.62)
Heart transplant/surgery	0.49 (0.40-0.58)	0.45 (0.37-0.53)	0.48 (0.41-0.55)
Calculus of kidney	0.54 (0.47-0.61)	0.45 (0.37-0.52)	0.52 (0.45-0.58)
Acute pharyngitis	0.43 (0.35-0.51)	0.45 (0.37-0.53)	0.42 (0.35-0.48)
Acute bronchitis and bronchiolitis	0.52 (0.44-0.61)	0.44 (0.36-0.55)	0.55 (0.45-0.63)
Diseases of pancreas	0.51 (0.42-0.58)	0.44 (0.37-0.53)	0.43 (0.36-0.49)
Paroxysmal supraventricular tachycardia	0.49 (0.42-0.57)	0.43 (0.34-0.51)	0.57 (0.48-0.65)
Opiates and related narcotics causing adverse e...	0.59 (0.50-0.68)	0.43 (0.35-0.51)	0.45 (0.36-0.54)
Other diseases of respiratory system, not elsew...	0.51 (0.40-0.60)	0.42 (0.34-0.50)	0.49 (0.40-0.57)
Cervicalgia	0.51 (0.44-0.59)	0.42 (0.36-0.51)	0.52 (0.44-0.59)
Complications of cardiac/vascular device, impla...	0.54 (0.47-0.61)	0.42 (0.32-0.53)	0.51 (0.42-0.59)
Other hypertrophic and atrophic conditions of skin	0.55 (0.47-0.63)	0.40 (0.32-0.47)	0.42 (0.36-0.50)

Table S5. The imputation accuracy, p-value and number of CpGs selected for significantly imputed MRS that also significantly improved over the baseline model.

Pharmaceutical Subclass	Medication GPI	AUC	p-value	Number of CpGs
Phosphate Binder Agents	5280	0.876	1.106E-50	2715
Hematopoietic Growth Factors	8240	0.840	1.747E-45	996
Immunosuppressive Agents	9940	0.828	9.443E-41	2870
CMV Agents	1220	0.905	1.720E-38	1223
Osmotic Diuretics	3740	0.848	6.372E-34	510
B-Complex w/ Folic Acid	7813	0.836	3.442E-31	2593
Metabolic Modifiers	3090	0.813	1.213E-28	2200
Prostatic Hypertrophy Agents	5685	0.779	2.411E-25	2586
Plasma Proteins	8540	0.739	4.379E-24	3353
Proton Pump Inhibitors	4927	0.693	3.500E-23	1097
Anti-infectives - Throat	8810	0.765	2.443E-20	453
Imidazole-Related Antifungals	1140	0.720	2.249E-17	2507
Vasodilators	3640	0.708	6.753E-17	654
Glucocorticosteroids	2210	0.663	1.354E-16	4508
Loop Diuretics	3720	0.674	5.020E-16	4529
Anti-infective Misc. - Combinations	1699	0.665	7.711E-16	3503
Analgesics Other	6420	0.651	1.084E-15	833
Antihistamines - Ethanolamines	4120	0.660	1.056E-14	649
Laxatives - Miscellaneous	4660	0.648	4.984E-14	4203
Anti-infective Agents - Misc.	1600	0.674	9.525E-14	657
5-HT3 Receptor Antagonists	5025	0.653	1.049E-13	4570
Fluoroquinolones	500	0.658	1.885E-13	510
Benzodiazepines	5710	0.658	1.957E-13	4482
Potassium Removing Agents	9945	0.736	2.568E-13	2048
Cephalosporins - 3rd Generation	230	0.665	4.926E-13	2379
Stimulant Laxatives	4620	0.642	1.014E-12	3949
Calcium Channel Blockers	3400	0.638	3.149E-12	4658
Insulin	2710	0.654	3.947E-12	3385
Carbohydrates	8010	0.652	5.207E-12	4246
Thrombolytic Enzymes	8560	0.747	5.481E-12	1504
Parenteral Therapy Supplies	9705	0.709	1.580E-11	554
Local Anesthetic Combinations	6999	0.655	2.178E-11	3235
Heparins And Heparinoid-Like Agents	8310	0.637	2.486E-11	607
Electrolyte Mixtures	7999	0.634	4.224E-11	591
Potassium	7970	0.643	4.564E-11	870
Calcium	7910	0.659	6.164E-11	3126
Alpha-Beta Blockers	3330	0.647	7.206E-11	4029
Beta Blockers Cardio-Selective	3320	0.618	8.699E-11	5159
Glycopeptides	1628	0.639	2.870E-10	2999
Saline Laxatives	4610	0.643	3.819E-10	3509
Magnesium	7940	0.636	1.011E-09	3643
Diagnostic Radiopharmaceuticals	9435	0.630	4.355E-09	652
Antiseptics - Mouth/Throat	8815	0.673	5.057E-09	2134
Vasopressors	3800	0.624	9.485E-09	4378

Continued on next page

Table S5. The imputation accuracy, p-value and number of CpGs selected for significantly imputed MRS that also significantly improved over the baseline model.

Pharmaceutical Subclass	Medication GPI	AUC	p-value	Number of CpGs
Phenothiazines	5920	0.616	1.141E-07	353
Antiperistaltic Agents	4710	0.655	3.923E-07	468
Alternative Medicine - C's	9509	0.658	2.111E-06	135
Liquid Vehicles	9840	0.655	2.814E-06	1372
Antiflatulents	5220	0.624	5.187E-06	1750
Alternative Medicine - M's	9539	0.652	6.305E-06	1792
Misc. Nutritional Substances	8050	0.616	1.029E-05	2702
Gallstone Solubilizing Agents	5210	0.724	1.071E-05	1177
Thiazides and Thiazide-Like Diuretics	3760	0.629	1.291E-05	73
Corticosteroids - Topical	9055	0.575	1.354E-04	44

Lab	R^2	p-value	Number of CpGs
Creatinine	0.457	1.266E-95	32364
Urea Nitrogen	0.435	2.502E-87	4218
Absolute Eos Count	0.352	3.960E-51	3602
Hemoglobin	0.284	3.024E-50	25995
Hematocrit	0.246	1.144E-42	1827
Neutrophil Percent, Auto	0.264	1.139E-36	897
Mean Corpuscular Hemoglobin	0.208	7.037E-35	33151
Mean Corpuscular Volume	0.183	1.439E-30	60383
Platelet Count, Auto	0.168	1.956E-28	15362
Chloride	0.141	1.493E-24	44943
Albumin	0.143	6.472E-22	6020
Absolute Immature Gran Count	0.155	1.545E-20	1705
White Blood Cell Count	0.120	3.405E-20	29995
Absolute Neut Count	0.149	4.974E-20	19924
Sodium	0.115	5.060E-20	35598
Absolute Lymphocyte Count	0.128	2.920E-17	10575
Absolute Mono Count	0.121	2.579E-16	3675
Neutrophils Abs (Prelim)	0.116	1.263E-15	18192
Glucose	0.075	4.033E-13	973
Absolute Baso Count	0.086	7.020E-12	566
Hgb A1c - Hplc	0.125	2.588E-11	902
Ferritin	0.122	1.331E-07	40620
Iron Binding Capacity	0.104	8.842E-07	7121
Qrs Duration	0.052	1.722E-06	4731
Anion Gap	0.027	1.729E-05	29869
Alanine Aminotransferase	0.028	2.801E-05	546
Cholesterol, Hdl	0.054	4.612E-05	60
Ventricular Rate	0.033	1.499E-04	92303
Bilirubin, Total	0.022	3.094E-04	535

Table S6. The imputation accuracy, p-value and number of CpGs selected for significantly imputed MRS that also significantly improved over the baseline model.

Table S7. The imputation accuracy, p-value and number of CpGs selected for significantly imputed MRS that also significantly improved over the baseline model.

Phenotype	Phecode	AUC	p-value	Number of CpGs
End stage renal disease	585.32	0.898	5.459E-72	2790
Chronic renal failure [CKD]	585.3	0.820	1.814E-56	4357
Renal dialysis	585.31	0.880	9.402E-56	2654
Renal failure	585.0	0.798	6.810E-51	4836
Hypertensive chronic kidney disease	401.22	0.801	1.446E-42	3851
Immunity deficiency	279.1	0.821	7.942E-33	624
Anemia of chronic disease	285.2	0.789	1.395E-32	3391
Disorders involving the immune mechanism	279.0	0.799	1.072E-30	2681
Anemia in chronic kidney disease	285.21	0.813	5.977E-27	537
Kidney replaced by transplant	587.0	0.813	8.000E-27	605
Morbid obesity	278.11	0.847	2.416E-26	158
Cirrhosis of liver without mention of alcohol	571.51	0.856	2.588E-25	441
Essential hypertension	401.1	0.701	1.007E-22	4666
Disorders resulting from impaired renal function	588.0	0.796	1.982E-20	1944
Decreased white blood cell count	288.1	0.811	7.196E-20	1716
Neutropenia	288.11	0.836	1.106E-19	1137
Type 2 diabetes	250.2	0.698	8.981E-19	500
Hypertensive heart and/or renal disease	401.2	0.723	1.408E-17	2804
Acute renal failure	585.1	0.704	1.739E-17	551
Hypertension	401.0	0.674	1.852E-17	563
Secondary hyperparathyroidism (of renal origin)	588.2	0.763	1.011E-15	1942
Poisoning by primarily systemic agents	963.0	0.818	1.029E-14	1022
Other anemias	285.0	0.667	1.134E-14	4294
Other disorders of the kidney and ureters	586.0	0.685	3.876E-14	3263
Hyperpotassemia	276.13	0.706	1.047E-13	2642
Fluid overload	276.6	0.756	3.137E-13	1667
Acid-base balance disorder	276.4	0.733	3.331E-13	1863
Respiratory failure, insufficiency, arrest	509.0	0.729	1.338E-11	491
Portal hypertension	571.81	0.803	2.149E-11	1347
Chronic liver disease and cirrhosis	571.0	0.707	6.362E-11	429
Disorders of fluid, electrolyte, and acid-base balance	276.0	0.664	7.581E-11	3827
Abnormal involuntary movements	350.1	0.757	7.668E-10	284
Liver abscess and sequelae of chronic liver disease	571.8	0.782	9.916E-10	1420
Purpura and other hemorrhagic conditions	287.0	0.714	1.059E-09	1747
Liver replaced by transplant	573.2	0.764	1.119E-09	317
Thrombocytopenia	287.3	0.697	1.367E-09	433
Splenomegaly	579.2	0.705	6.780E-09	350
Coagulation defects	286.0	0.738	1.068E-08	453
Altered mental status	292.4	0.722	1.817E-08	1054
Nephritis and nephropathy without mention of glomerulonephritis	580.3	0.679	2.788E-08	1640
Type 2 diabetes with renal manifestations	250.22	0.680	3.467E-08	1716
Nephritis; nephrosis; renal sclerosis	580.0	0.664	4.350E-08	2296

Continued on next page

Table S7. The imputation accuracy, p-value and number of CpGs selected for significantly imputed MRS that also significantly improved over the baseline model.

Phenotype	Phecode	AUC	p-value	Number of CpGs
Nausea and vomiting	789.0	0.650	7.959E-08	2725
Antineoplastic and immunosuppressive drugsadverse effects	963.1	0.786	3.432E-07	290
Acute pain	338.1	0.649	4.095E-07	2306
Cardiomegaly	416.0	0.622	4.106E-07	3672
Senile cataract	366.2	0.657	4.269E-07	1875
Other disorders of metabolism	277.0	0.704	5.053E-07	1362
Chronic Kidney Disease, Stage III	585.33	0.651	1.493E-06	515
Renal failure NOS	585.2	0.692	1.697E-06	1197
Chronic Kidney Disease, Stage IV	585.34	0.675	3.079E-06	1956
Atherosclerosis	440.0	0.660	8.130E-06	329
Heart failure NOS	428.2	0.623	1.243E-05	2759
Poisoning by hormones and synthetic substitutes	962.0	0.690	1.919E-05	1061
Iron deficiency anemia secondary to blood loss (chronic)	280.2	0.667	3.463E-05	269
Other hypertrophic and atrophic conditions of skin	701.0	0.632	5.942E-05	951

Table S8. Number of samples with reported usage of medications in the pharmaceutical subclasses. Pharmaceutical subclasses are sorted by number of samples.

Pharmaceutical Subclass	Number of Samples (Percent)
Sodium	699 (80.9%)
Opioid Agonists	639 (74.0%)
Local Anesthetics - Amides	589 (68.2%)
Non-Barbiturate Hypnotics	584 (67.6%)
5-HT ₃ Receptor Antagonists	549 (63.5%)
Analgesics Other	544 (63.0%)
Radiographic Contrast Media	535 (61.9%)
Anesthetics - Misc.	507 (58.7%)
Glucocorticosteroids	499 (57.8%)
Salicylates	459 (53.1%)
Heparins And Heparinoid-Like Agents	459 (53.1%)
Opioid Combinations	458 (53.0%)
HMG CoA Reductase Inhibitors	456 (52.8%)
Proton Pump Inhibitors	443 (51.3%)
Oil Soluble Vitamins	434 (50.2%)
Vasopressors	421 (48.7%)
Surfactant Laxatives	398 (46.1%)
Electrolyte Mixtures	390 (45.1%)
Antiarrhythmics Type I-B	383 (44.3%)
Beta Blockers Cardio-Selective	383 (44.3%)
Cephalosporins - 1st Generation	369 (42.7%)
Calcium Channel Blockers	367 (42.5%)
Loop Diuretics	346 (40.0%)
Miscellaneous Contrast Media	341 (39.5%)
Nondepolarizing Muscle Relaxants	336 (38.9%)
Fluoroquinolones	327 (37.8%)
Stimulant Laxatives	326 (37.7%)
Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Agents (NSAIDs)	313 (36.2%)
Sympathomimetics	308 (35.6%)
Antihistamines - Ethanolamines	301 (34.8%)
Laxatives - Miscellaneous	293 (33.9%)
Magnesium	290 (33.6%)
Local Anesthetics - Topical	280 (32.4%)
Potassium	277 (32.1%)
Insulin	269 (31.1%)
Benzodiazepines	265 (30.7%)
Diagnostic Radiopharmaceuticals	264 (30.6%)
Anticonvulsants - Misc.	260 (30.1%)
Carbohydrates	252 (29.2%)
Saline Laxatives	250 (28.9%)
Antispasmodics	250 (28.9%)
H ₂ Antagonists	232 (26.9%)
Angiotensin II Receptor Antagonists	231 (26.7%)
ACE Inhibitors	225 (26.0%)
Penicillin Combinations	219 (25.3%)
Cephalosporins - 3rd Generation	217 (25.1%)

Nitrates	215 (24.9%)
Glycopeptides	213 (24.7%)
Alpha-Beta Blockers	210 (24.3%)
Calcium	207 (24.0%)
Multivitamins	207 (24.0%)
Local Anesthetic Combinations	200 (23.1%)
Anti-infective Misc. - Combinations	198 (22.9%)
Anti-infective Agents - Misc.	193 (22.3%)
Plasma Proteins	190 (22.0%)
Diagnostic Drugs	189 (21.9%)
Water Soluble Vitamins	188 (21.8%)
Phenothiazines	184 (21.3%)
Gastrointestinal Stimulants	182 (21.1%)
Corticosteroids - Topical	182 (21.1%)
Central Muscle Relaxants	181 (20.9%)
Viral Vaccines	175 (20.3%)
Iron	170 (19.7%)
Vasodilators	168 (19.4%)
Antibiotics - Topical	166 (19.2%)
Hematopoietic Growth Factors	165 (19.1%)
Azithromycin	164 (19.0%)
Antacids - Calcium Salts	164 (19.0%)
Antimyasthenic/Cholinergic Agents	158 (18.3%)
Nasal Steroids	158 (18.3%)
Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs)	157 (18.2%)
Thiazides and Thiazide-Like Diuretics	157 (18.2%)
Misc. Nutritional Substances	155 (17.9%)
Opioid Antagonists	155 (17.9%)
Platelet Aggregation Inhibitors	154 (17.8%)
Thyroid Hormones	149 (17.2%)
Antifungals - Topical	149 (17.2%)
Bacterial Vaccines	144 (16.7%)
Immunosuppressive Agents	142 (16.4%)
Phosphate Binder Agents	140 (16.2%)
Serotonin Modulators	136 (15.7%)
Laxative Combinations	136 (15.7%)
Biguanides	135 (15.6%)
Depolarizing Muscle Relaxants	135 (15.6%)
Genitourinary Irrigants	134 (15.5%)
Prostatic Hypertrophy Agents	134 (15.5%)
Bronchodilators - Anticholinergics	131 (15.2%)
Antiflatulents	130 (15.0%)
Antacid Combinations	127 (14.7%)
Aminopenicillins	126 (14.6%)
Imidazole-Related Antifungals	125 (14.5%)
Diagnostic Tests	120 (13.9%)
Cobalamins	118 (13.7%)
Folic Acid/Folates	116 (13.4%)
B-Complex w/ Folic Acid	116 (13.4%)
Antihistamines - Non-Sedating	113 (13.1%)
Anesthetics Topical Oral	108 (12.5%)

Diabetic Supplies	107 (12.4%)
Osmotic Diuretics	106 (12.3%)
Tetracyclines	105 (12.2%)
Multiple Vitamins w/ Minerals	105 (12.2%)
Ophthalmic Anti-infectives	104 (12.0%)
Metabolic Modifiers	102 (11.8%)
Potassium Removing Agents	102 (11.8%)
Potassium Sparing Diuretics	101 (11.7%)
Hemostatics - Topical	101 (11.7%)
Ophthalmics - Misc.	101 (11.7%)
Gout Agents	100 (11.6%)
Alternative Medicine - M's	99 (11.5%)
Parenteral Therapy Supplies	99 (11.5%)
Cough/Cold/Allergy Combinations	99 (11.5%)
Antiseptics - Mouth/Throat	98 (11.3%)
Direct Factor Xa Inhibitors	97 (11.2%)
Anti-infectives - Throat	94 (10.9%)
Anti-inflammatory Agents - Topical	93 (10.8%)
Coumarin Anticoagulants	92 (10.6%)
Posterior Pituitary Hormones	91 (10.5%)
Antidotes and Specific Antagonists	90 (10.4%)
Antiadrenergic Antihypertensives	90 (10.4%)
Ophthalmic Steroids	90 (10.4%)
Antitussives	88 (10.2%)
Lincosamides	84 (9.7%)
Dibenzapines	83 (9.6%)
Bone Density Regulators	81 (9.4%)
Antianxiety Agents - Misc.	80 (9.3%)
Phosphate	78 (9.0%)
Antiemetics - Anticholinergic	77 (8.9%)
Antiperistaltic Agents	76 (8.8%)
Herpes Agents	76 (8.8%)
Bicarbonates	75 (8.7%)
Liquid Vehicles	72 (8.3%)
Antiarrhythmics Type III	72 (8.3%)
Artificial Tears and Lubricants	71 (8.2%)
Antidiarrheal/Probiotic Agents - Misc.	71 (8.2%)
Toxoid Combinations	70 (8.1%)
Urinary Antispasmodic - Antimuscarinics (Antich...	67 (7.8%)
Lozenges	67 (7.8%)
CMV Agents	66 (7.6%)
Thrombolytic Enzymes	66 (7.6%)
Impotence Agents	65 (7.5%)
Alternative Medicine - C's	64 (7.4%)
Sulfonylureas	63 (7.3%)
Antihypertensive Combinations	63 (7.3%)
Specialty Vitamins Products	63 (7.3%)
Aminoglycosides	61 (7.1%)
Cephalosporins - 2nd Generation	60 (6.9%)
Alkalinizers	59 (6.8%)
Opioid Partial Agonists	73 (6.8%)

Urinary Anti-infectives	58 (6.7%)
Irrigation Solutions	58 (6.7%)
Influenza Agents	57 (6.6%)
Expectorants	57 (6.6%)
Beta Blockers Non-Selective	56 (6.5%)
Tricyclic Agents	56 (6.5%)
Serotonin-Norepinephrine Reuptake Inhibitors (S...	56 (6.5%)
Cephalosporins - 4th Generation	55 (6.4%)
Antihistamines-Topical	55 (6.4%)
Antacids - Bicarbonate	54 (6.2%)
Bulk Laxatives	53 (6.1%)
Alpha-2 Receptor Antagonists (Tetracyclics)	52 (6.0%)
Ophthalmic Local Anesthetics	49 (5.7%)
Hemostatics - Systemic	49 (5.7%)
Zinc	48 (5.6%)
Dipeptidyl Peptidase-4 (DPP-4) Inhibitors	47 (5.4%)
Gallstone Solubilizing Agents	47 (5.4%)
Cycloplegic Mydriatics	47 (5.4%)
Protamine	58 (5.4%)
Butyrophenones	46 (5.3%)
Antidepressants - Misc.	45 (5.2%)
Mucolytics	45 (5.2%)
Leukotriene Modulators	44 (5.1%)
B-Complex Vitamins	44 (5.1%)
Acne Products	44 (5.1%)

Table S9. Medications used in each pharmaceutical subclass

Pharmaceutical Subclass	Drug Name
ALKALINIZERS	BICITRA
ALKALINIZERS	CITRIC
ALKALINIZERS	CYTRA-2
ALKALINIZERS	CYTRA-3
ALKALINIZERS	POT
ALKALINIZERS	POTASSIUM
ANTI-INFECTIVES - THROAT	CLOTTRIMAZOLE
ANTI-INFECTIVES - THROAT	MICONAZOLE
ANTI-INFECTIVES - THROAT	NYSTATIN
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	B
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	B-COMPLEX
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	DIALYVITE
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	FULL
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	NEPHRO-VITE
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	NEPHROCAPS
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	RENA-VITE
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	RENAL
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	RENAL-VITE
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	VOL-CARE
B-COMPLEX W/ FOLIC ACID	VP-VITE
BIGUANIDES	METFORMIN
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	ADALAT
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	AFEDITAB
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	AMLODIPINE
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	CARTIA
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	DILT-XR
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	DILTIAZEM
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	FELODIPINE
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	ISRADIPINE
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	NICARDIPINE
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	NIFEDICAL
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	NIFEDIPINE
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	NIMODIPINE
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	NORVASC
CALCIUM CHANNEL BLOCKERS	VERAPAMIL
CMV AGENTS	VALCYTE
CMV AGENTS	VALGANCICLOVIR
DIBENZAPINES	OLANZAPINE
DIBENZAPINES	QUETIAPINE
DIBENZAPINES	ZYPREXA
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	ARANESP
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	DARBEPOETIN
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	EPOETIN
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	EPOGEN
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	FILGRASTIM
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	FILGRASTIM-SNDZ
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	MIRCERA

HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	NEULASTA
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	NEUPOGEN
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	PEGFILGRASTIM
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	PROCRIT
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	ROMIPLOSTIM
HEMATOPOIETIC GROWTH FACTORS	ZARXIO
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	ANTI-THYMOCYTE
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	AZATHIOPRINE
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	BASILIXIMAB
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	BELATACEPT
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	CELLCEPT
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	CYCLOSPORINE
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	EVEROLIMUS
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	IDS
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	MYCOPHENOLATE
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	MYCOPHENOLIC
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	MYFORTIC
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	NEORAL
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	PROGRAF
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	RAPAMUNE
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	SIROLIMUS
IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE AGENTS	TACROLIMUS
METABOLIC MODIFIERS	CALCITRIOL
METABOLIC MODIFIERS	CINACALCET
METABOLIC MODIFIERS	DOXERCALCIFEROL
METABOLIC MODIFIERS	HECTOROL
METABOLIC MODIFIERS	PARICALCITOL
METABOLIC MODIFIERS	ROCALTROL
METABOLIC MODIFIERS	SENSIPAR
METABOLIC MODIFIERS	ZEMPLAR
OSMOTIC DIURETICS	MANNITOL
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	AURYXIA
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	CALCIUM
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	FERRIC
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	FOSRENOL
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	LANTHANUM
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	PHOSLO
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	RENAGEL
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	REVELA
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	SEVELAMER
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	SUCROFERRIC
PHOSPHATE BINDER AGENTS	VELPHORO
POTASSIUM REMOVING RESINS	KALEXATE
POTASSIUM REMOVING RESINS	KAYEXALATE
POTASSIUM REMOVING RESINS	KIONEX
POTASSIUM REMOVING RESINS	PATROMER
POTASSIUM REMOVING RESINS	SODIUM
POTASSIUM REMOVING RESINS	VELTASSA
SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS)	CITALOPRAM
SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS)	ESCITALOPRAM
SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS)	FLUOXETINE

SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS)	FLUVOXAMINE
SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS)	LEXAPRO
SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS)	PAROXETINE
SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS)	SERTRALINE
SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS)	ZOLOFT
SPECIALTY VITAMINS PRODUCTS	MG-PLUS
SPECIALTY VITAMINS PRODUCTS	ONE-A-DAY
SPECIALTY VITAMINS PRODUCTS	PROSTATE
SULFONYLUREAS	GLIMEPIRIDE
SULFONYLUREAS	GLIPIZIDE
SULFONYLUREAS	GLYBURIDE
THROMBOLYTIC ENZYMES	ALTEPLASE
VASODILATORS	HYDRALAZINE
VASODILATORS	MINOXIDIL
VASODILATORS	NITROPRUSSIDE

Figure S6. Downsampled performance on additional medications. We extended the downsampling experiments to include the top 10 most accurately imputed medications that also offered significant predictive power over the baseline features. We include here the remaining 9 medications.

Figure S7. Downsampled performance on additional labs. We extended the downsampling experiments to include the top 10 most accurately imputed labs that also offered significant predictive power over the baseline features. We include here the remaining 9 labs.

Figure S8. Downsampled performance on additional Phecodes. We extended the downsampling experiments to include the top 10 most accurately imputed Phecodes that also offered significant predictive power over the baseline features. We include here the remaining 9 Phecodes.

Lab	PGS accession	Study	Number of variants in weight	Number of variants present in our data
Albumin	PGS000669	Sinnott-Armstrong et al.	11,912	9,172
Cholesterol	PGS000677	Sinnott-Armstrong et al.	17,204	13,401
Creatinine	PGS000679	Sinnott-Armstrong et al.	5,469	4,242
HGBA1C	PGS000685	Sinnott-Armstrong et al.	14,658	11,208
HDL	PGS000686	Sinnott-Armstrong et al.	25,070	19,123
Hematocrit	PGS001225	Tanigawa et al.	15,721	11,898
Hemoglobin	PGS001400	Tanigawa et al.	15,602	11,770
Mean corpuscular hemoglobin	PGS001219	Tanigawa et al.	13,003	9,853
Mean corpuscular volume	PGS001220	Tanigawa et al.	17,311	13,181
Urea nitrogen	PGS000701	Sinnott-Armstrong et al.	12,351	9,473

Table S10. Polygenic scores used for the imputed genotypes. We list below the weights used for computing the polygenic risk scores. We downloaded the weights from the Polygenic Score Catalogue (PGS)[55] from two studies of the UKBiobank [51, 53].

Figure S9. Self-reported ancestry along genetic PCs We show the primary self-identified ethnicity in each plot individually. For the analysis using external PRS we limited the set of white-identifying individuals to those who additionally had a PC1 score of $- < .01$. We show the individuals used in our analysis in plot E.

Figure S10. Labs as predicted by methylation, an externally-trained polygenic risk score, both, and a model that includes both as well as their interaction. The cross-validated adjusted R^2 between the true and imputed lab value on 541 unrelated patients of non-Hispanic-Latino white-identifying individuals using predictors that leveraged baseline features with either an MRS, a PRS externally-trained from the UKBiobank, both the MRS and the PRS, or a model that used both as well as the interaction between the MRS and PRS. Creatinine was the only outcome for which the interaction between both risk scores was statistically significant ($p=9.16e-05$), however the interaction for mean corpuscular hemoglobin was nominally significant ($p=1.44e-02$). HDL corresponds to high-density lipoprotein cholesterol and HGBA1C to glycated hemoglobin.

Figure S11. Best methylation-predicted medications within ancestral populations. After training a model on the entire heterogeneous set of individuals, we evaluated the predictive performance within each population separately. We observed no significant differences within self-reported ancestral groupings.

Figure S12. Best methylation-predicted lab panels within ancestral populations. After training a model on the entire heterogeneous set of individuals, we evaluated the predictive performance within each population separately. We observed no significant differences within self-reported ancestral groupings.

Figure S13. Imputation accuracy when constructing PRS using chipped genotypes compared to using imputed genotypes We fit models using the imputed genotypes on the outcomes that were best imputed by the chipped genotypes and that significantly improved over the baseline model. Using the imputed genotypes did not result in significant differences in imputation accuracy when compared to the chipped genotypes.

Figure S14. Imputation error as a function of time since methylation sample collection date We analyzed the lab value imputation residuals to see if the errors were associated with the number of days between the lab result and the methylation collection date. After correcting for multiple hypotheses, only one lab showed a significant association between the imputed value residuals and time between collection dates (absolute basophil count, Pearson $R=0.178$, Bonferroni corrected p-value=0.0045). Here we show the absolute residual error as a function of the number of days the lab resulted before methylation collection for the only significantly associated lab, absolute basophil count (note the log scaling on the x-axis)