Genetically-proxied anti-diabetic drug target perturbation and risk of cancer: a Mendelian randomization analysis
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Abstract

Aims/hypothesis: Epidemiological studies have generated conflicting findings on the relationship between anti-diabetic medication use and cancer risk. Naturally occurring variation in genes encoding anti-diabetic drug targets can be used to investigate the effect of their pharmacological perturbation on cancer risk.

Methods: We developed genetic instruments for three anti-diabetic drug targets (peroxisome proliferator activated receptor gamma, PPARG; sulfonylurea receptor 1, ABCC8; glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor, GLP1R) using summary genetic association data from a genome-wide association study (GWAS) of type 2 diabetes in 69,869 cases and 127,197 controls in the Million Veteran Program. Genetic instruments were constructed using cis-acting genome-wide significant ($P<5\times10^{-8}$) single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) permitted to be in weak linkage disequilibrium ($r^2<0.20$). Summary genetic association estimates for these SNPs were obtained from GWAS consortia for the following cancers: breast (122,977 cases, 105,974 controls), colorectal (58,221 cases, 67,694 controls), prostate (79,148 cases, 61,106 controls), and overall (i.e. site-combined) cancer (27,483 cases, 372,016 controls). Inverse-variance weighted random-effects models adjusting for linkage disequilibrium were employed to estimate causal associations between genetically-proxied drug target perturbation and cancer risk. Colocalisation analysis was employed to examine robustness of findings to violations of Mendelian randomization (MR) assumptions. A Bonferroni correction was employed as a heuristic to define associations from MR analyses as “strong” and “weak” evidence.

Results: In Mendelian randomization analysis, genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation was weakly associated with higher risk of prostate cancer (OR for PPARG perturbation equivalent to a 1 unit decrease in inverse-rank normal transformed HbA1c: 1.75, 95% CI 1.07-2.85, $P=0.02$). In histological subtype-stratified analyses, genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation was weakly associated with lower risk of ER+ breast cancer (OR 0.57, 95% CI 0.38-0.85; $P=6.45\times10^{-3}$). In colocalisation analysis however, there was little evidence of shared causal variants for type 2 diabetes liability and cancer endpoints in the PPARG locus, though these analyses were likely underpowered. There was little evidence to support associations of genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation with colorectal or overall cancer risk or genetically-proxied ABCC8 or GLP1R perturbation with risk across cancer endpoints.

Conclusions/interpretation: Our drug-target MR analyses did not find consistent evidence to support an association of genetically-proxied PPARG, ABCC8 or GLP1R perturbation with breast, colorectal, prostate or overall cancer risk. Further evaluation of these drug targets using alternative molecular epidemiological approaches may help to further corroborate the findings presented in this analysis.
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Research in context

- What is already known about this subject?
  - Anti-diabetic medication use is variably linked to both increased and decreased cancer risk in conventional epidemiological studies
  - It is unclear whether these associations represent causal relationships

- What is the key question?
  - What is the association of genetically-proxied perturbation of three anti-diabetic drug targets (PPARG, ABCC8, GLP1R) with risk of breast, colorectal, prostate and overall cancer risk?

- What are the new findings?
  - Genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation was weakly associated with higher risk of prostate cancer and lower risk of ER+ breast cancer
  - There was little evidence that liability to type 2 diabetes and these cancer endpoints shared one or more causal variants in the PPARG locus, a necessary precondition to infer causality between PPARG perturbation and cancer risk

- How might this impact on clinical practice in the foreseeable future?
  - Our drug-target Mendelian randomization analyses did not find consistent evidence to support a link between genetically-proxied perturbation of PPARG, ABCC8, and GLP1R and risk of breast, colorectal, prostate and overall cancer risk
  - These findings suggest that on-target effects of PPARG agonists, sulfonylureas, and GLP1R agonists are unlikely to confer large effects on breast, colorectal, prostate, or overall cancer risk
Introduction

Globally, an estimated 460 million individuals have type 2 diabetes, the majority of whom require long-term use of anti-diabetic medications to maintain glycaemic control [1]. Several different classes of oral anti-diabetic medications are used to manage this condition, including biguanides (e.g. metformin), sulphonylureas, thiazolidinediones, dipeptidyl peptidase-4 (DPP-4) inhibitors, sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors and glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor (GLP1R) agonists, with diverse mechanisms of action [2].

Preclinical studies have variably reported both carcinogenic and anti-neoplastic effects of anti-diabetic medications. For example, in vitro studies have suggested that metformin, an insulin sensitisier and first-line therapy for type 2 diabetes, can reduce cell proliferation, induce apoptosis, and cause cell cycle arrest [3]. Thiazolidinediones, insulin sensitisers and selective peroxisome proliferator-activator nuclear receptor (PPARG) agonists, have been suggested to increase cellular differentiation, reduce cellular proliferation, and induce apoptosis in some cell lines but to promote metastatic prostate cancer in vivo [4-6]. There is also some evidence that sulphonylureas, secretagogues that lower blood glucose levels by stimulating pancreatic insulin secretion, may promote carcinogenesis, potentially via increasing circulating insulin levels [7, 8]. Finally, in vitro studies have reported potential antiproliferative effects of GLP1R agonists in various cancer cell types[9-11].

Epidemiological studies of anti-diabetic medication use have provided some support for findings from laboratory studies. For example, some observational studies have reported that metformin users have lower risk of several cancers while sulphonylurea use has been associated with an increased risk of site-specific (i.e. colorectal, metastatic prostate) and overall cancer [12-17]. In addition, some thiazolidinediones (i.e. pioglitazones) have been linked to an elevated risk of bladder, prostate, and pancreatic cancer, though use of rosiglitazones has been associated with lower breast cancer risk [18, 19]. Finally, GLP1R agonist use has been associated with a decreased risk of prostate cancer when compared with sulphonylurea use [20].

The causal nature of associations reported between anti-diabetic medication use and cancer risk in conventional epidemiological studies is often unclear. This is because of the susceptibility of such studies to residual confounding (e.g. due to indication) and various forms of bias (e.g. immortal time, prevalent user), which can undermine robust causal inference [21-23]. While clinical trials of anti-diabetic medications have not consistently reported differences in rates of cancer among users of these medications, such studies are often underpowered to detect effects for individual cancer sites [23-27]. Further, such studies often have limited follow-up periods, thus not being able to adequately capture outcomes with long induction periods, such as cancer.
Drug target-Mendelian randomization (MR) uses germline variants in genes encoding drug targets as instruments (“proxies”) for these targets to estimate the effect of their pharmacological perturbation on disease endpoints [28, 29]. Since germline genetic variants are randomly assorted at meiosis and fixed at conception, analyses using variants as instruments should be less prone to conventional issues of confounding and reverse causation. In addition, given the length of time required for solid tumour development, the use of germline genetic variants as instruments is advantageous as it permits estimation of the long-term effects of medication use on cancer risk [30].

Given the widespread use of anti-diabetic medications and reports of both adverse and protective associations of these medications with cancer risk in preclinical and epidemiological studies, there is a need to further evaluate the role of these medications in the risk of common adult cancers. Additionally, given the long induction periods of cancer, using MR to examine target-mediated effects of medications that have been on the market for relatively short periods of time (e.g. SGLT2 inhibitors and GLP1R agonists) can be informative in predicting their long-term safety profiles. We thus aimed to i) develop genetic instruments for the targets of five approved type 2 diabetes medications with known mechanisms of action [sulfonylurea receptor 1 (ABCC8), PPAR\gamma, sodium/glucose cotransporter 2 (SLC5A2), DPP4, GLP1R)] and ii) evaluate associations of genetically-proxied perturbation of three of these targets with reliable cis-acting instruments (ABCC8, PPAR\gamma, and GLP1R) with risk of breast, colorectal, prostate, common cancers with epidemiological evidence suggesting a link between anti-diabetic medication use and their onset, and overall (i.e. site-combined) cancer [5, 12-14, 18, 19, 31-33].

Methods

Summary genetic association data were obtained from three cancer-specific genome-wide association study (GWAS) consortia. Summary genetic association estimates for overall and oestrogen receptor-stratified breast cancer risk in up to 122,977 cases and 105,974 controls were obtained from the Breast Cancer Association Consortium (BCAC) [34]. Summary genetic association estimates for overall and site-specific (i.e. colon, rectal) colorectal cancer risk in up to 58,221 cases and 67,694 controls were obtained from an analysis of the Genetics and Epidemiology of Colorectal Cancer Consortium (GECCO), ColoRectal Transdisciplinary Study (CORECT), and Colon Cancer Family Registry (CCFR) [35]. Summary genetic association estimates for overall and advanced prostate cancer risk (i.e. metastatic disease, Gleason score ≥8, prostate-specific antigen >100 or prostate cancer-related death) in up to 79,148 cases and 61,106 controls were obtained from the Prostate Cancer Association Group to Investigate Cancer Associated Alterations in the Genome (PRACTICAL) consortium [36]. These analyses were restricted to participants of European ancestry.
Overall (i.e. site-combined) cancer risk data in 27,483 incident cases and 372,016 controls were also obtained from a GWAS performed in the UK Biobank cohort study [37]. Briefly, cancer cases were classified according to the International Classification of Diseases (ICD9, ICD10) with data completed to April 2019 and controls were defined as individuals who did not have any cancer code (ICD9 or ICD10) and did not self-report a cancer diagnosis. GWAS were performed using a linear mixed model as implemented in BOLT-LMM (v2.3) (to account for relatedness and population stratification) and adjusted for age, sex, and genotyping array [38, 39].

Further information on statistical analysis, imputation, and quality control measures for these studies is available in the original publications. All studies contributing data to these analyses had the relevant institutional review board approval from each country, in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and all participants provided informed consent.

**Instrument construction**

To generate genetic instruments to proxy anti-diabetic drug target perturbation, summary genetic association data were obtained from a GWAS of type 2 diabetes (T2D) in the Million Veteran Program (148,726 cases; 965,732 controls of European ancestry) [40]. Analyses were adjusted for age, sex, and ten principal components of genetic ancestry. Instruments were constructed in PLINK by obtaining SNPs associated with type 2 diabetes at genome-wide significance ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) that were in or within ±500 kb from the gene encoding each respective target (PPARG, Chr3: 12328867-12475855; ABCC8, Chr11: 17414432-17498449; GLP1R, Chr6: 39016574-39055519) using the 1000 Genomes Phase 3 reference panel [41, 42]. We were unable to identify genome-wide significant SNPs within 500kb windows from **SLC5A2** and **DPP4** (i.e. instruments for SGLT2 and DPP-4 inhibitors, respectively) and therefore did not proceed with Mendelian randomization analyses for these targets. We also did not include metformin as a drug target due to the unclear mechanism(s) of action of this medication [43]. For PPARG, ABCC8, and GLP1R, SNPs used as instruments were permitted to be in weak linkage disequilibrium ($r^2<0.20$) with each other to increase the proportion of variance in each respective drug target explained by the instrument, maximising instrument strength [44]. In total, 9 SNPs that met these criteria were obtained for PPARG, 6 for ABCC8, and 4 for GLP1R.

In a separate population, we then evaluated the association of type 2 diabetes SNPs in drug target regions with glycated haemoglobin (HbA$_{1c}$) levels, a marker of long-term blood glucose levels, in order to minimise winner’s curse bias. SNP summary statistics were re-scaled to represent a mmol/mol unit reduction in HbA$_{1c}$ to provide more interpretable effect estimates in Mendelian randomization analyses. HbA$_{1c}$ values were obtained from a GWAS of 407,766 participants of the UK Biobank study and adjusted for age, sex, batch, and ten principal components of genetic ancestry.
For the PPARG instrument, 2 SNPs where the effect on HbA1c was in the opposite direction to that of type 2 diabetes were removed from the instrument (rs17036160, rs11712085), as these associations likely represent pleiotropic mechanisms that would bias consequent Mendelian randomization analyses.

Instrument validation

Instruments were validated by examining the association of genetically-proxied drug target perturbation with endpoints influenced by these medications in randomised controlled trials. For PPARG, alanine aminotransferase (ALT) and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) levels were used as positive controls and for ABCC8 and GLP1R, body mass index (BMI) was used [45-48]. Colocalisation was then performed to assess whether drug targets and traits representing positive controls share the same causal variant at a given locus. Such an analysis can permit exploration of whether drug targets and positive control traits are influenced by distinct causal variants that are in linkage disequilibrium with each other, indicative of horizontal pleiotropy (an instrument influencing an outcome through pathways independent to that of the exposure), a violation of the exclusion restriction criterion [49].

Colocalisation analysis was performed using the coloc R package which uses approximate Bayes factor computation to generate posterior probabilities that associations between two traits represent each of the following configurations: (i) neither trait has a genetic association in the region (H0), (ii) only the first trait has a genetic association in the region (H1), (iii) only the second trait has a genetic association in the region (H2), (iv) both traits are associated but have different causal variants (H3) and (v) both traits are associated and share a single causal variant (H4) [50]. Colocalisation analysis was performed by generating ±500 kb windows around the gene encoding each respective drug target. We used a posterior probability of >0.50 to indicate support for a configuration tested [51]. Where there was not support for H4, we then examined the possibility of colocalisation across other secondary conditionally independent signals for either drug targets or positive controls by performing pairwise conditional and colocalization analysis on all conditionally independent association signals using GCTA-COJO and the coloc package as implemented in pwCoCo[50, 52, 53].

Statistical analysis

Causal estimates were generated using inverse-variance weighted (IVW) random-effects models (permitting overdispersion in models). These models were adjusted for weak linkage disequilibrium between SNPs with reference to the 1000 Genomes Phase 3 reference panel [41, 54].
Where there was under-dispersion in causal estimates generated from individual genetic variants, the residual standard error was set to 1 (i.e. equivalent to a fixed-effects model).

Mendelian randomization analysis assumes that a genetic instrument (i) is associated with a modifiable exposure or drug target (“relevance”), (ii) does not share a common cause with an outcome (“exchangeability”), and (iii) has no direct effect on the outcome (“exclusion restriction”)[28].

The “relevance” MR assumption was evaluated by generating estimates of the proportion of variance of each drug target (in HbA1c units) explained by the instrument ($r^2$) and F-statistics. F-statistics can be used to examine whether results are likely to be influenced by weak instrument bias, i.e., reduced statistical power and bias when an instrument explains a limited proportion of the variance in a drug target. As a convention, a F-statistic of >10 is indicative of minimal weak instrument bias [55].

We evaluated the “exclusion restriction” Mendelian randomization assumption by performing colocalisation to examine whether drug targets and cancer endpoints showing nominal evidence of an association in MR analyses ($P < 0.05$) share the same causal variant at a given locus. Iterative leave-one-out analysis was performed iteratively removing one SNP at a time from instruments to examine whether findings showing nominal evidence of association were driven by a single influential SNP.

To account for multiple testing across analyses, a Bonferroni correction was used to establish a $P$-value threshold of $< 0.0019$ (false positive rate = 0.05/27 statistical tests [3 drug targets tested against 9 primary cancer endpoints]), which we used as a heuristic to define “strong evidence”, with findings between $P \geq 0.0019$ and $P < 0.05$ defined as “weak evidence”.

**Results**

Characteristics of genetic variants used to instrument anti-diabetic drug targets are presented in Table 1. Across all three drug targets, F-statistics for their respective instruments ranged from 34.4 to 583.0, suggesting that weak instrument bias was unlikely to affect the conclusions (Supplementary Table 1). Power calculations suggested that we had 80% power to detect ORs ranging from 1.40-2.62 (in PPARG analyses), 2.03-8.34 (in ABCC8 analyses), and 2.22-8.78 (in GLP1R analyses) per mmol/mol reduction in target-mediated inverse rank-normal transformed HbA1c across all cancer endpoints ($\alpha=0.05$). Complete power estimates across all MR analyses are presented in Supplementary Table 2.

**Instrument validation**
Genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation was associated with lower levels of ALT (SD change in ALT per PPARG perturbation equivalent to 1 unit inverse-rank normal transformed [IRNT] HbA1c reduction: -0.57, 95% CI -1.01, -0.13; \( P=0.01 \)) and AST (-0.49, 95% CI -1.79, -0.19; \( P=1.53 \times 10^{-3} \)). Colocalisation analysis suggested that T2D associations in the PPARG locus had a 91.8% and 83.9% probability of sharing a causal variant with ALT and AST, respectively (Supplementary Tables 3-4, Figures 1-3).

Genetically-proxied ABCC8 perturbation was associated with elevated BMI (SD change in BMI per ABCC8 perturbation equivalent to 1 unit IRNT HbA1c reduction: 0.530, 95% CI 0.004, 0.172; \( P=3.75 \times 10^{-3} \)). Colocalisation analysis suggested that ABCC8 and BMI had a 94.0% posterior probability of sharing a causal variant within the ABCC8 locus (Supplementary Table 5, Figures 4-5).

There was little evidence to support an association of genetically-proxied GLP1R perturbation with BMI (SD change in BMI equivalent to 1 unit IRNT HbA1c reduction: -0.08, 95% CI -0.30, 0.15; \( P=0.51 \)). Colocalisation analysis applied to both marginal and conditionally independent associations for T2D and BMI in the GLP1R locus did not support shared causal variants across these traits (posterior probability of shared causal variants across models: 0.22-0.49%) (Supplementary Table 6, Figures 6-7).

Genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation and cancer risk

There was weak evidence for an association of genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation with an elevated risk of prostate cancer (OR 1.75, 95% CI 1.07-2.85; \( P=0.02 \)), but little evidence of association with other cancer endpoints (Table 2). Findings for prostate cancer risk were consistent in iterative leave-one-out analysis (Supplementary Table 7). Colocalisation using marginal and conditional associations for T2D and prostate cancer in the PPARG locus suggested that T2D was unlikely to share a causal variant with this cancer in this region (posterior probability of a shared causal variant across models: \( \leq 0.09\% \), posterior probability of distinct causal variants: \( \leq 25\% \)) (Supplementary Table 8, Figure 8).

In subtype-stratified analyses, genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation was weakly associated with lower risk of ER+ breast cancer (OR 0.57, 95% CI 0.38-0.85; \( P=6.45 \times 10^{-3} \)). This finding was consistent in iterative leave-one-out analysis (Supplementary Table 9). Colocalisation using marginal and conditional associations for T2D and ER+ breast cancer in the PPARG locus reported a low posterior probability (H\( _1 \leq 5\% \), posterior probability of distinct causal variants: \( \leq 23\% \)) of both traits sharing one or more causal variants within this region (Supplementary Table 10, Figure 9).
Genetically-proxied ABCC8 and GLP1R perturbation and cancer risk

There was little Mendelian randomization evidence of association of genetically-proxied ABCC8 or GLP1R perturbation with site-specific or overall cancer risk (Tables 3-4).

Discussion

In this Mendelian randomization analysis of up to 287,829 cases and 606,790 controls, we found weak evidence for an association of genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation with a higher risk of prostate cancer and lower risk of ER+ breast cancer. In colocalisation analysis, however, there was little evidence that genetic liability to type 2 diabetes and these cancer endpoints shared one or more causal variants within PPARG, though these analyses were likely underpowered given low posterior probabilities to support both H3 (i.e. distinct causal variants) and H4 (i.e. shared causal variants) across these analyses. We found little evidence of association of genetically-proxied GLP1R or ABCC8 perturbation with cancer risk.

Despite in vivo studies suggesting an important role of PPARG in prostate tumour growth and conventional epidemiological studies suggesting a link between pioglitazone use and elevated prostate cancer risk, our combined Mendelian randomization and colocalisation analyses did not find consistent evidence for an association of genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation with prostate cancer risk [6, 18]. Likewise, our findings are not consistent with some previous epidemiological studies which have reported links between rosiglitazone use and lower breast cancer risk and thiazolidinedione use and lower colorectal cancer risk [5, 19].

Interpretation of the pharmaco-epidemiological literature linking anti-diabetic medication use with cancer risk is challenging because of the likely susceptibility of many previous studies to residual confounding (e.g. by indication) due to the use of inappropriate comparator groups (i.e. non-medication users), the inclusion of “prevalent users” of medications in analyses, and the possibility of “immortal time” bias arising due to misalignment of the start of follow-up, eligibility, and treatment assignment of participants [21, 23].

Among the strengths of our analysis is the strict instrument selection and validation process employed. By using cis-acting variants, in close proximity to the genes that code for the drug targets of interest, horizontal pleiotropy should be minimised. In addition, we used strict positive control
analysis (i.e. testing drug targets against established secondary effects of medications) and colocalisation analyses (including colocalisation analyses permitting multiple causal variants) to validate the selected instruments. Our use of a summary-data Mendelian randomization approach permitted us to leverage large-scale genetic data from several GWAS consortia, enhancing statistical power and precision of causal estimates.

There were several limitations to this analysis. First, we had sufficient statistical power to detect large effect sizes only and therefore cannot rule out more modest effects of the drug targets examined on cancer risk. Second, although colocalisation analyses of PPARG and cancer endpoints provided low posterior probabilities for shared causal variants, it should be noted that this may also reflect limited power. The low posterior probabilities supporting either shared or distinct causal variants across several colocalisation analyses suggests that many of these analyses may have been too underpowered to support either of these configurations evaluated. Third, the low posterior probability of shared causal variants in “positive control” colocalisation analyses for GLP1R and body mass index could reflect distinct signalling mechanisms influencing type 2 diabetes and body mass index in GLP1R, the presence of which would not necessarily influence the validity of this as an instrument for GLP1R signalling perturbation to affect glycaemic control [57]. Fourth, we were unable to evaluate the role of several anti-diabetic drug targets (i.e. DPP-4 and SGLT2) due to the absence of reliable genetic instruments for these targets. Fifth, our analyses were restricted to examining target-mediated (i.e. “on-target”) effects of anti-diabetic medications on cancer endpoints. Sixth, potential non-linear drug and/or time-dependent effects were not evaluated in the current analysis. Seventh, MR estimates reported represent long-term effects of target modulation in non-diabetic populations, whereas the clinical effects of these medications may be more pronounced among type 2 diabetes patients and could depend on length of medication use. Finally, samples were restricted to individuals of European ancestry and therefore the generalisability of these findings to non-European populations is unclear.

In conclusion, we developed novel instruments for PPARG, ABCC8, and GLP1R using strict validation protocols and evaluated the association of genetically-proxied perturbation of these targets with risk of cancer. In Mendelian randomization analysis we found weak evidence that genetically-proxied PPARG perturbation was associated with a higher risk of prostate cancer and a lower risk of ER+ breast cancer. There was little evidence of colocalisation for these findings, a necessary precondition to infer causality between PPARG perturbation and these cancer endpoints, which could reflect the absence of shared causal variants across type 2 diabetes liability and these cancer endpoints in PPARG or the low statistical power of these analyses. Further assessment of these drug targets using alternative molecular epidemiological approaches (e.g. using protein or expression quantitative trait loci or using direct circulating measures of these proteins) and/or studies using medical registry data (e.g. “target trial” analyses) may help to further corroborate findings presented in this analysis.
[58]. Finally, we found little evidence of an association of genetically-proxied ABCC8 and GLP1R perturbation with risk of breast, colorectal, prostate, or overall cancer risk.
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### Table 1. Characteristics of single-nucleotide polymorphisms used as instruments to proxy drug targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>SNP</th>
<th>EA/NEA</th>
<th>EAF</th>
<th>Effect (SE) T2D</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Effect (SE) HbA1c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABCC8</td>
<td>rs5219</td>
<td>C/T</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.069 (0.005)</td>
<td>3.15 x 10^{-48}</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs4148640</td>
<td>T/G</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.045 (0.007)</td>
<td>4.47 x 10^{-11}</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs61880293</td>
<td>T/C</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.058 (0.009)</td>
<td>8.13 x 10^{-10}</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs7130826</td>
<td>T/G</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.031 (0.005)</td>
<td>1.94 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>-0.004 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs10832783</td>
<td>G/A</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.055 (0.009)</td>
<td>4.63 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs214080</td>
<td>A/G</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.005)</td>
<td>1.96 x 10^{-8}</td>
<td>-0.007 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLP1R</td>
<td>rs10305420</td>
<td>T/C</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.032 (0.005)</td>
<td>2.69 x 10^{-11}</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs34179517</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.044 (0.007)</td>
<td>3.09 x 10^{-10}</td>
<td>-0.007 (0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs9296291</td>
<td>C/T</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.033 (0.006)</td>
<td>3.42 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>-0.013 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs10305457</td>
<td>C/T</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.044 (0.008)</td>
<td>3.04 x 10^{-8}</td>
<td>-0.018 (0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPARG</td>
<td>rs7637403</td>
<td>A/G</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.074 (0.007)</td>
<td>1.03 x 10^{-24}</td>
<td>-0.007 (0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs4135247</td>
<td>A/G</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.042 (0.005)</td>
<td>2.23 x 10^{-19}</td>
<td>-0.035 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs598747</td>
<td>A/G</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.052 (0.007)</td>
<td>9.51 x 10^{-15}</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs15053537</td>
<td>A/G</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.140 (0.019)</td>
<td>5.38 x 10^{-13}</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs143888770</td>
<td>T/C</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.106 (0.016)</td>
<td>1.21 x 10^{-10}</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs17819328</td>
<td>T/G</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.028 (0.005)</td>
<td>9.56 x 10^{-10}</td>
<td>-0.023 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rs4135300</td>
<td>C/T</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.045 (0.008)</td>
<td>5.50 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>-0.013 (0.003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABCC8 = ATP Binding Cassette Subfamily C Member 8, GLP1R = glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor, PPARG = peroxisome proliferator activated receptor gamma, SNP = Single-nucleotide Polymorphism, EA = Effect Allele, NEA = Non-Effect Allele, EAF = Effect Allele Frequency. Effect (SE) corresponds to change in ln(OR) of type 2 diabetes or change in inverse normal-rank transformed HbA1c (mmol/mol). P-value corresponds to type 2 diabetes analyses.
Table 2. Mendelian randomization estimates examining the association of genetically-proxied perturbation of PPARG with site-specific and overall cancer risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N (cases, controls)</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast cancer</td>
<td>122,977; 105,974</td>
<td>0.67 (0.43-1.04)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER+ Breast cancer</td>
<td>69,501; 105,974</td>
<td>0.57 (0.38-0.85)</td>
<td>6.45 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER- Breast cancer</td>
<td>21,468; 105,974</td>
<td>1.14 (0.64-2.01)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal cancer</td>
<td>58,221; 67,694</td>
<td>0.95 (0.51-1.75)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon cancer</td>
<td>32,002; 64,159</td>
<td>1.22 (0.72-2.08)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectal cancer</td>
<td>16,212; 64,159</td>
<td>0.82 (0.25-2.71)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate cancer</td>
<td>79,148; 61,106</td>
<td>1.75 (1.07-2.85)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced prostate cancer</td>
<td>15,167; 58,308</td>
<td>1.64 (0.62-4.33)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall cancer risk</td>
<td>27,483; 372,016</td>
<td>0.72 (0.44-1.19)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPARG = peroxisome proliferator activated receptor gamma, ER+ = Oestrogen receptor positive, ER- = Oestrogen receptor negative. OR (95% CI) are scaled to represent the effect of genetically-proxied perturbation of PPARG equivalent to a 1 unit lowering of inverse rank-normal transformed HbA1c (mmol/mol). Advanced prostate cancer is defined as metastatic disease, Gleason score ≥8, prostate-specific antigen >100 or prostate cancer-related death.
**Table 3.** Mendelian randomization estimates examining the association of genetically-proxied perturbation of ABCC8 with site-specific and overall cancer risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N (cases, controls)</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast cancer</td>
<td>122,977; 105,974</td>
<td>2.09 (0.81-5.39)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER+ Breast cancer</td>
<td>69,501; 105,974</td>
<td>2.10 (0.66-6.74)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER- Breast cancer</td>
<td>21,468; 105,974</td>
<td>1.83 (0.48-6.97)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal cancer</td>
<td>58,221; 67,694</td>
<td>0.61 (0.21-1.76)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon cancer</td>
<td>32,002; 64,159</td>
<td>0.55 (0.15-1.93)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectal cancer</td>
<td>16,212; 64,159</td>
<td>0.76 (0.15-3.87)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate cancer</td>
<td>79,148; 61,106</td>
<td>0.94 (0.37-2.43)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced prostate cancer</td>
<td>15,167; 58,308</td>
<td>1.67 (0.32-8.57)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall cancer risk</td>
<td>27,483; 372,016</td>
<td>0.90 (0.31-2.59)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABCC8 = ATP Binding Cassette Subfamily C Member 8, ER+ = Oestrogen receptor positive, ER- = Oestrogen receptor negative. OR (95% CI) are scaled to represent the effect of genetically-proxied perturbation of ABCC8 equivalent to a 1 unit lowering of inverse rank-normal transformed HbA1c (mmol/mol). Advanced prostate cancer is defined as metastatic disease, Gleason score $\geq8$, prostate-specific antigen $>100$ or prostate cancer-related death.
**Table 4.** Mendelian randomization estimates examining the association of genetically-proxied perturbation of GLP1R with site-specific and overall cancer risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N (cases, controls)</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast cancer</td>
<td>122,977; 105,974</td>
<td>0.72 (0.33-1.58)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER+ Breast cancer</td>
<td>69,501; 105,974</td>
<td>0.81 (0.33-2.01)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER- Breast cancer</td>
<td>21,468; 105,974</td>
<td>0.48 (0.13-1.71)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal cancer</td>
<td>58,221; 67,694</td>
<td>1.36 (0.50-3.68)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon cancer</td>
<td>32,002; 64,159</td>
<td>1.94 (0.59-6.33)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectal cancer</td>
<td>16,212; 64,159</td>
<td>1.13 (0.25-5.23)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate cancer</td>
<td>79,148; 61,106</td>
<td>0.87 (0.35-2.14)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced prostate cancer</td>
<td>15,167; 58,308</td>
<td>0.99 (0.10-9.51)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall cancer risk</td>
<td>27,483; 372,016</td>
<td>1.21 (0.45-3.26)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLP1R = glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor, ER+ = Oestrogen receptor positive, ER- = Oestrogen receptor negative. OR (95% CI) are scaled to represent the effect of genetically-proxied perturbation of GLP1R equivalent to a 1 unit lowering of inverse rank-normal transformed HbA1c (mmol/mol). Advanced prostate cancer is defined as metastatic disease, Gleason score ≥8, prostate-specific antigen >100 or prostate cancer-related death.
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