

Cross-phenotype relationship between opioid use disorder and suicide attempts: new evidence from polygenic association and Mendelian randomization analyses

Yunqi Huang^{1,2,3}, MBBS; Dongru Chen⁴, MS; Albert M. Levin⁵, PhD; Brian K. Ahmedani^{4,6}, MSW, PhD; Cathrine Frank⁶, MD; Miaoxin Li⁷, PhD; Qiang Wang^{1,2,3*}, PhD, MD; Hongsheng Gui^{4,6*}, MS, PhD; Pak C. Sham⁸, PhD, MRCPsych

¹Mental Health Center and Psychiatric Laboratory, State Key Laboratory of Biotherapy, West China Hospital of Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

²West China Brain Research Center, West China Hospital of Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

³Sichuan Clinical Medical Research Center for Mental Disorders, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

⁴Center for Health Policy and Health Services Research, Henry Ford Health, Detroit, MI, USA

⁵Department of Public Health Sciences, Henry Ford Health, Detroit, MI, USA

⁶Behavioral Health Services and Psychiatry Research, Henry Ford Health, Detroit, MI, USA

⁷Zhongshan School of Medicine, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

⁸Department of Psychiatry, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, the University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

*** Correspondence:**

Qiang Wang, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Dianxin South Street 28, Chengdu, Sichuan, China; +86-28-85423651 (Tel), wangqiang130@scu.edu.cn ([Email](mailto:wangqiang130@scu.edu.cn)).

Hongsheng Gui, Behavioral Health Services and Psychiatry Research, Henry Ford Health, 1 Ford Place, 3A, Detroit, MI 48202, USA; +1-313-874-3042 (Tel), hgui1@hfhs.org ([Email](mailto:hgui1@hfhs.org)).

Total word count: 2,999

Key Points

Question: Does opioid use disorder (OUD) have a potentially causal role in the risk for suicide attempts (SA), or vice versa?

Findings: In this observational study with raw data from >150,000 UK Biobank samples and genome-wide association summary statistics from >600,000 individuals, positive phenotypic and genetic associations were observed between OUD and SA, whether or not controlling for major psychiatric disorders. Comprehensive Mendelian randomization analyses (one-sample and two-sample) suggested the genetic liability for SA was associated with increased risk for OUD. However, they were still underpowered to reveal the putative causal association from OUD to SA.

Meaning: This genomics-based study supports a strong genetic association underlying the OUD-SA comorbidity. Though both phenotypes are intertwined with other psychiatric disorders, there also exists an independent bidirectional relationship between OUD and SA.

Abstract (318 words)

IMPORTANCE: Clinical epidemiological studies have found high rates of comorbidity between suicide attempts (SA) and opioid use disorder (OUD). However, the patterns of correlation and causation between them are still not clear due to psychiatric confounding.

OBJECTIVE: To investigate the pairwise associations and interrogate the potential bidirectional relationship between OUD and SA using genetically based methods.

DESIGN, SETTING, AND PARTICIPANTS: We utilized raw phenotypes and genotypes from UK Biobank, and summary statistics from Million Veteran Program, Psychiatric Genomic Consortium, iPSYCH, and International Suicide Genetics Consortium. Statistical genetics tools were used to perform epidemiological association, genetic correlation, polygenic risk score prediction, and Mendelian randomizations (MR). Analyses were conducted to examine the OUD-SA relationship with and without controlling for psychiatric disease status (e.g., major depressive disorder [MDD]).

MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES: OUD and SA with or without major psychiatric disorders (schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder, and alcohol use disorder).

RESULTS: Strong correlations between OUD and SA were observed at both phenotypic level (overall samples [OR=2.94, $P = 1.59 \times 10^{-14}$]; non-psychiatric subgroup [OR=2.15, $P = 1.07 \times 10^{-3}$]) and genetic level ($r^2=0.4$ and 0.5 with or without conditioning on MDD). The higher genetic susceptibility to SA can increase the polygenic risk of OUD (OR=1.08, false discovery rate [FDR] = 1.71×10^{-3}), while the higher susceptibility to OUD can also increase the risk of SA (OR=1.09, FDR = 1.73×10^{-6}). However, predictive abilities for both were much weakened after controlling for influence of psychiatric diseases. A combination of different MR analyses suggested a possible causal association from SA to OUD (2-sample univariable MR: OR=1.14, $P = 0.001$; multivariable MR: OR=1.08, $P = 0.001$).

CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE: This study provided new genetic evidence underlying the strong OUD-SA comorbidity. While controlling for the influence of psychiatric diseases, there is still some clue on possible causal association between SA genetic liability and the risk for OUD. Future prevention strategy for each phenotype needs to take into consideration of screening for the other one.

Introduction

Opioids are among the world's oldest known psychoactive drugs for thousands of years, and widely used for medicinal and recreational purposes.¹ Fentanyl, tramadol, hydromorphone and morphine, the most commonly prescribed opioids, are used in acute and chronic pain management, and non-pain conditions such as multiple sclerosis.^{2,3} Although the total number and rate of opioid prescription dispensed have declined in the last decade, the incidence of opioid use disorder (OUD) and rate of opioid overdose death are both increasing.^{4,5} Over 40 million people suffer from opioid misuse or OUD globally.^{1,6,7} In the United States, it is estimated that >10 million people misused opioid, >2 million had an OUD, and ~50,000 died from opioid overdose annually.⁸ However, not everyone who has opioid exposure (OE) extra-medically develops OUD,⁹⁻¹¹ and the underlying biological mechanisms of developing OUD are to be uncovered.

Suicidality is another major public health concern that accounts for death and disability worldwide with an increased rate in recent decades^{12,13}. Suicide attempts (SA), defined as non-fatal self-injurious behaviour with the intent to die, has been estimated to occur about 10- 20 times more frequently than actual suicide and is a major source of disability, reduced quality of life, and social and economic burden.¹⁴ Known risk factors for SA are mental health (MH) conditions, such as major depressive disorder (MDD), bipolar disorder (BD), schizophrenia (SCZ) and their related clinical variables.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ Opioid drugs are one of the mostly used means for committing suicide.

Clinical epidemiological studies have found high rates of comorbidity between these two behavioral traits,¹⁸⁻²⁰ especially withdrawal from or forced tapering states.²¹ As a reflection of their interconnected relationship, risk of suicidal ideation and behaviour has been found markedly increased in people with OUD, with highest risk for more severe outcomes.²²⁻²⁴ Also, these two public health crises are intertwined at multiple levels. People with a range of mental health conditions, social and environmental factors are at high risk for both disorders.²⁵⁻²⁷ Chronic pain, one of the reasons of opioid medical use, is associated with

increased risk of mood or anxiety disorder²⁸ and SA.²⁹ However, due to confounding factors, it is challenging to explain OUD-SA comorbidity with epidemiology data.

In fact, both SA³⁰ and OUD³¹ are genetically heritable (heritability at 0.55 and 0.34, respectively), and have been investigated through genome-wide association studies (GWAS). The largest-scale GWAS on OUD, performed by Million Veteran Project (MVP) researchers, reidentified the *OPRM1* gene as the most replicable genetic locus.³¹ A recent GWAS on SA that was performed by International Suicide Genetics Consortium (ISGC), has assembled almost all available SA datasets in the field.³⁰ Besides identifying novel disease genes for each phenotype, these updated genomic data also provide us new resource for interrogating cross-phenotype relationships, for instance, through polygenic risk score (PRS) prediction and Mendelian randomization (MR)³² analysis. These two approaches are complementary to each other and can rigorously assess the evidence regarding association and causality when combined.³³ This is also an opportunity to quantify their genetic correlation in the context of other psychiatric diseases, and then help to dissect their phenotypic correlation into nature and nurture parts.

Up to date, there is still no valid longitudinal cohort or clinical trial to reveal the temporal pattern and mechanism behind OUD and SA co-occurrence. Here we combined UK Biobank (UKB) phenome-genome data and published GWAS summary statistics to investigate their multi-layer relationships. The statistical genetics approaches were tailored for the data and adopted to reveal the possibility and degree of bidirectional association between OUD and SA. Our study also controlled for potential confounders of their psychopathology by conditional and stratified models. This new evidence may help us design more efficient strategy for promoting behavioural health in future.^{26, 27, 34}

Materials and Methods

Study design

Genomic data and statistical genetics analyses provide a new solution to disentangle the comorbidity between OUD and SA. As shown in **eTable 1**, we have collected both primary data (UK Biobank) and secondary data (GWAS summary statistics) and designed an integrated analytical pipeline to investigate their relationship (**eFigure 1**).

UK Biobank

Definition of OUD and SA phenotypes (binary status), and other comorbid psychiatric traits were through mental health questionnaire (MHQ) and electronic health records in UKB (**eTable 2**). Processing of genotype data followed the recommendation in the original report.³⁵ Detailed criteria and quality control steps are included in the Supplementary. Particularly, we used self-reported ancestry, principal component (PC) analysis and kinship relatedness to select European-descent unrelated individuals.^{36, 37} Number of PC to be adjusted for downstream association was determined by their eigenvalues (**eFigure 2**). The UKB received ethical approval from the North West–Haydock Research Ethics Committee (REC reference 11/NW/0382), and had appropriate informed consent from all its participants. The current study was conducted under application No. 15422 and 86920.

GWAS summary statistics

GWAS summary statistics for SA were collected from two resources: 1) overall ISGC data repository (26,590 cases, 492,022 controls; with UKB),³⁰ the largest GWAS focusing on SA; and 2) a Danish Integrative Psychiatric Research (iPSYCH) study (6,024 cases, 44,240 controls; without UKB)³⁸ as independent verification. Genetic variants presented in both datasets showing no heterogeneity were retained. GWAS summary statistics for OUD (10,544 cases, 72,163 controls; without UKB) and alcohol use disorder (AUD) was accessed through NCBI dbGaP for MVP (phs001672.v6.p1).³⁹ GWAS summary

statistics for OE, MDD, BD and SCZ were downloaded directly from Psychiatric Genomics Consortium (PGC) website.^{40,41} Additional harmonization steps were included in the Supplement.

Observational association in UKB

Descriptive statistics between groups were compared and test for difference by independent t-test or chi-square test. Conditional logistic regression was used to examine the observational association between OUD status and SA outcomes in all eligible subjects (OUD-All and SA-All) and those without mental health problems (OUD-nonMH and SA-nonMH) among UKB participants. Model was adjusted by age, gender, and whether diagnosed with mental health disorders or not. The age and sex of participants were baseline characteristics determined at recruitment. These conditional models were run in all individuals, and in males and females separately.

Polygenic risk score association

Published GWAS for MVP OUD³⁹ or iPSYCH SA³⁸ was used as training dataset, and UKB data as target dataset. ISGC SA data was not used in PRS analysis since it already included UKB. Training dataset included GWAS summary statistics with and without adjustment of major mental health diseases (iPSYCH M2 and M1; MVP OUD|MDD and OUD). HapMap3 CEU markers⁴² was referred in this analysis. PRSice-2⁴³ was used to construct PRS scores in UKB targeted dataset at different *P* thresholds (5×10^{-8} , 10^{-7} , 10^{-6} , 10^{-5} , 10^{-4} , .001, .01, .05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, and 1). To avoid systematic error from population stratification,⁴⁴ a principal component analysis (PCA) on the resulting PRS scores was performed and the resulting PCs were used in subsequent association analysis.⁴⁵ Standardized PRS was generated using the entire distribution and associated with binary phenotype (OUD or SA) by logistic regression, adjusted for age, sex, PC1-PC4, and array type.

Univariable Mendelian Randomization

Only OUD and SA were included in this type of MR. First, bidirectional one-sample MR (1SMR) analyses were performed on UKB using individual-level genotyping data matched with corresponding phenotypes in ‘All’ or in those ‘nonMH’ samples. Second, bi-directional two-sample MR (2SMR) was then conducted by inverse variance–weighted (IVW) method (as primary) and 3 other companion methods (weighted median, MR-Egger regression, and GSMR; as secondary), imbedded in TwoSampleMR and MendelianRandomisation R packages (R version 4.0.2) and GSMR software⁴⁶. Pleiotropy or heterogeneity test was performed with MR-Egger regression (intercept), MR-PRESSO, or HEIDI test in GSMR, respectively. Several sensitivity analyses were included to further evaluate the influence of different instrumental SNPs, overlapping sample, and confounding factors on 2SMR estimated effects (detail in Supplement). MR power calculation was performed using mRnd.⁴⁷

Pairwise genetic correlation

To examine how other psychiatric exposures may serve as potential confounders, we firstly applied linkage disequilibrium score regression (LDSC)⁴⁸ to estimate the genetic correlation between OUD, SA and related MH phenotypes. The Bonferroni method was used to correct the *P* values returned from LDSC. Only those having significant genetic correlation with OUD or SA were included in final multivariable MR analyses.

Multivariable Mendelian Randomization

Multivariable MR (MVMR) analyses were lastly performed using GWAS summary dataset from OUD, SA, and their correlated psychiatric traits. The same criterion as univariable MR was adopted to select instrumental SNPs for each exposure, covariate, or outcome. We used the MVMR extension of the IVW method to estimate the effect of each exposure trait and whether there existed mediating effects from its covariates. Multivariable median method and MR-Egger method were also included as sensitivity tests. Forest plots were used to present the MVMR fitting.

Results

Observational association between OUD and SA

When examined individually, male gender, younger age, psychiatric diseases affection, and OUD are all risk factors for SA; as a comparison, male gender, older age, psychiatric diseases affection, and SA are risk factors for OUD (**Table 1** and **eTable 3**). In the conditional logistic models (**Table 2**), patients diagnosed with OUD were associated with higher likelihood of SA in overall sample (OR =2.94; 95% CI, 2.24-3.88; $P = 1.59 \times 10^{-14}$). After limiting to those without major mental health disorders (nonMH), their phenotypic correlation is still significant (OR =2.15; 95% CI, 1.36-3.41; $P = 1.07 \times 10^{-3}$). For the gender-specific analysis, OUD status presented positive association with SA in both gender groups but had stronger effect in males than in females (OR =4.67 vs 2.28 in overall, and 2.22 vs 2.13 in non-MH).

Polygenic risk score association between OUD and SA

As shown in **Table 3**, the PRS for MVP OUD significantly predicted SA status in UKB, among all and non-MH samples (OR =1.09 or 1.06, respectively; FDR < .05). Meanwhile, the PRS for iPSYCH SA was also positively associated with OUD status in UKB for both settings (OR=1.08 or 1.07, respectively; FDR <.05). When using GWAS with adjustment of major psychiatric diseases as training data, the PRS association was still significant for the pair of iPsych SA (M2) and UKB OUD-All (OR =1.05, FDR <.05); but the effects for other three OUD-SA pairs were much weakened and not significant anymore.

Univariable MR-based association between OUD and SA

Using PRS as an instrumental variable, 1SMR in UKB data did not identify any significant causal association between OUD and SA (**eTable 4**). In the extended 2SMR result (**Table 4**), it showed a significant causal effect of the genetic risk of SA on OUD (IVW: OR =1.14, 95%CI: 1.05-1.24, $P = .001$; GSMR: OR =1.14, 95%CI: 1.07-1.21, $P < .001$), surviving Bonferroni correction (0.05/8). Three validity tests did not find any violation of MR assumptions for SA-OUD analysis (all $P > 0.05$). However, no consistent evidence of a reverse causal effect was found when investigating the direction from OUD to

SA (IVW: OR =1.02, 95%CI: 0.87-1.19, $P = .828$; GSMR: OR =1.25, 95%CI:1.05-1.49, $P = .014$). This may be due to the existence of horizontal pleiotropy (MR-PRESSO global test $P = .023$) and limited MR power (<0.2). The overall distribution of instrumental SNPs' effects for both 2SMR analyses are shown in **Figure 1A-D**. When re-examining their relationship in additional sensitivity analyses (**eTable 5**), the causal effect of SA liability on OUD is still significant ($P < .05$) after regressing out the genetic risk of MDD from both GWAS datasets. Like 1SMR result, none of these causal associations was identifiable when using much smaller SA GWAS (i.e., iPSYCH cohort) against MVP OUD. More details on model fitting and individual SNP annotation are included in **eTables 6 and eFigures 3-4**.

Genetic correlation with other psychiatric traits

LDSC result (**Figure 1E** and **eTable 7**) showed that OUD and SA had a high genetic correlation ($rg = 0.50$, $P = 1.81 \times 10^{-11}$). Both traits also presented strong correlations with MDD (OUD: $rg = 0.41$, $P = 2.40 \times 10^{-8}$; SA: $rg = 0.86$, $P = 2.51 \times 10^{-123}$), BD (OUD: $rg = 0.27$, $P = 1.33 \times 10^{-6}$; SA: $rg = 0.58$, $P = 6.13 \times 10^{-81}$), SCZ (OUD: $rg = 0.31$, $P = 2.55 \times 10^{-10}$; SA: $rg = 0.43$, $P = 9.58 \times 10^{-56}$) and AUD (OUD: $rg = 0.81$, $P = 2.64 \times 10^{-39}$; SA: $rg = 0.48$, $P = 8.24 \times 10^{-32}$), but not with OE (OUD: not applicable; SA: $rg = 0.38$, $P = .092$). After conditioning on MDD polygenic risk, the genetic correlation between OUD and SA was still significant ($rg = 0.40$, $P = 3.76 \times 10^{-5}$).

Multivariable MR-based association controlling for other psychiatric traits

In the MVMR results involving OUD, SA and those significantly correlated traits (**eTable 8** and **Figure 1F**), genetic liability of SA still retained a significant causal association with OUD (IVW OR= 1.08, 95%CI:1.03-1.13, $P < 0.001$), further supported by two additional sensitivity tests ($P = 0.005$ and < 0.001) and validity checking ($P > 0.05$). However, when assessing the genetic liability of OUD with SA, the three MVMR methods did not agree on a consistent causal effect (IVW OR =1.09, 95%CI: 1.00-1.20, $P = .054$). Both patterns were generally stable in repeated MVMR models with reduced number of confounders (**eFigure 5**). A full list of instrumental SNPs involved in MVMR was included in **eTable 9**.

Discussion

In this study, our triangulated results support more the existence of an MH-independent bidirectional relationship between OUD and SA: 1) the undirected phenotypic and genetic correlations are both significant after adjustment of mental health conditions; 2) from SA to OUD, not only SA polygenicity risk can predict OUD status in opioid-exposed population, but also the genetic liability of SA has a suggestive causal effect on OUD risk; 3) from OUD to SA, though it is underpowered to identify similar causal association, the OUD polygenicity risk can still predict SA status in nonMH population.

To our knowledge, this is the first endeavour using genomic data to explain OUD and SA comorbidity in the context of other mental health conditions. Although observational studies have emphasized the association between substance use disorder (SUD) and suicide idea or behaviours, they were unable to establish causal relationships.^{49, 50} Meanwhile, there are only a few related genetic association studies specifically focusing on correlated relationships between them. Instead, previous studies usually concentrated on SA with psychiatric disorders, especially MDD,⁵¹ BD,^{51, 52} and SCZ⁵³; or they just focused on mental disorders themselves.³² Though studies have emphasized that suicidality is genetically independent of major psychiatric diagnoses,^{38, 54, 55} few has unearthed biological mechanism of SA until recent finding from ISGC becoming available.³⁰ With similar approaches (e.g., PRS and MR), an earlier report has revealed a potential causal association between self-harm and some complex traits (including mental health disorders and SUD).¹⁷ Nevertheless, OUD was left behind in their study. Though cross-phenotype genetic correlation and MR were also included in the original MVP OUD GWAS,³¹ it did not consider SA or self-harm in their selected traits. Our findings can fill the knowledge gap remained.

One mechanism could be that impulsiveness that serves in stress-diathesis model might partly account for this special relationship.⁵⁶ Suicide attempters, differ from suicide decedents who are more deliberate, are more linked to impaired probabilistic learning assessed by risk taking tendency⁵⁷ and economic and social reward and punishments,^{58, 59} in another word, are assumed to be of higher trait impulsiveness.^{60, 61} When

faced from psychological or material stress, such as stigma, discrimination and violence, they usually lack of social reward, as well as chronically expose to social exclusion. The stress response triggers a psychobiological reaction involving the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis,^{55, 62} which in turn might potentially exacerbate poor health outcomes and risk behaviours such as opioid abuse.⁶³ Another explanation lies on the opioid receptor system. This system may play a role in negative affect associated with suicidality since its abnormality may impact cognition and reward circuitry via altered mu opioid receptor binding,^{55, 59} and buprenorphine, the kappa antagonist to decrease illicit opioid use and reduce the multiple negative consequences of OUD (e.g., fatal and nonfatal substances overdose, infectious complications, and anti-suicidal strengths).⁶⁴ Additional clue comes from our SNP-gene annotation (**eTable S6**) and gene-set enrichment analysis (**eFigure 4**). Genes mapped by instrumental SNPs included in two-sample MR have not only shown significant effects in impulsiveness trait (e.g., risk-taking tendency and adventurousness) and major psychiatric disorders, but also enriched in metabolic and hematological index abnormalities,^{60, 65-68} indicating their influence in inflammatory and immune dysfunction. This is consistent with pathogenetic mechanism of suicidal behaviours⁵⁵ and suggests a possible risk for OUD and use of anti-inflammatory drugs in both phenotypes.⁶⁹

Limitations

The main advantage of this study lies on the big genomic data (e.g., UKB, MVP, and ISGC) we can collect for the phenotypes of interest, and the integrated pipeline for cross-phenotype analysis. We also included additional data and sensitivity tests for verifying potential causal associations. Nevertheless, this data-driven study also has some limitations. First, we don't have access to clinical phenotypes in ISGC SA and MVP OUD studies. Both focused mainly on their primary phenotype and did not especially filter out those participants with the alternative phenotype. Given that OUD is often under diagnosed at population level, there might be hidden OUD patients in ISGC samples that may affect the polygenicity risk of SA. Second, the reason why using opioids, like physical pains of cancer patients, were not taken into account. Hence there might be a horizontal pleiotropy between the pathogenesis of pain and

phenotypes (e.g., MDD) we focused on.³² Third, this study mainly focused on establishing genetic correlation and causal associations between OUD and SA, but not proceed much to dig up biological mechanisms of their observed comorbidity. Further research should add more biological evidence (e.g., exact genes and pathways) through gene transcription and multi-omics analyses.⁷⁰ Last, this bivariate relationship was based on observational data and statistical approaches. Pragmatic clinical trials and implementation research should be added in the future study before translating it into clinical services.⁷¹

Conclusion

In summary, both OUD and SA phenotypes present strong phenotypic and genetic association with each other and major categories of psychiatric diseases. There is also an independent association between OUD and SA after controlling for the influence of psychiatric diseases. Moreover, their relationship is likely to be putatively bidirectional. Comprehensive prevention approaches that address the intersections between suicide, opioid use and shared comorbidity with mental health conditions are needed, so as to provide a promising path forward for addressing these public health challenges among the population.

Author Contributions:

Drs. Qiang Wang Qiang and Hongsheng Gui have full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analyses.

Concept and design: All authors.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Huang, Chen, Wang, Gui.

Drafting of the manuscript: Huang, Wang, Gui.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Statistical analysis: Huang, Chen, Li, Wang, Gui.

Obtained funding: Wang, Gui.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Wang, Gui.

Supervision: Wang, Gui.

Fundings

This study was financially supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (Grant NO.81771446 to QW). HG is supported by Mentored Scientist Grant in Henry Ford Health.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor

The funding sources had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Acknowledgement

This research was made possible by previous studies from PGC, MVP, iPSYCH, the developers of the MRC-IEU UK Biobank, and researchers from ISGC (especially Dr. Niamh Mullins), who provided the latest European-ancestry statistics on SA. We acknowledge their contributing studies and the participants in those studies, without whom this effort would not be possible.

Software and codes

All analyses were conducted using publicly available data. Complete genetic datasets for every analysis included in this study are available in the Supplement. The individual-level data publicly available summary-level data is available by application at <https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/>. For summary-level data, OUD and AUD are accessed through NCBI dbGaP for MVP (phs001672.v6.p1)³⁹. MDD, BD, SCZ and OE were accessed at <https://www.med.unc.edu/pgc/results-and-downloads/> and through MR Base at <https://www.mrbase.org/>. Code Availability: the analysis code in R is available on request, and all data displayed in the figures are available in the Supplement.

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Degenhardt L, Grebely J, Stone J, et al. Global patterns of opioid use and dependence: harms to populations, interventions, and future action. *The Lancet*. 2019;394(10208):1560-1579. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(19)32229-9
2. Patten DK, Schultz BG, Berlau DJ. The Safety and Efficacy of Low-Dose Naltrexone in the Management of Chronic Pain and Inflammation in Multiple Sclerosis, Fibromyalgia, Crohn's Disease, and Other Chronic Pain Disorders. *Pharmacotherapy*. Mar 2018;38(3):382-389. doi:10.1002/phar.2086
3. Wilkinson ST, Yarnell S, Radhakrishnan R, Ball SA, D'Souza DC. Marijuana Legalization: Impact on Physicians and Public Health. *Annu Rev Med*. 2016;67:453-66. doi:10.1146/annurev-med-050214-013454
4. Blanco C, Volkow ND. Management of opioid use disorder in the USA: present status and future directions. *Lancet*. Apr 27 2019;393(10182):1760-1772. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)33078-2
5. Jalal H, Buchanich JM, Roberts MS, Balmert LC, Zhang K, Burke DS. Changing dynamics of the drug overdose epidemic in the United States from 1979 through 2016. *Science*. Sep 21 2018;361(6408)doi:10.1126/science.aau1184
6. Association. AP. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (Fifth Edition)*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association; 2013.
7. Degenhardt L, Grebely J, Stone J, et al. Global patterns of opioid use and dependence: harms to populations, interventions, and future action. *Lancet*. Oct 26 2019;394(10208):1560-1579. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32229-9
8. Provisional drug overdose death counts (2022).
9. Sweeting M, De Angelis D, Ades A, Hickman M. Estimating the prevalence of ex-injecting drug use in the population. *Stat Methods Med Res*. Aug 2009;18(4):381-95. doi:10.1177/0962280208094704
10. Amin-Esmaeili M, Rahimi-Movaghar A, Sharifi V, et al. Epidemiology of illicit drug use disorders in Iran: prevalence, correlates, comorbidity and service utilization results from the Iranian Mental Health Survey. *Addiction*. Oct 2016;111(10):1836-47. doi:10.1111/add.13453
11. Santiago Rivera OJ, Havens JR, Parker MA, Anthony JC. Risk of Heroin Dependence in Newly Incident Heroin Users. *JAMA Psychiatry*. Aug 1 2018;75(8):863-864. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.1214
12. Curtin SC WM, Hedegaard H. Increase in suicide in the United States, 1999–2014. *NCHS data brief*.
13. Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, et al. Suicide prevention strategies revisited: 10-year systematic review. *Lancet Psychiatry*. Jul 2016;3(7):646-59. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30030-X
14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System. . <https://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/index.html>. Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System. cdc.gov.
15. Strawbridge RJ, Ward J, Ferguson A, et al. Identification of novel genome-wide associations for suicidality in UK Biobank, genetic correlation with psychiatric disorders and polygenic association with completed suicide. *EBioMedicine*. Mar 2019;41:517-525. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2019.02.005
16. Ruderfer DM, Walsh CG, Aguirre MW, et al. Significant shared heritability underlies suicide attempt and clinically predicted probability of attempting suicide. *Mol Psychiatry*. Oct 2020;25(10):2422-2430. doi:10.1038/s41380-018-0326-8
17. Lim KX, Rijsdijk F, Hagenaars SP, et al. Studying individual risk factors for self-harm in the UK Biobank: A polygenic scoring and Mendelian randomisation study. *PLoS Med*. Jun 2020;17(6):e1003137. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003137
18. Santaella-Tenorio J, Martins SS, Cerda M, Olfson M, Keyes KM. Suicidal ideation and attempts following nonmedical use of prescription opioids and related disorder. *Psychol Med*. Jan 2022;52(2):372-378. doi:10.1017/S0033291720002160
19. Sampasa-Kanyinga H, Bakwa-Kanyinga F, Chaput JP, Hamilton HA, Elton-Marshall T, Colman I. Nonmedical use of prescription opioids, psychological distress, and suicidality among adolescents. *Soc*

- Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* May 2021;56(5):783-791. doi:10.1007/s00127-020-01958-x
20. Rizk MM, Herzog S, Dugad S, Stanley B. Suicide Risk and Addiction: The Impact of Alcohol and Opioid Use Disorders. *Curr Addict Rep.* Mar 14 2021;1-14. doi:10.1007/s40429-021-00361-z
 21. Darnall BD, Juurlink D, Kerns RD, et al. International Stakeholder Community of Pain Experts and Leaders Call for an Urgent Action on Forced Opioid Tapering. *Pain Med.* Mar 1 2019;20(3):429-433. doi:10.1093/pm/ppy228
5218985 [pii]
 22. Wilcox HC, Conner KR, Caine ED. Association of alcohol and drug use disorders and completed suicide: an empirical review of cohort studies. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* Dec 7 2004;76 Suppl:S11-9. doi:S0376-8716(04)00210-8 [pii]
10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2004.08.003
 23. Bohnert KM, Ilgen MA, Louzon S, McCarthy JF, Katz IR. Substance use disorders and the risk of suicide mortality among men and women in the US Veterans Health Administration. *Addiction.* Jul 2017;112(7):1193-1201. doi:10.1111/add.13774
 24. Ashrafioun L, Bishop TM, Conner KR, Pigeon WR. Frequency of prescription opioid misuse and suicidal ideation, planning, and attempts. *J Psychiatr Res.* Sep 2017;92:1-7. doi:S0022-3956(16)30183-2 [pii]
10.1016/j.jpsychires.2017.03.011
 25. Simon GE, Johnson E, Lawrence JM, et al. Predicting Suicide Attempts and Suicide Deaths Following Outpatient Visits Using Electronic Health Records. *Am J Psychiatry.* May 24 2018;appiajp201817101167. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.17101167
 26. Oquendo MA, Volkow ND. Suicide: A Silent Contributor to Opioid-Overdose Deaths. *N Engl J Med.* Apr 26 2018;378(17):1567-1569. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1801417
 27. Bohnert ASB, Ilgen MA. Understanding Links among Opioid Use, Overdose, and Suicide. *N Engl J Med.* Jan 3 2019;380(1):71-79. doi:10.1056/NEJMr1802148
 28. Von Korff M, Crane P, Lane M, et al. Chronic spinal pain and physical-mental comorbidity in the United States: results from the national comorbidity survey replication. *Pain.* Feb 2005;113(3):331-9. doi:S0304-3959(04)00544-5 [pii]
10.1016/j.pain.2004.11.010
 29. Ilgen MA, Zivin K, Austin KL, et al. Severe pain predicts greater likelihood of subsequent suicide. *Suicide Life Threat Behav.* Dec 2010;40(6):597-608. doi:10.1521/suli.2010.40.6.597
10.1521/suli.2010.40.6.597 [pii]
 30. Mullins N, Kang J, Campos AI, et al. Dissecting the Shared Genetic Architecture of Suicide Attempt, Psychiatric Disorders, and Known Risk Factors. *Biol Psychiatry.* Feb 1 2022;91(3):313-327. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2021.05.029
 31. Zhou H, Rentsch CT, Cheng Z, et al. Association of OPRM1 Functional Coding Variant With Opioid Use Disorder: A Genome-Wide Association Study. *JAMA Psychiatry.* Oct 1 2020;77(10):1072-1080. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.1206
 32. Rosoff DB, Smith GD, Lohoff FW. Prescription Opioid Use and Risk for Major Depressive Disorder and Anxiety and Stress-Related Disorders: A Multivariable Mendelian Randomization Analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry.* Feb 1 2021;78(2):151-160. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.3554
 33. Andrews SJ, Fulton-Howard B, O'Reilly P, Marcora E, Goate AM, collaborators of the Alzheimer's Disease Genetics C. Causal Associations Between Modifiable Risk Factors and the Alzheimer's Phenome. *Ann Neurol.* Jan 2021;89(1):54-65. doi:10.1002/ana.25918
 34. McClelland KI, Davies TH. Understanding Links among Opioid Use, Overdose, and Suicide. *N Engl J Med.* Apr 4 2019;380(14):1379-1380. doi:10.1056/NEJMc1901540
 35. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature.* Oct 2018;562(7726):203-209. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0579-z
 36. Reich D, Price AL, Patterson N. Principal component analysis of genetic data. *Nat Genet.* May 2008;40(5):491-2. doi:10.1038/ng0508-491
 37. Manichaikul A, Mychaleckyj JC, Rich SS, Daly K, Sale M, Chen WM. Robust relationship

- inference in genome-wide association studies. *Bioinformatics*. Nov 15 2010;26(22):2867-73. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq559
38. Erlangsen A, Appadurai V, Wang Y, et al. Genetics of suicide attempts in individuals with and without mental disorders: a population-based genome-wide association study. *Mol Psychiatry*. Oct 2020;25(10):2410-2421. doi:10.1038/s41380-018-0218-y
39. Colbert SMC, Hatoum AS, Shabalin A, et al. Exploring the genetic overlap of suicide-related behaviors and substance use disorders. *Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet*. Dec 2021;186(8):445-455. doi:10.1002/ajmg.b.32880
40. Polimanti R, Walters RK, Johnson EC, et al. Leveraging genome-wide data to investigate differences between opioid use vs. opioid dependence in 41,176 individuals from the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium. *Mol Psychiatry*. Aug 2020;25(8):1673-1687. doi:10.1038/s41380-020-0677-9
41. Howard DM, Adams MJ, Clarke TK, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis of depression identifies 102 independent variants and highlights the importance of the prefrontal brain regions. *Nat Neurosci*. Mar 2019;22(3):343-352. doi:10.1038/s41593-018-0326-7
42. International HapMap C. The International HapMap Project. *Nature*. Dec 18 2003;426(6968):789-96. doi:10.1038/nature02168
43. Choi SW, O'Reilly PF. PRSice-2: Polygenic Risk Score software for biobank-scale data. *Gigascience*. Jul 1 2019;8(7)doi:10.1093/gigascience/giz082
44. Price AL, Patterson NJ, Plenge RM, Weinblatt ME, Shadick NA, Reich D. Principal components analysis corrects for stratification in genome-wide association studies. *Nat Genet*. Aug 2006;38(8):904-9. doi:10.1038/ng1847
45. Coombes BJ, Ploner A, Bergen SE, Biernacka JM. A principal component approach to improve association testing with polygenic risk scores. *Genet Epidemiol*. Oct 2020;44(7):676-686. doi:10.1002/gepi.22339
46. Zhu Z, Zheng Z, Zhang F, et al. Causal associations between risk factors and common diseases inferred from GWAS summary data. *Nat Commun*. Jan 15 2018;9(1):224. doi:10.1038/s41467-017-02317-2
47. Brion MJ, Shakhbazov K, Visscher PM. Calculating statistical power in Mendelian randomization studies. *Int J Epidemiol*. Oct 2013;42(5):1497-501. doi:10.1093/ije/dyt179
48. Bulik-Sullivan BK, Loh PR, Finucane HK, et al. LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nat Genet*. Mar 2015;47(3):291-5. doi:10.1038/ng.3211
49. Macfarlane GJ, Beasley M, Jones GT, Stannard C. The epidemiology of regular opioid use and its association with mortality: Prospective cohort study of 466 486 UK biobank participants. *EClinicalMedicine*. Apr 2020;21:100321. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100321
50. Wilkins NJ, Clayton H, Jones CM, Brown M. Current Prescription Opioid Misuse and Suicide Risk Behaviors Among High School Students. *Pediatrics*. Apr 2021;147(4)doi:10.1542/peds.2020-030601
51. Mullins N, Bigdeli TB, Borglum AD, et al. GWAS of Suicide Attempt in Psychiatric Disorders and Association With Major Depression Polygenic Risk Scores. *Am J Psychiatry*. Aug 1 2019;176(8):651-660. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.18080957
52. Miller JN, Black DW. Bipolar Disorder and Suicide: a Review. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. Jan 18 2020;22(2):6. doi:10.1007/s11920-020-1130-0
53. Willsey AJ, Morris MT, Wang S, et al. The Psychiatric Cell Map Initiative: A Convergent Systems Biological Approach to Illuminating Key Molecular Pathways in Neuropsychiatric Disorders. *Cell*. Jul 26 2018;174(3):505-520. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2018.06.016
54. Sokolowski M, Wasserman D. Genetic origins of suicidality? A synopsis of genes in suicidal behaviours, with regard to evidence diversity, disorder specificity and neurodevelopmental brain transcriptomics. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. Aug 2020;37:1-11. doi:10.1016/j.euroneuro.2020.06.002
55. Mann JJ, Rizk MM. A Brain-Centric Model of Suicidal Behavior. *Am J Psychiatry*. Oct 1 2020;177(10):902-916. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20081224

56. Mann JJ, Waternaux C, Haas GL, Malone KM. Toward a clinical model of suicidal behavior in psychiatric patients. *Am J Psychiatry*. Feb 1999;156(2):181-9. doi:10.1176/ajp.156.2.181
57. Ackerman JP, McBee-Strayer SM, Mendoza K, et al. Risk-sensitive decision-making deficit in adolescent suicide attempters. *J Child Adolesc Psychopharmacol*. Mar 2015;25(2):109-13. doi:10.1089/cap.2014.0041
58. Bridge JA, Reynolds B, McBee-Strayer SM, et al. Impulsive aggression, delay discounting, and adolescent suicide attempts: effects of current psychotropic medication use and family history of suicidal behavior. *J Child Adolesc Psychopharmacol*. Mar 2015;25(2):114-23. doi:10.1089/cap.2014.0042
59. Lutz PE, Courtet P, Calati R. The opioid system and the social brain: implications for depression and suicide. *J Neurosci Res*. Apr 2020;98(4):588-600. doi:10.1002/jnr.24269
60. Millner AJ, Lee MD, Hoyt K, Buckholtz JW, Auerbach RP, Nock MK. Are suicide attempters more impulsive than suicide ideators? *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. Mar - Apr 2020;63:103-110. doi:10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2018.08.002
61. Melhem NM, Porta G, Oquendo MA, et al. Severity and Variability of Depression Symptoms Predicting Suicide Attempt in High-Risk Individuals. *JAMA Psychiatry*. Jun 1 2019;76(6):603-613. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.4513
62. Gustafsson PE, Linander I, Mosquera PA. Embodying pervasive discrimination: a decomposition of sexual orientation inequalities in health in a population-based cross-sectional study in Northern Sweden. *Int J Equity Health*. Jan 21 2017;16(1):22. doi:10.1186/s12939-017-0522-1
63. Anestis MD, Soberay KA, Gutierrez PM, Hernandez TD, Joiner TE. Reconsidering the link between impulsivity and suicidal behavior. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*. Nov 2014;18(4):366-86. doi:10.1177/1088868314535988
64. Yovell Y, Bar G, Mashiah M, et al. Ultra-Low-Dose Buprenorphine as a Time-Limited Treatment for Severe Suicidal Ideation: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Psychiatry*. May 1 2016;173(5):491-8. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2015.15040535
65. Kang S, Nakanishi Y, Kioi Y, et al. Semaphorin 6D reverse signaling controls macrophage lipid metabolism and anti-inflammatory polarization. *Nat Immunol*. Jun 2018;19(6):561-570. doi:10.1038/s41590-018-0108-0
66. Biernacki MA, Foster KA, Woodward KB, et al. CFBF-MYH11 fusion neoantigen enables T cell recognition and killing of acute myeloid leukemia. *J Clin Invest*. Oct 1 2020;130(10):5127-5141. doi:10.1172/JCI137723
67. Forrest MP, Hill MJ, Quantock AJ, Martin-Rendon E, Blake DJ. The emerging roles of TCF4 in disease and development. *Trends Mol Med*. Jun 2014;20(6):322-31. doi:10.1016/j.molmed.2014.01.010
68. Zeng J, Wang Y, Luo Z, et al. TRIM9-Mediated Resolution of Neuroinflammation Confers Neuroprotection upon Ischemic Stroke in Mice. *Cell Rep*. Apr 9 2019;27(2):549-560 e6. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2018.12.055
69. Beurel E, Jope RS. Inflammation and lithium: clues to mechanisms contributing to suicide-linked traits. *Transl Psychiatry*. Dec 16 2014;4:e488. doi:10.1038/tp.2014.129
70. Denny JC, Collins FS. Precision medicine in 2030-seven ways to transform healthcare. *Cell*. Mar 18 2021;184(6):1415-1419. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.01.015
71. Richesson RL, Marsolo KS, Douthit BJ, et al. Enhancing the use of EHR systems for pragmatic embedded research: lessons from the NIH Health Care Systems Research Collaboratory. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. Nov 25 2021;28(12):2626-2640. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocab202

Figure legends

Figure 1. Bi-directional two-sample Mendelian randomization results between OUD and SA.

A) Results of GSMR analysis from OUD to SA. Yellow crosses: 9 SNPs included in GSMR. B) Results of IVW, Weighted median, MR-Egger, Weighted mode and simple mode from OUD to SA. Black crosses: 20 SNPs included in the analyses. C) Results of GSMR analysis from SA to OUD. Yellow crosses: 29 SNPs included in GSMR. D) Results of IVW, Weighted median, MR-Egger, Weighted mode and simple mode from SA to OUD. Black crosses: 16 SNPs included in the analyses. E) Genetic correlations across different phenotypes included in multivariable Mendelian Randomization. F) Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the effect of SA liability on OUD and vice versa, estimated using the multivariable Mendelian randomization (MR) IVW approach. The vertical line means $OR = 1$. Red points represent significant causal effects, and green points represent insignificant associations. The larger point size is, the more significant SNPs of the traits were included in the analyses.

Tables.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for SA and OUD assessed in UKB

| Characteristic | SA | | | OUD | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|
| | Cases | Controls | P | Cases | Controls | P |
| Total size | 3591 | 116674 | | 2169 | 50543 | |
| # Male (%) | 1290 (35.9) | 52299 (44.8) | $<2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ | 817 (37.7) | 21024 (41.6) | 3.0×10^{-4} |
| Mean age (SD) | 53.9 | 56.4 | $<2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ | 59 | 58.6 | 0.026 |
| # MH diseases (%) [*] | 1242 (34.6) | 8775 (7.5) | $<2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ | 826 (38.1) | 9922 (19.6) | $<2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ |
| # OUD (%) | 67 (1.9) | 338 (0.3) | $<2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ | 2169 (100.0) | 0 (0.0) | NA [^] |
| # SA (%) | 3591 (100.0) | 0 (0.0) | NA [^] | 67 (3.1) | 775 (1.5) | 2.8×10^{-8} |

^{*} Mental health (MH) diseases were defined by ICD-9/10 codes for depression, anxiety, stress-related disorder, substance misuse (excluding OUD), and psychotic disorders.

[^] NA means not available as the test is not valid when certain cell count is 0.

SD shorts for standard deviation.

Table 2. Observational association between SA and OUD phenotypes in UKB

| Outcome* | Exposure | Group (N) | OR (95% CI) | P |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| SA-All | OUD-All | All (12,559) | 2.94 (2.24, 3.88) | 1.59×10^{-14} |
| | | Men only (4,874) | 4.67 (2.99, 7.31) | 1.45×10^{-11} |
| | | Women only (7,685) | 2.28 (1.60, 3.24) | 4.97×10^{-6} |
| SA-noMH [^] | OUD-noMH | All (10,570) | 2.15 (1.36, 3.41) | 1.07×10^{-3} |
| | | Men only (4,138) | 2.22 (0.88, 5.60) | 9.21×10^{-2} |
| | | Women only (6,418) | 2.13 (1.26, 3.62) | 5.07×10^{-3} |

* Logistic regressions were adjusted by age and sex for groups with 'All', and by age for sex-stratified groups (Men, Women).

[^] noMH is for non-Mental health conditions, selected by excluding all individuals with major psychiatric diseases.

N for total sample size, OR shorts for odds ratio, CI for confidence interval.

Table 3. Polygenic risk score association between OUD and SA

| Target* | Training[^] | <i>P</i>-Best | <i>P</i>-PCA | OR (%95 CI) | FDR |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| UKB_SA-All | MVP OUD | 4.92x10 ⁻⁷ | 5.42x10 ⁻⁷ | 1.09 (1.05, 1.13) | 1.73x10 ⁻⁶ |
| | MVP OUD MDD | 9.83x10 ⁻³ | 0.068 | 1.03 (1.00, 1.07) | 0.099 |
| UKB SA-noMH | MVP OUD | 4.46x10 ⁻³ | 9.65x10 ⁻³ | 1.06 (1.01, 1.10) | 0.022 |
| | MVP OUD MDD | 0.067 | 0.869 | 1.00 (0.96, 1.05) | 0.869 |
| UKB OUD-All | iPSYCH SA M1 | 5.61x10 ⁻⁴ | 6.42x10 ⁻⁴ | 1.08 (1.03, 1.13) | 1.71x10 ⁻³ |
| | iPSYCH SA M2 | 0.016 | 0.019 | 1.05 (1.01, 1.10) | 0.033 |
| UKB OUD-noMH | iPSYCH SA M1 | 0.019 | 0.018 | 1.07 (1.01, 1.13) | 0.033 |
| | iPSYCH SA M2 | 0.139 | 0.204 | 1.04 (0.98, 1.09) | 0.251 |

*Target is from UKB genotype data. All is for all samples, noMH is for samples without major mental health conditions.

[^] Training is from GWAS summary statistics by MVP or iPYCH. No overlapping samples are included. OUD|MDD is OUD GWAS conditioning on MDD. SA M1 and SA M2 are GWAS without or with controlling for MH conditions. respectively.

P-Best is for p-value from the best thresholding PRS, *P*-PCA is for p-value from principal component 1 of PRSs of different thresholding. OR for odds ratio, CI for confidence interval, and FDR for false discovery rate (Benjamini-Hochberg) that used to correct multiple testing.

Table 4. Univariable two-sample MR result using MVP-ODU and ISGC-SA datasets

| Exposure vs Outcome [^] | MR effect estimate | | | | | MR validity test | | MR power | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------|-----------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------|
| | Method | OR | 95% CI | <i>P</i> | nsnp [*] | Method | <i>P</i> | F-statistic | Power |
| ODU ~ SA | IVW | 1.02 | 0.87-1.19 | 0.828 | 20 | MR-Egger intercept test | 0.868 | 6957.83 | 0.16 |
| | Weighted median | 1.06 | 0.89-1.26 | 0.538 | 20 | MR-PRESSO global test | 0.023 | | |
| | MR-Egger regression | 1.06 | 0.66-1.70 | 0.207 | 20 | Q statistics heterogeneity test | 0.023 | | |
| | GSMR | 1.25 | 1.05-1.49 | 0.014 | 9 | | | | |
| SA ~ ODU | IVW | 1.14 | 1.05-1.24 | 0.001 | 16 | MR-Egger intercept test | 0.726 | 10695.47 | 1 |
| | Weighted median | 1.15 | 1.03-1.28 | 0.012 | 16 | MR-PRESSO global test | 0.892 | | |
| | MR-Egger regression | 1.09 | 0.84-1.42 | 0.525 | 16 | Q statistics heterogeneity test | 0.966 | | |
| | GSMR | 1.14 | 1.07-1.21 | <0.001 | 29 | | | | |

[^] In two-sample MR between MVP and ISGC, overlapping sample is only 0.4%.

* nsnp means number of instrumental SNPs used. More SNP details are provided in TabS6.

OR stands for odds ratio, CI for confidence interval, MR for Mendelian randomization, IVW for inverse-variance weighted, GSMR for generalized summary-data-based Mendelian randomization.

