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## Session 13:

Mendelian Randomization

## Drawback with observational studies

## CONFOUNDING

## REVERSE CAUSATION



## We can leverage genetic variation to (partly) overcome these issues



## Mendelian Randomization

> Basic principle: "genetic variants which mirror the biological effects of a modifiable environmental exposure and alters disease risk should be associated with disease risk to the extent predicted by their influence on exposure to the risk factor."
> The allocation of genetic variants from parents to offspring will generally be unrelated to other factors which affect the outcome.
> Furthermore, associations between the genotype and the outcome will not be affected by reverse causation because disease does not affect genotype

## Possible effects of C-reactive protein (CRP) concentrations on cardiovascular (CV) events

Expected outcome from hypothetical randomized clinical trial of selective CRP-lowering intervention, and from Mendelian randomization analysis, if CRP were causal in developing CV.


## The three key assumptions in MR analyses

1. $G$ (SNP or a combination of multiple SNPs) is robustly associated with X (risk factor)
2. G is unrelated to any confounders $C$, that can bias the relationship between $G$ and $Y$ (outcome). In other words, there are no common causes of $G$ and $Y$ (e.g., population
 stratification)
3. $G$ is related to $Y$ only through its association with X (i.e., no pleiotropy)

## Assumption 1: G is robustly associated with X

> Under certain conditions, the relative bias of the instrument variable (IV) estimate is $\sim 1 /$ F. A "weak" IV has been defined as having $\mathrm{F}<10$, where

$$
F=\frac{R^{2}(n-1-k)}{\left(1-R^{2}\right) k} \quad \begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{R}^{2} \text { is variance in } \mathrm{X} \text { explained by the } \mathrm{IV}(\mathrm{~s}), \\
& \mathrm{n} \text { is sample size and } \mathrm{k} \text { is number of } \mathrm{V} \mathrm{~s}
\end{aligned}
$$

> Weak IVs can lead to biased effect estimates (in the direction of the observed $X-Y$ association) in the presence of confounding of the $X-Y$ relationship.

## Assumption 2: No confounding

$>G$ is independent of factors (measured and unmeasured) that confound the $X-Y$ relation
> Since G is randomized at birth and thus is independent of non-genetic confounders and is not modified by the course of disease, the one main concern here is population stratification - i.e., if ancestry is related both to G and Y .
> If you have individual-level data, you can adjust for this (e.g., PCs)

## Assumption 3: No pleiotropy

$>$ This assumption is the trickiest
> Assumes that $G$ is only associated with $Y$ via $X$ and thus the association between $G$ and $Y$ is fully mediated by $X$ and not through any unmeasured factor(s). Needs to be true for SNPs in LD too


## Scenarios invalidating assumption 3

LD


Pleiotropy


# Best (but oft-forgotten) practices: the design, analysis, and interpretation of Mendelian randomization studies ${ }^{1}$ 

Philip C Haycock, ${ }^{2} *$ Stephen Burgess, ${ }^{3}$ Kaitlin H Wade, ${ }^{2}$ Jack Bowden, ${ }^{2,4}$ Caroline Relton, ${ }^{2}$ and George Davey Smith ${ }^{2}$

TABLE 2
Different design strategies for MR

| Study design |  | Test |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| G-X + G-Y | Implies $\mathrm{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{Y}$ | Comments |
| One-sample MR | Various hypotheses | No estimation of magnitude of causal effect |
|  |  | Requires individual-level data; lower power; MR estimates <br> are biased toward the confounded observational |
| association by weak instruments |  |  |

[^0]
## Summary data from two studies

> The G-X and the G-Y associations are estimated in two different samples.
> Assumes no overlap among samples and that the two populations are similar (ancestry, age, sex, etc.)
> Note: The G-X and G-Y associations need to be coded using the same effect allele

## Summary data from two studies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\beta}=\frac{\sum_{k} \beta_{1 k} \beta_{2 k} \sigma_{\beta_{2 k}}^{-2}}{\sum_{k} \beta_{1 k} \sigma_{\beta_{2 k}}^{-2}} \\
& \operatorname{se}(\hat{\beta})=\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sum_{k} \beta_{1 k}^{2} \sigma_{\beta_{2 k}}^{-2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\beta_{1 \mathrm{k}}$ is the mean change in $X$ per allele for SNP $k, \beta_{2 k}$ is the mean change in $Y$ per allele for SNP $k, \sigma_{2 k}^{-2}$ is the inverse variance for the G-Y association.

## MR-base: An easy tool for Mendelian Randomization Analysis

> http://app.mrbase.org/
> A web-based platform (MR-Base) and an R-package "TwoSampleMR".
> Has catalogued thousands of genotype-phenotype associations and also allows manual file upload.

To begin analysis in the web application please review the data access agreement and accept by logging in with your google account.

## $\infty$ MRBASE

## A platform for Mendelian randomisation using summary data from genome-wide association

studies

## Current status

Beta phase release
App version:
1.2.2 3a435d (31 January 2019)

R version:
3.5.1

Host:
e4ec2116cb55
R/TwoSampleMR version
0.4.18

Database version:
0.2.0 (17 December 2017 )

To use MR-Base using the TwoSampleMR R package directly; https://github.com/MRCIEU/TwoSampleMR
See our sister website LD Hub for automated LD score regression:
http://dsc.broadinstitute.org/
@(MRBASE

## ©MRBASE

ID Acknowledgements Data access agreement

## TwoSampleMR R package

## Hongile Chen

 hongjie.chen41@gmail.com\& Perform MR analysis $\equiv$ Choose exposures $\equiv$ Choose outcomes $\equiv \operatorname{Run}$ MR

## Q Quick SNP lookut

## A platform for Mendelian randomisation using summary data from genome-wide association

studies

Select the exposure (Instrumental variable),
outcome and analysis scheme here.
To begin analysis in the web application please review the data access agreement and accept by logging in with your google account.

Get started package to analyse your own outcome datasets.

## Currentstatus

Beta phase release
App version:
1.2.2 3a435d (31 January 2019)

R version:
3.5.1

Host:
e4ec2116cb55
R/TwoSampleMR version:
0.4.18

Database version:
0.2.0 (17 December 2017)

To use MR-Base using the TwoSampleMR R package directly:
https://github.com/MRCIEU/TwoSampleMR
See our sister website LD Hub for automated LD score regression:
http://ldsc.broadinstitute.org/
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Hongie chen
Logged in as
Hongife chen
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- Gene expression QTLS
- Protein level QTLs

O Metabolite level QTLs
O Methylation level QTLs

## Select exposure source <br> O Manual file upload

O NHGR1-EEI GWAS catalog

- mR Base GWAS catalog


MR Base GWAS catalog
The MR Base database holds a collection of the summary statistics from a large number of GWASs. It is possible to use this resource to manually identify instruments, and to therefore use these traits as exposurues by finding the independent GWAS significant hits from these summary associations.
To use a trait as an exposure, highlight the relevant row in the table below (multiple traits can be selected). All sNPs with p values below the specified threshold will be extracted, and clumping will be used to remove SNPs in Lo with sentinal SNPs. These SNPs will be used as instruments in the MR analysis.

## @OMRBASE

## © Welcome to MR Base

i About
© Acknowledgements

* Data access agreement

TwoSampleMR R package

## Logged in as Hongie Ch

 Hongiie Chenhongie.chen41@gmail.com
© Perform MR analysis \# Choose exposures $\equiv$ Choose outcomes三 Run MR

Q Quick SNP lookup

Select outcomes for analysis
The MR Base database houses a large collection of summary statistic data from hundreds of GWAS studies. In order to perform two sample MR, the SNPs that were selected for the exposures will be extracted from the outcomes that you select here. Please select the outcomes that you want to test for being causally influenced by the exposures.

## Studies available in MR base

| Display columns | $\square$ Firstauthor | $\square$ Sample size | $\square$ Access | $\square \mathrm{Sd}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ ID | $\square$ Consortium | $\square$ Number of variants | $\square$ Sex |  |
| $\nabla$ Trait | $\square$ Number of cases | $\square$ Year | $\square$ Category | $\square$ Subcategory |
| $\square$ Note | $\square$ Number of controls | $\square$ PubmedID | $\square$ Population | $\square$ Unit |

## - Number of variants

$\square$ PubmedID

Select the outcome GWAS data to be used
Search:
of $\mid \uparrow \quad$ Number of $\mid \uparrow \quad$ i $\dagger$
trols

2017 Disease
2017 Disease
2017 Disease
iCOGS; GWAS meta analysis)
1128 ER-Breast cancer (Combined Oncoarray;
iCOGS; GWAS meta analysis)
1129 Breast cancer (Oncoarray)
1130 Breast cancer (iCOGS)
1131 Breast cancer (GWAS)
1132 ER + Breast cancer (Oncoarray)
1133 ER + Breast cancer (iCOGS)
1134 ER + Breast cancer (GWAS)
1135 ER- Breast cancer (Oncoarray)
Breast Cancer
Breast Cancer All All

## @oMRBASE

## (9) Welcome to MR Base <br> i About <br> II Acknowledgements <br> Data access agreement <br> TwoSampleMR R package <br> <br> $\equiv$ Run MR <br> <br> Q Quick SNP lookup

 <br> <br> ongife Che <br> <br> ongife Che hongjie.chen41@gmail.com hongjie.chen41@gmail.com <br> <br> Perform MR analysis <br> <br> Perform MR analysis <br> <br> \# Choose exposures <br> <br> \# Choose exposures <br> <br> $\equiv$ Choose outcomes <br> <br> $\equiv$ Choose outcomes <br> Use clumping to prune SNPs for LD <br> LD proxies <br> a particular exposure SNP is not present in an outcome dataset, should proxy SNPs be used instead through LD tagging? <br> $\square$ Use proxies? <br> Minimum LD Rsq value <br> 0.6 0.8 <br>  <br> Allow palindromic SNPs? <br> MAF threshold for aligning palindromes <br> }LD clumping
Most two sample MR methods require that the instruments do not have LD between them.
Linkage disequilibrium
Do not check for LD between SNPs

## Allele harmonisation

An important step in two sample MR is making sure that the effects of the SNPs on the exposure correspond to the same allele as their effects on the outcome. This is potentially difficult with palindromic SNPs.

## Handling reference alleles

All effect alleles are definitely on the positive strand

- Attempt to align strands for palindromic SNPs

O Exclude palindromic SNPs

## Select methods for analysis

Many methods exist for performing two sample MR. Different methods have sensitivities to different potential issues, accommodate different scenarios, and vary in their statistical efficiency.

## Choose which methods to use:

## $\checkmark$ Wald ratio

$\square$ Maximum likelihood

- MR Egger
$\square$ MR Egger (bootstrap)
$\square$ Simple median
- Weighted median
$\square$ Penalised weighted median
$\nabla$ Inverse variance weighted
$\square$ IVW radial
$\square$ Inverse variance weighted (multiplicative random effects)
$\square$ Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)
$\square$ Simple mode
$\square$ Weighted mode
$\square$ Weighted mode (NOME)
$\square$ Simple mode (NOME)
Robust adjusted profile score (RAPS)
$\square$ Sign concordance test
$\square$ Unweighted regression


## Submit

 perform the analysis.
## 4 Perform MR analysis

After setting up the analysis scheme, click here to submit the request to perform the MR analysis
© Welcome to MR Base
i About
III Acknowledgements
\＄Data access agreement

TwoSampleMR R package

## Logged in as

Hongjie Chen
hongife．chen41＠gmail．com
¢ Perform MR analysis
$\equiv$ Choose exposures
$\equiv$ Choose outcomes
\＃Run MR
ㅂ MRResults
Q Quick SNP／ookup

Exposure
Age at menopause｜｜id：1004
Outcome
－Breast cancer（Combined Oncoarray；iCOGS；GWAS meta analysis）｜｜id：112
む Generate HTML report
this table shows the MR estimates from each method of the causal effect of the exposure on the outcome．The effects are reported in the units that were used to estimate the SNP effects．

Test statistics corresponding to MR analysis approaches selected．

| method | $\downarrow \dagger$ | nsnp 1 ¢ | b $\backslash 1$ | se ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | pval［1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR Egger |  | 35 | 0.06926 | 0.02329 | 0.005452 |
| Weighted median |  | 35 | 0.05319 | 0.01036 | $2.815 \mathrm{e}-7$ |
| Inverse variance weighted |  | 35 | 0.04993 | 0.01036 | 0.000001446 |
| Weighted mode |  | 35 | 0.06599 | 0.01204 | 0.000004092 |

Exposure details

## Name：Age at menopause

D： 1004
Number of instruments used： 42
Units：years
Number of cases： NaN
Number of controls： NaN
Sample size： 69360
PubmedID： 26414677
First author：Day
Consortium：ReproGen
Year： 2015

## Outcome details

Name：Breast cancer（Combined Oncoarray；COGS；GWAS meta analysis）
D： 1126
SNPs in GWAS： 10680257
Number of instruments identified： 35 of which are LD proxies： 0 \＃of instruments were found in the outcome GWAS， Units：log odds
Number of cases： 122977
Number of controls： 105974
Sample size： 228951
PubmedID： 29059683
First author：Michailidou
Consortium：BCAC
Year： 2017

Downloads for all analyses
』Download harmonised summary statistics
$\star$ Download MR results $\longleftarrow$ Download the generated datasets or MR analysis results here．
』 Download leave－one－out sensitivity analysis
$\downarrow$ Download single SNP MR results

## Single SNP analysis Method comparison plot

The causal effect of exposure on outcome is estimated using each SNP singly using the Wald ratio，and epresented in a forest plot．The MR estimate using all SNPs using the MR Egger and IWW methods are also shown．Formal estimates of heterogeneity are shown in the tables below．
$\star$ Download PDF of this graph which were used in the MR analysis．

Causal effect of exposure on outcome，by SNP

## (BREAKOUT ACTIVITY)

> (Explore MR-Base (http://www.mrbase.org) to conduct your own MR study. Run an MR study of body mass index and lung cancer risk following the example in class. )

## BREAKOUT ACTIVITY

> In which examples (a-f) below do the MR assumptions not hold for assessing the association between exposure $\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}\right)$ and outcome (Y)? Why? Why not?
a. genetic

b. genetic

c. genetic

d. genetic
 variants
exposure
e. genetic $\longrightarrow$ outcome $\longrightarrow$ exposure variants

## Bidirectional MR analysis

> Approach to overcome reverse causation
$>$ IVs for both $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$ are used to assess the causal association in both directions

1. Is $G_{1}$ associated with $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ ?
2. Is $G_{2}$ associated with $X_{1}$ ?
(Also confirm that $G_{1}$ is associated with $X_{1}$ and that $\mathrm{G}_{2}$ is associated with $\mathrm{X}_{2}$


## BMI and CRP - what causes what?

## > There is a consistent observed association between high BMI and high CRP levels




Light grey points represent a scatter plot of the correlation between circulating CRP and residual BMI. Gray areas represent 95\% confidence regions around IV estimates. Black area represents 95\% confidence regions around simple linear regression estimates.

These data suggest that the observed association between circulating CRP and measured BMI is likely to be driven by BMI, with CRP being a marker of elevated adiposity.

Table 5. Observational and instrumental variable derived relationships between BMI and circulating CRP.

| 4 Previous table | - Figures and tables index |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Effect estimates |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome /explanatory variable | Observational | Instrumental variable | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {IV }}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\text {diff }}$ | $F_{\text {first }}$ |
| CRP/BMI | 1.46 (1.44, 1.48) | 1.41 (1.10, 1.80) | 0.006 | 0.8 | 31.1 |
| BMI/CRP | 1.03 (1.00, 1.07) | -0.24 (-0.58, 0.11) | 0.2 | <0.0001 | 57.3 |

## Drawbacks with MR analysis

> Large sample sizes are needed

- As genetic effects on risk factors are typically small, MR estimates of association have much wider confidence intervals than conventional epidemiological estimates.
> Make sure that the three key assumptions hold
- In practice, this is very difficult, especially for the third assumption of no pleiotropy.

Table 1. Summary of some methods proposed for Mendelian randomization: inverse-variance weighted method and robust methods.
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Method } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Consistency } \\ \text { assumption }\end{array} & \text { Strengths and weaknesses } & \text { Reference } & \text { Software } \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Inverse-variance } \\ \text { weighted }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { All variants valid or } \\ \text { balanced pleiotropy }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Most efficient (greatest statistical power), biased if average } \\ \text { pleiotropic effect differs from zero }\end{array} & 18 & & \text { * } \\ \hline \text { MR-Egger } & \text { InSIDE } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sensitive to outliers, sensitive to violations of InSIDE assumption, } \\ \text { InSIDE assumption often not plausible, often less efficient }\end{array} & 19 & \text { * }\end{array}\right\}$

Each of the methods in the table can be implemented using summarized data. False positive rates refer to the simulation study by Slob and Burgess ${ }^{27}$. InSIDE is the Instrument Strength Independent of Direct Effect assumption.

## Mendelian Randomization in $\mathbf{R}$

> Has several methods for performing MR using summary data.
> https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MendelianRandomization/index.html
> https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCHjMrVSqOu1rcrYQPAD bNA



[^0]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{G} \times \mathrm{E}$, gene-environment interaction; G-X, SNP-exposure association; G-Y, SNP-outcome association, M, mediator; MR, Mendelian randomization; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism; X, hypothesized exposure; Y, outcome variable of interest.

