


4. C-reactive Protein Coronary Heart Disease Genetics Collaboration. Association between C-reactive protein and coronary heart disease: Mendelian randomisation analysis based on individual participant data. *BMJ* 2011;342:d548.
5. Ligthart S, Vaez A, Vösa U *et al.* Genome analyses of >200,000 individuals identify 58 loci for chronic inflammation and high-light pathways that link inflammation and complex disorders. *Am J Hum Genet* 2018;103:691–706.
6. Ference BA, Robinson JG, Brook RD *et al.* Variation in PCSK9 and HMGCR and risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:2144–53.
7. Swerdlow DI, Kuchenbaecker KB, Shah S *et al.* Selecting instruments for Mendelian randomization in the wake of genome-wide association studies. *Int J Epidemiol* 2016;45:1600–16.
8. Owen MR, Doran E, Halestrap AP. Evidence that metformin exerts its anti-diabetic effects through inhibition of complex 1 of the mitochondrial respiratory chain. *Biochem J* 2000;348:607–14.
9. Madiraju AK, Erion DM, Rahimi Y *et al.* Metformin suppresses gluconeogenesis by inhibiting mitochondrial glycerophosphate dehydrogenase. *Nature* 2014;510:542–46.
10. Buse JB, DeFronzo RA, Rosenstock J *et al.* The primary glucose-lowering effect of metformin resides in the gut, not the circulation: results from short-term pharmacokinetic and 12-week dose-ranging studies. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:198–205.
11. Wu H, Esteve E, Tremaroli V *et al.* Metformin alters the gut microbiome of individuals with treatment-naïve type 2 diabetes, contributing to the therapeutic effects of the drug. *Nat Med* 2017;23:850–58.
12. Schmidt AF, Finan C, Gordillo-Marañón M *et al.* Genetic drug target validation using Mendelian randomization. *bioRxiv* 2019:781039.

## Mendelian randomization applied to pharmaceutical use: the case of metformin and lung cancer

James Yarmolinsky\*, Caroline J Bull , Venexia M Walker , Aayah Nounu and George Davey Smith 

MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

\*Corresponding author. MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK. E-mail: james.yarmolinsky@bristol.ac.uk

International Journal of Epidemiology, 2020, 1410–1411

doi: 10.1093/ije/dyaa059

Advance Access Publication Date: 1 May 2020



Zhou *et al.* recently reported findings from a Mendelian randomization analysis aiming to examine the causal relationship between metformin use and lung cancer risk.<sup>1</sup> This is a topical question because of previously reported associations between use of metformin, a commonly prescribed drug for the treatment of type 2 diabetes, and lower cancer risk across several anatomical sites, including lung cancer.<sup>2,3</sup>

In lieu of an established drug target of metformin, Zhou *et al.* used genetically-proxied measures of growth differentiation factor 15 (GDF15), a cytokine previously reported to be strongly associated with metformin use,<sup>4</sup> to ‘assess the causal relationship between metformin use and lung cancer occurrence’. The authors interpreted their findings as indicating no evidence of a causal relationship between these traits. We have some methodological and interpretative concerns regarding the analyses presented in this paper.

In order to examine the causal effect of metformin on lung cancer risk using GDF15 as a marker of metformin use, it is necessary to assume that (i) metformin use affects GDF15 levels and (ii) any effect of metformin on lung cancer is entirely mediated through GDF15 levels. Although we believe the first assumption to have reasonable face validity, we believe that the second assumption is likely to be violated.

The identification of GDF15 as a potential biomarker of metformin use was first reported in a cross-sectional analysis of metformin use and 237 serum biomarkers using baseline data from 8401 participants enrolled in the Outcome Reduction with Initial Glargine Intervention (ORIGIN) trial.<sup>4</sup> The large effect size for this association observed in models adjusted for clinical factors and other serum biomarkers (Odds ratio of metformin use: 3.94; 95% confidence interval: 3.59–4.33 per standard deviation increase in GDF15) provides some assurance that this finding is unlikely to be largely driven through residual confounding (e.g. due to unmeasured or imprecisely measured confounders). Though GDF15 appears to be a plausible mediator of some of the antidiabetic effect of metformin (e.g. by reducing body weight), reverse causation (i.e. higher pre-baseline GDF15 levels increasing the likelihood of subsequent metformin prescription) cannot be ruled out given emerging evidence to suggest an effect of nutritional imbalance on circulating GDF15 levels.<sup>5,6</sup> At a minimum, it would have aided the reader in interpreting conclusions from their analysis if Zhou *et al.* had more clearly conveyed the novelty of the findings reported in the ORIGIN trial and, thus, the provisional nature of the hypothesized relationship between metformin use and GDF15.

Even if the assumption that metformin use affects GDF15 were to hold, we believe that it is incorrect to interpret a Mendelian randomization analysis of GDF15 on lung cancer risk as being equivalent to assessing 'causality between metformin use and lung cancer incidence', as claimed by Zhou *et al.* This is because GDF15 levels represent only one of several hypothesized mechanistic pathways through which metformin use may influence subsequent lung cancer risk.<sup>7</sup> For example, metformin has been shown to influence both (i) tumour metabolism through inhibition of mitochondrial complex I and (ii) tumour development through altered systemic metabolism (e.g. through lowering blood glucose via reduced hepatic gluconeogenesis, in turn reducing plasma insulin levels).<sup>8,9</sup> Both mechanisms involve activation of AMP-activated protein kinase (AMPK) by metformin, an inhibitor of the mammalian target of the rapamycin (mTOR) pathway, which reduces cell proliferation and induces cell cycle arrest and apoptosis.<sup>7</sup> In addition, it is possible that GDF15 may simply act as a biomarker of metformin use and may not provide any information on the mechanism of action of metformin or its health effects. We therefore believe that the Mendelian randomization analysis presented by Zhou *et al.* would more accurately be described as an analysis of the effect of GDF15, rather than metformin use, on lung cancer risk.

Finally, Zhou *et al.* constructed an instrument to proxy GDF15 from five genetic variants all of which were in mild to high linkage disequilibrium ( $r^2 = 0.25-0.80$ ) with at least one other variant in the instrument. The two sensitivity analyses employed to test for evidence of violations of Mendelian randomization assumptions either cannot be performed using correlated variants (weighted median estimation) or are susceptible to violation of the InSIDE (Instrument Strength Independent of Direct Effect) assumption (MR-Egger) even if correlations were considered in the model for this latter analysis. Effect estimates generated from the weighted median estimate could be biased either toward or away from the null, depending on the genetic correlation structure between individual variants. Consequently, the robustness of the overall null finding reported by the authors to bias from negative horizontal pleiotropy (attenuation of the effect estimate toward the null due to the presence of genetic variants influencing lung cancer through pathways independent to GDF15) is unclear.

Mendelian randomization remains a potentially powerful approach for the discovery, development and repurposing of pharmacological agents for disease prevention and treatment.<sup>10</sup> However, careful attention must be paid to both the interpretation and design of such studies in order to avoid drawing erroneous conclusions.

## Funding

J.Y., C.J.B. and A.N. are supported by a Cancer Research UK Programme Grant [The Integrative Cancer Epidemiology Programme] (C18281/A19169). All authors are members of the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit which is supported by the Medical Research Council and the University of Bristol (MC\_UU\_12013/1-9) (<https://mrc.ukri.org/>, <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/>).

## Conflict of interest

None declared.

## References

1. Zhou H, Shen J, Fang W *et al.* Mendelian randomization study showed no causality between metformin use and lung cancer risk. *Int J Epidemiol* 2020;**49**:1406–8.
2. Graaf MR, Beiderbeck AB, Egberts AC, Richel DJ, Guchelaar HJ. The risk of cancer in users of statins. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;**22**:2388–94.
3. Khurana V, Bejjanki HR, Caldito G, Owens MW. Statins reduce the risk of lung cancer in humans: a large case-control study of US veterans. *Chest* 2007;**131**:1282–88.
4. Gerstein HC, Pare G, Hess S *et al.* Growth differentiation factor 15 as a novel biomarker for metformin. *Dia Care* 2017;**40**:280–83.
5. Mullican SE, Lin-Schmidt X, Chin CN *et al.* GFRAL is the receptor for GDF15 and the ligand promotes weight loss in mice and nonhuman primates. *Nat Med* 2017;**23**:1150–57.
6. Patel S, Alvarez-Guaita A, Melvin A, *et al.* GDF15 provides an endocrine signal of nutritional stress in mice and humans. *Cell Metab.* 2019; **29**(3):707–718.e708.
7. Heckman-Stoddard BM, DeCensi A, Sahasrabudhe VV, Ford LG. Repurposing metformin for the prevention of cancer and cancer recurrence. *Diabetologia* 2017;**60**:1639–47.
8. Shaw RJ, Lamia KA, Vasquez D *et al.* The kinase LKB1 mediates glucose homeostasis in liver and therapeutic effects of metformin. *Science* 2005;**310**:1642–46.
9. Wheaton WW, Weinberg SE, Hamanaka RB *et al.* Metformin inhibits mitochondrial complex I of cancer cells to reduce tumorigenesis. *Elife* 2014;**3**:e02242.
10. Walker VM, Davey Smith G, Davies NM, Martin RM. Mendelian randomization: a novel approach for the prediction of adverse drug events and drug repurposing opportunities. *Int J Epidemiol* 2017;**46**:2078–89.