nature portfolio

Corresponding author(s):	Joel Gelernter and Daniel F. Levey
Last updated by author(s):	Sep 28, 2023

Reporting Summary

Nature Portfolio wishes to improve the reproducibility of the work that we publish. This form provides structure for consistency and transparency in reporting. For further information on Nature Portfolio policies, see our <u>Editorial Policies</u> and the <u>Editorial Policy Checklist</u>.

< ∙	トつ	1		Ηı	\sim
.)	ıa	ш	15	u	CS

For	all statistical analyses, confirm that the following items are present in the figure legend, table legend, main text, or Methods section.
n/a	Confirmed
	\square The exact sample size (n) for each experimental group/condition, given as a discrete number and unit of measurement
\boxtimes	A statement on whether measurements were taken from distinct samples or whether the same sample was measured repeatedly
	The statistical test(s) used AND whether they are one- or two-sided Only common tests should be described solely by name; describe more complex techniques in the Methods section.
	A description of all covariates tested
	A description of any assumptions or corrections, such as tests of normality and adjustment for multiple comparisons
	A full description of the statistical parameters including central tendency (e.g. means) or other basic estimates (e.g. regression coefficient AND variation (e.g. standard deviation) or associated estimates of uncertainty (e.g. confidence intervals)
	For null hypothesis testing, the test statistic (e.g. <i>F</i> , <i>t</i> , <i>r</i>) with confidence intervals, effect sizes, degrees of freedom and <i>P</i> value noted <i>Give P values as exact values whenever suitable.</i>
\boxtimes	For Bayesian analysis, information on the choice of priors and Markov chain Monte Carlo settings
\boxtimes	For hierarchical and complex designs, identification of the appropriate level for tests and full reporting of outcomes
\boxtimes	\square Estimates of effect sizes (e.g. Cohen's d , Pearson's r), indicating how they were calculated
	Our web collection on <u>statistics for biologists</u> contains articles on many of the points above.

Software and code

Policy information about availability of computer code

Data collection

No software was used for data collection.

Data analysis

PLINK was used for GWAS, METAL was used for meta-analysis, R was used for statistical tests, all R packages are mentioned explicitly in text where the package was used in analysis. FUSION software was used to perform TWAS using tissue databases described in text. GCTA was used for conditional analysis. All software packages used in this analysis are publicly available.

For manuscripts utilizing custom algorithms or software that are central to the research but not yet described in published literature, software must be made available to editors and reviewers. We strongly encourage code deposition in a community repository (e.g. GitHub). See the Nature Portfolio <u>guidelines for submitting code & software</u> for further information.

Data

Policy information about availability of data

All manuscripts must include a data availability statement. This statement should provide the following information, where applicable:

- Accession codes, unique identifiers, or web links for publicly available datasets
- A description of any restrictions on data availability
- For clinical datasets or third party data, please ensure that the statement adheres to our policy

The GWAS summary statistics generated during and/or analyzed during the current study will be available via dbGAP; the dbGaP accession assigned to the Million Veteran Program is phs001672.v1.p. The website is: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/projects/gap/cgi-bin/study.cgi?study_id=phs001672.v1.p1.

Human research participants

Policy information about studies involving human research participants and Sex and Gender in Research.

Reporting on sex and gender

We have no available information on gender. Study design was population based -or- based on specific criteria (such as prior treatment in the US VA system) and efforts were made to recruit both males and females. The new part of the primary GWAS analysis involved the Million Veteran Program, which provided more than half of the total cases. This cohort is 91.9% male, making a stratification by sex challenging due to power differentials. We have performed a sex stratified analysis and placed associated figures in the supplement.

Population characteristics

The MVP is made of of veterans receiving care in the VA Healthcare System. Participants were 64.78 years old on average. See Table 1.

Recruitment

The largest sample were recruited through the Million Veteran Program (MVP). Active users of the Veterans Health Administration healthcare system (>8 million veterans) learn of MVP via an invitational mailing and/or through MVP staff while receiving clinical care with informed consent and HIPAA authorization as the only inclusion criteria. Enrollment involves providing a blood sample for genomic analyses, allowing ongoing access to medical records and other administrative health data by authorized MVP staff, and completing questionnaires.

Ethics oversight

Research involving MVP in general is approved by the VA Central IRB; the current project was also approved by IRBs in Boston, San Diego, and West Haven.

Note that full information on the approval of the study protocol must also be provided in the manuscript.

Field-specific reporting

Please select the one below that is the best fit for your research. If you are not sure, read the appropriate sections before making your selection.				
🔀 Life sciences	Behavioural & social sciences	Ecological, evolutionary & environmental sciences		
For a reference copy of the document with all sections, see <u>nature.com/documents/nr-reporting-summary-flat.pdf</u>				

Life sciences study design

All studies must disclose on these points even when the disclosure is negative.

Sample size

Sample size reflected our best efforts to gather all possible participants with genetic data and available phenotypes as described.

Data exclusions

All subjects that passed basic quality control, were assigned to either European, African, Admixed American (name is from the reference panel which includes several groups collected from Latin American populations) and East Asian ancestry, and had available phenotype information

were retained. All exclusion criteria were pre-established.

Replication We performed genome-wide genetic correlations between all of the cohorts included in the meta-analysis. We used leave-one-out analysis to replicate previous findings from the field in the independent (and novel for the phenotype) MVP cohort

Randomization Randomization was not applicable to this study. Cohorts were allocated to cases and controls based on available ICD codes in the electronic

health records of participants.

Blinding Data were collected entirely independently of the analysts. There was no need for blinding or randomization.

Reporting for specific materials, systems and methods

We require information from authors about some types of materials, experimental systems and methods used in many studies. Here, indicate whether each material, system or method listed is relevant to your study. If you are not sure if a list item applies to your research, read the appropriate section before selecting a response.

portfolio reporting summar	ומנטות	701
rtfolio reporti		5
olio reporti	Ξ	7
reporti		<u>)</u>
_ <u>-</u> 2.	5	2.
		ς.

Ma	terials & experimental systems	Me	thods
n/a	Involved in the study	n/a	Involved in the study
\boxtimes	Antibodies	\boxtimes	ChIP-seq
\boxtimes	Eukaryotic cell lines	\boxtimes	Flow cytometry
\boxtimes	Palaeontology and archaeology	\boxtimes	MRI-based neuroimaging
\boxtimes	Animals and other organisms		
\boxtimes	Clinical data		
\boxtimes	Dual use research of concern		