

1 Supplemental Table S1. P-values associated with PRS with different p-value thresholds  
 2 predicting antipsychotic efficacy in each cohort.

3

<b>PRS pT</b>	<b>5x10<sup>-8</sup></b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.50</b>
<b>ZHH Old FE</b>	.54	.28	.013	.031	.024	.028	.028
<b>EUFEST</b>	.61	.26	.012	.050	.041	.012	.014
<b>PAFIP</b>	.58	.13	.006	.017	.025	.068	.150
<b>CIDAR</b>	.94	.21	.96	.73	.22	.24	.18

4

5

1 Supplemental Table S2. Secondary analysis of response rate in each cohort, separated by  
 2 Caucasians and non-Caucasians. Low versus high PRS classifications were median split within  
 3 each cohort or sub-cohort.

4

	<b>Reported Full Sample</b>		<b>Caucasians</b>		<b>Non-Caucasians</b>	
	Low PRS	High PRS	Low PRS	High PRS	Low PRS	High PRS
<b>ZHH Old FE</b>	57.9%	51.3%	60.0%	44.4%	62.1%	48.3%
	(22/38)	(20/39)	(6/10)	(4/9)	(18/29)	(14/29)
<b>EUFEST</b>	65.7%	42.3%	65.7%	42.3%	80.0%	50.0%
	(46/70)	(30/71)	(46/70)	(30/71)	(4/5)	(2/4)
<b>PAFIP</b>	58.9%	48.5%	58.9%	48.5%	NA	NA
	(56/95)	(47/97)	(56/95)	(47/97)		
<b>CIDAR</b>	60.0%	74.0%	61.1%	70.6%	64.5%	72.7%
	(30/50)	(37/50)	(11/18)	(12/17)	(20/31)	(24/33)
<b>Total</b>	60.9%	52.1%	61.7%	47.9%	64.6%	60.6%
	(154/253)	(134/257)	(119/193)	(93/194)	(42/65)	(40/66)

5

6