

# MR-Hevo: statistical model and methods

## Statistical model

- $X$  exposure
- $Y$  outcome
- $\mathbf{Z}$  vector of genotypic instruments, of length equal to the number  $J$  of unlinked loci
- $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  vector of coefficients of effects of instruments  $Z$  on exposure  $X$
- $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  vector of coefficients of direct (pleiotropic) effects of instruments on outcome  $Y$
- $\mathbf{X}_u$  unpenalized covariates
- $\theta$  parameter for causal effect of  $X$  on  $Y$
- $\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_u$  parameters for intercept and unpenalized covariates  $\mathbf{X}_u$

We have a dataset of  $N$  individuals with measurements of the outcome  $Y$  and the genetic instruments  $\mathbf{Z}$ . From summary statistics we have estimates  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$  of the effects  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  of the instrument on the exposure, with corresponding standard errors  $a_1, \dots, a_j$ .

We specify a Bayesian full probability model as below

$$\alpha_j \sim N(\hat{\alpha}_j, a_j^2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\langle X \rangle = \alpha_0 + \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$$

$$g(\mathbb{E}\langle Y \rangle) = \beta_0 + \mathbf{X}_u\boldsymbol{\beta}_u + \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \theta\mathbb{E}\langle X \rangle$$

where  $g(\cdot)$  is a link function.

To calculate the likelihood as a function of the causal effect parameter  $\theta$ , we have to marginalize over the distribution of the direct effects  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  given the data

The regression coefficients are given a regularized horseshoe prior

$$\beta_j \sim N(0, \tau^2 \tilde{\lambda}_j^2), \tilde{\lambda}_j^2 = \frac{\eta \lambda_j^2}{\eta + \tau^2 \lambda_j^2}$$

Half-Cauchy priors are specified on the unregularized local scale parameters  $\lambda_j$ .

$$\lambda_j \sim C^+(0, 1)$$

A weakly informative gamma distribution is specified for  $\eta$ :

$$\eta \sim \text{Gamma}(0.5\nu_{\text{slab}}, 0.5\nu_{\text{slab}}s_{\text{slab}}^2)$$

The heavy tail of the half-Cauchy distribution allows some of the regression coefficients to escape the shrinkage imposed by the global parameter  $\tau$ . The regularization parameter  $\eta$  regularizes the scale of the nonzero coefficients (those that are in the slab of the spike and slab distribution). Even the largest coefficients will be regularized as a Gaussian with variance  $\eta$ .

The value of  $\nu_{\text{slab}}$  controls the shape of the distribution of  $\eta$ . Piironen and Vehtari recommend setting  $\nu_{\text{slab}} = 1$ , but setting  $\nu_{\text{slab}} = 2$  may be required to regularize the sampler so that it does not draw very large values of  $\eta$ .

The scaling factor  $s_{\text{slab}}$  is specified based on prior information about the size of the largest direct effects. This information will usually be available from genome-wide association studies of the outcome.

A half- $t$  distribution is chosen for the global scale parameter  $\tau$

$$\tau \sim t^+(0, s_{\text{global}}, \nu_{\text{global}})$$

Specifying  $\nu_{\text{global}} = 1$  gives a half-Cauchy prior. Setting  $\nu_{\text{global}} = 2$  may be required to regularize the sampler so that it does not draw very large values of  $\tau$ . This regularization shrinks the right tail of the distribution of  $\tau$ , and thus limits narrowness of the spike component.

The scaling factor  $s_{\text{global}}$  is specified to encode a prior guess about the number  $r_0$  of nonzero coefficients for the direct effects. Piironen and Vehtari show that this implies that most of the prior mass for  $\tau$  is located near the value

$$\tau_0 = \frac{r_0}{J - r_0} \frac{\sigma_y}{\sqrt{N}}$$

We specify  $s_{\text{global}}$  so that the median of the prior on  $\tau$  is  $\tau_0$  calculated as above.

For the  $j$ th instrument, the *shrinkage coefficient*  $\kappa_j$  is

$$\kappa_j = \frac{1}{1 + \tilde{\lambda}_j^2}$$

This takes values from 0 (no shrinkage) to 1 (complete shrinkage). The prior on this parameter has a horseshoe shape.

The effective number  $m$  of nonzero coefficients is then

$$m = \sigma(1 - \kappa_j)$$

## Extension to instruments that are calculated from multiple SNPs

For each clump of exposure-associated SNPs and each individual in the target dataset, a locus-specific score is calculated from the vector  $\hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{u}}$  of univariate summary statistics for the effect of SNPs on the exposure  $X$ . Estimates of the multivariable coefficients  $\hat{\gamma}$  are calculated by premultiplying the univariate coefficients by the correlation matrix between the SNP genotypes (obtained from a reference population). Where this correlation matrix is singular or ill-conditioned, a pseudo-inverse can be used to calculate the multivariable coefficients.

The locus-specific score  $S$  is then calculated as  $\mathbf{G} \cdot \gamma$ .

Because  $S$  is calculated from the genotypes and the coefficients for the effect of genotypes on exposure, we cannot simply substitute it for the genetic instrument  $Z$  in the model above. We can however factor the dot product  $\mathbf{G} \cdot \gamma$  as the product of two scalars: the magnitude of the coefficient vector  $|\gamma|$  and a pseudo-genotype  $|\mathbf{G}| \cos \phi$ , where  $\phi$  is the angle between the vectors  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\gamma$ . We can then substitute  $|\gamma|$  for the scalar

coefficient  $\alpha$  and  $S/|\gamma|$  for the scalar instrument  $Z$  as a pseudo-genotype in the statistical model defined above.

This procedure ensures that all exposure-associated SNPs can be used in constructing the genotypic instruments, and that these instruments are unlinked so that their pleiotropic effects can be modelled as independent.

## Computational methods

To generate the posterior distribution given the model and the data, we use the program **Stan**. Scripts for a linear regression (continuous outcome) and a logistic regression (binary outcome) are [here](#).

The likelihood from the posterior distribution of  $\theta$  by dividing by the prior. This is done by fitting a kernel density to the posterior samples of  $\theta$ , weighting each observation by the inverse of the prior. We take the logarithm of this likelihood, and fit a quadratic function to the log-likelihood function. The maximum likelihood estimate and test of the null hypothesis  $\theta = 0$  are obtained from this quadratic approximation to the log-likelihood.