

Genome-wide analyses of behavioural traits biased by misreports and longitudinal changes

Angli Xue¹, Longda Jiang¹, Zhihong Zhu¹, Naomi R. Wray^{1,2}, Peter M. Visscher¹, Jian Zeng¹, Jian Yang^{1,3,*}

¹ Institute for Molecular Bioscience, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia

² Queensland Brain Institute, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, 4072, Australia

³ Institute for Advanced Research, Wenzhou Medical University, Wenzhou, Zhejiang 325027, China

* Correspondence: Jian Yang (jian.yang.qt@gmail.com)

Abstract

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have discovered numerous genetic variants associated with human behavioural traits. However, behavioural traits are subject to misreports and longitudinal changes (MLC) which can cause biases in GWAS and follow-up analyses. Here, we demonstrate that individuals with higher disease burden in the UK Biobank ($n = 455,607$) are more likely to misreport or reduce their alcohol consumption (AC) levels, and propose a correction procedure to mitigate the MLC-induced biases. The AC GWAS signals removed by the MLC corrections are enriched in metabolic/cardiovascular traits. Almost all the previously reported negative estimates of genetic correlations between AC and common diseases become positive/non-significant after the MLC corrections. We also observe MLC biases for smoking and physical activities in the UK Biobank. Our findings provide a plausible explanation of the controversy about the effects of AC on health outcomes and a caution for future analyses of self-reported behavioural traits in biobank data.

Introduction

Behaviours and lifestyles are modifiable risk/protective factors for common diseases in humans. In the past few decades, one of the most controversial debates in public health is on the effect of alcohol consumption (AC) on common diseases, especially cardiovascular/metabolic diseases. Large-scale meta-analyses of epidemiological studies^{1,2} on AC concluded that “no level of alcohol consumption improves health”³. This conclusion, however, is contradictory to the negative estimates of genetic correlation (r_g) between AC and several diseases such as obesity^{4,7}, major depressive disorder (MDD)^{6,7}, Parkinson’s disease⁵ and type 2 diabetes (T2D)⁵ reported in recent genome-wide association studies (GWAS) and also contradictory to the protective effects of moderate drinking reported in observational studies^{8,9}. Different hypotheses have been proposed to explain these discrepancies, including: 1) heavy AC might alter metabolism or impair nutrient absorption^{10,11}, meaning that the effect is dosage-dependent; 2) people who had health problems may quit or reduce drinking, or underreport their intake level¹²; and 3) some other common explanations include confounding factors⁶ (e.g., socio-economic status and physical activities) and collider bias^{13,14}. Nevertheless, to date, no study has provided in-depth investigation into the causes of the discrepancies.

In epidemiological or genetic studies, phenotypic data of behavioural and lifestyle traits are often collected from self-reported questionnaires, which are subject to misreporting (i.e., self-report biases), especially for questions related to smoking, drinking and drug use¹⁵⁻¹⁸. These behaviours are also subject to change during lifetime¹⁹⁻²², for instance in response to disease diagnosis, but data to track such longitudinal variations are rarely available. Both misreports and longitudinal changes (hereafter referred to as MLC) could change the distribution of behavioural phenotypes and thus may affect the results of both epidemiological and genetic studies.

In this study, we set out to investigate biases due to MLC in genetic analyses of self-reported behavioural traits including AC, tobacco smoking, and physical activities in the UK Biobank (UKB)²³. The UKB includes detailed questionnaires of these behavioural traits, providing a unique resource to investigate the potential pitfalls in the analyses of self-reported phenotypes. We demonstrate that MLC could induce biases in GWAS for these traits and follow-up analyses that use summary statistics from the GWAS. We then propose a correction procedure to mitigate the MLC biases and elaborate on why some of previous studies might suffer from MLC.

Results

Misreports and longitudinal changes in alcohol consumption

Misreports are common in self-reported data sets¹⁵⁻¹⁸ but often overlooked in genetic analyses. Here, we focused on the analyses of AC because 1) its relationship with common diseases is controversial;

2) the data required by our investigations and corrections are available; and 3) the sample size is large ($n = 455,607$). In this study, our definition of misreports for AC includes misreporting about drinking status²⁴, underreporting the AC level^{15,17}, and selective recall of the question about AC level²⁵, all of which might occur in the UKB. These kinds of misreports are mainly attributed to^{26,27} social desirability^{28,29} (i.e., the tendency of participants to answer questions in ways that make them viewed favourably by others) and recall bias^{30,31} (i.e., the accuracy and completeness of past events recalled by participants are influenced by subsequent events that they experienced). First, 14,488 UKB participants identified themselves as never drinkers, but combining additional data from follow-up questionnaires and medical records³² revealed that at least 10% of these individuals were very likely to have drinking history, e.g., previously diagnosed as having alcoholic hepatitis or alcohol use disorder (**Supplementary Note 1**). This means that classifying self-reported never drinkers as lifetime abstainers could be problematic²⁴. Thus, our analyses on AC were mainly focused on current drinkers unless specified elsewhere. Second, 9,064 individuals are classified as current drinkers but reported zero consumption level, indicating possible underreporting. Third, 66,058 individuals (15.6% current drinkers) reported their alcohol intake frequency and other related questions but did not report their AC levels, suggesting a potential selective recall bias. It has been shown previously that heavy drinkers tend to be unresponsive²⁵, and a high non-response rate could lead to an underestimate of the average AC level in the sample³³. To investigate the characteristics of the suspected misreporting individuals, we examined the phenotypes of 18 common diseases in the UKB and used disease count (the number of diseases carried) as an indicator of disease burden for each participant (**Methods**, **Table 1**, and **Supplementary Table 1**). We observed that unresponsive individuals had a much higher mean disease count than individuals with complete responses (1.63 vs. 1.37, Welch t-test $P = 6.35 \times 10^{-294}$; **Table 1**). The suspected underreporting individuals ($n = 9,064$) also showed a higher mean disease count than the remaining current drinkers (1.73 vs. 1.36, Welch t-test $P = 2.68 \times 10^{-87}$).

Another important source of bias is the change in drinking behaviour during the life course for reasons such as changes in health status. For instance, if people change their AC level because they are affected by a disease, such a disease ascertainment will give rise to a bias in observed or genetic relationship between AC and the disease. In the UKB, all the current drinkers ($n = 424,507$) were asked a question “compared to 10 years ago, do you drink less/the same/more nowadays?” (**Methods**), and ~62% of them reported “less” or “more”. We denote the three groups of individuals as LESS, SAME and MORE, respectively. The LESS group ($n = 191,653$) had a lower average AC level, higher disease prevalence for several common diseases, and higher mean disease count than individuals in the other two groups (**Table 1** and **Supplementary Table 1**). A follow-up question was to ask the participants to choose the reason(s) why they reduced drinking, and the available options

include illness, health precaution, and financial reasons (**Table 2**). There were 15,889 individuals choosing illness/ill health or doctor's advice as the primary reason for reducing drinking, and their mean disease count was nearly twice that of all other current drinkers (**Table 2**). In the subgroup of individuals who reported AC and had reduced drinking due to illness or doctor's advice ($n = 11,886$), the prevalence of cardiovascular disease (CVD) was 0.411, ~2.7 times higher than that in all current drinkers (0.154), providing strong evidence of disease ascertainment of AC (**Supplementary Table 1**).

Biases in GWAS for alcohol consumption due to MLC

We conducted GWAS analyses for AC with and without correcting for MLC. The MLC corrections included excluding individuals who might underreport AC level, excluding individuals who reduced drinking due to illness/doctor's advice, and adjusting the mean and variance difference in three longitudinal change groups (**Methods** and **Supplementary Figures 1-2**). There were 53 and 47 independently genome-wide significant loci ($P_{\text{GWAS}} < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) before and after the corrections, respectively (**Supplementary Table 2** and **Supplementary Figure 3**). We identified 16 loci that became non-significant after the corrections ($P_{\text{GWAS}} \geq 5 \times 10^{-8}$, **Supplementary Table 2**). By searching the top associated SNPs at these loci in an online database PheWAS³⁴ (**URLs**), we found that 44.9% of associated phenotypes ($P_{\text{PheWAS}} < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) were metabolic/cardiovascular traits such as body mass index (BMI), triglyceride (TC), and coronary artery disease (CAD) (**Figure 1**). We showed by a down-sampling analysis that the number of loci that became non-significant after the MLC corrections was significantly larger than that expected from a loss of sample size, and that 10 loci that became genome-wide significant after the MLC corrections were likely to be masked by MLC in the uncorrected GWAS (**Methods**, **Supplementary Table 2-3**). These results were in line with the simulation results (**Methods** and **Supplementary Note 2**) that MLC could reduce the power to detect true signals and induce spurious signals due to disease ascertainment (**Supplementary Figures 3-9**).

Estimates of genetic correlation biased by MLC

Biases in GWAS data due to MLC are expected to carry over to follow-up analyses using summary statistics of the GWAS, such as the genetic correlation (r_g) analysis. To demonstrate such biases, we estimated r_g between AC and 18 common diseases in the UKB by the bivariate LD score regression³⁵ (LDSC) (**Methods**) using AC GWAS data from each of the three longitudinal change groups or the whole sample. Before the MLC corrections, we observed substantial differences between \hat{r}_g (between AC and diseases) estimated using AC GWAS data from the LESS, SAME and MORE groups (**Table 1**). We also estimated r_g between different AC GWAS data sets (**Supplementary Tables 5-6**, and **Supplementary Figure 10**) and found that the \hat{r}_g between AC in the LESS and

MORE groups was significantly different from 1 ($\hat{r}_g = 0.796$, standard error (s.e.) = 0.074). All these results suggest that there was heterogeneity between AC data from the three longitudinal change groups. The heterogeneity was also demonstrated in an additional analysis where we estimated r_g between AC (using data from the UKB) and 234 traits (using data from LD-Hub³⁶) and found that the \hat{r}_g using AC GWAS data from the LESS group were substantially different from those using AC GWAS data from the MORE group, with more than half of the \hat{r}_g (143/234) in the opposite direction between the two groups (**Supplementary Figure 11**). Notably, after the MLC corrections, the \hat{r}_g between all pairwise AC GWAS data sets were close to 1 (ranging from 0.91 to 0.99; **Supplementary Table 6**).

In the r_g analysis using AC GWAS data from the whole sample without the MLC corrections, AC showed nominally significant ($p < 0.05$) negative \hat{r}_g with 3 diseases (i.e., T2D, hypertensive disease and iron deficiency anemias) (**Figure 2** and **Supplementary Table 4**). Negative estimates of r_g between AC and diseases have also been reported in the literature. For instance, Clarke et al.⁴ show a negative \hat{r}_g between AC and obesity, and Liu et al.⁵ show that AC is negatively genetically correlated with several common diseases including Parkinson's disease, obesity, and T2D. However, after the MLC corrections, AC showed nominally significant \hat{r}_g with 8 diseases, all of which were positive (**Figure 2**). These results imply that the negative estimates of r_g between AC and diseases from the analyses without the MLC corrections (including those in prior works) were caused by disease ascertainment. Nevertheless, this conclusion is not definitive because the ground truth is unknown in real data analysis. Hence, we sought to verify it by simulation (**Methods** and **Supplementary Note 2**), and the results showed that the estimated SNP effect correlation (\hat{r}_b) between a simulated phenotype and disease gradually changed to the opposite direction as the strength of disease ascertainment increased (**Supplementary Note 2** and **Supplementary Figures 5** and **7**), supporting our conclusion. The simulation results also showed that after MLC corrections, r_b was slightly underestimated but with no bias in direction in the presence of disease ascertainment (**Supplementary Figure 9**).

Socio-economic status (SES) has been shown to affect people's alcohol use and health outcomes, and several studies have shown that people with higher SES tend to have higher AC levels and lower disease risks than people with lower SES^{37,38}. Clarke et al.⁴ and Liu et al.⁵ show positive \hat{r}_g between AC and educational attainment (EA). We observed a similar estimate in our study ($\hat{r}_g = 0.082$, s.e. = 0.021) before the MLC corrections, but the estimate became non-significant after the MLC corrections (**Figure 3**), likely because MLC are associated with EA. For example, the mean years of schooling of individuals who reduced AC due to illness/doctor advice (12.76, s.e.m. = 0.05) was

significantly lower than that of the remaining current drinkers (14.23, *s. e. m.* = 0.01). We also included household income (HI) and social deprivation (SD) in the analysis (**Methods**), and our results showed that $\hat{\tau}_g$ between AC and HI or SD could also be biased by MLC (**Supplementary Table 9**).

Estimates of causal effect biased by MLC

Mendelian randomization (MR) is a method that uses genetic variants as instrumental variables to infer causal relationship between exposure and outcome^{39,40}. As the MR analysis relies on GWAS data, it may also be affected by the MLC biases as described above. We used BMI in the UKB as an example to demonstrate the performance of MR in the presence of MLC, based on several commonly used MR methods including IVW (inverse variance weighted)⁴¹, MR-Egger⁴², GSMR⁴³, weighted median⁴⁴. While the estimates from weighted median, MR-Egger and GSMR were all positive and consistent across all the analyses with or without the MLC corrections, the estimates from IVW, simple median⁴⁴ and MR-PRESSO⁴⁵ seemed to be sensitive to MLC with some of them being negative (**Figure 4**). The negative estimates from the analyses without the MLC corrections were likely to be driven by the 16 loci that were removed by the MLC corrections (note that the mean per-SNP MR estimate at the 16 loci was -0.077). GSMR provided the most robust estimates among the MR methods tested (**Figure 4** and **Supplementary Table 10**) because it has a step (called HEIDI-outlier filtering) that can identify and remove some of the genetic instruments whose effects were biased by pleiotropy/confounding, diminishing the bias in the estimated causal effects (**Supplementary Figure 14**). Notably, after the MLC corrections of AC, the estimates from all the MR methods were largely consistent (**Supplementary Table 10**). We also ran the GSMR analysis in a reverse direction without the MLC corrections and found significant negative effect of BMI on AC ($\hat{b}_{BMI \rightarrow AC} = -0.076, P = 1.11 \times 10^{-33}$) (**Supplementary Table 11**), consistent with the observation above that high BMI might be one of reasons to reduce AC (**Table 1**).

In addition to the UKB data, we also analysed GWAS summary data for AC from Liu et al.⁵ with a sample size of ~1 million consisting of ~42.9% of the sample from 23andMe and ~33.0% from the UKB (**Methods**). The results were similar to those from the analyses above using the AC GWAS data from the UKB only (**Supplementary Table 10** and **Supplementary Figure 15**), which implies that MLC may not be UKB-specific but also exist in other data sets because otherwise the biases would be smaller in this analysis given only one-third of the AC data were from the UKB. We further confirmed the biases in MR analyses from MLC by simulation (**Supplementary Figures 6** and **8**), and demonstrated that the estimates of causal effects from MR were nearly unbiased after the MLC corrections (**Supplementary Figure 9**).

The J-shaped relationship between AC and CVD

In epidemiological studies, there are debates about whether moderate drinking is protective against CVD because of an observed J-shaped relationship between AC and CVD^{2,19,46}. We showed that the moderate drinking group ($0 < AC \leq 25$ gram/week), often used as the reference group to compute the effect (odds ratio, OR) of AC on disease risk, was enriched with individuals from the LESS group which had a higher CVD incidence than the SAME and MORE groups (**Supplementary Figure 12**). This could result in a higher CVD incidence in the reference group than average, leading to a J-shaped relationship between AC and CVD (**Supplementary Figure 13A**). Although the J-shaped relationship between AC and CVD did not change much after MLC corrections (**Supplementary Figure 13B**), it became monotonically increasing after excluding the LESS group from the reference (**Supplementary Figure 13C**). Polygenic predictor of AC showed no evidence for any protective effect of moderate drinking against CVD (**Supplementary Figure 13D**), consistent with the result from a previous study⁴⁶. Our results indicated that the J-shaped relationship between AC and CVD observed in epidemiological studies might be driven by disease ascertainment (**Supplementary Note 3**).

Biases from MLC in other self-reported behavioural traits

Self-reported smoking data in the UKB is also likely to suffer from MLC. Similar to that for AC, all the current smokers were asked “Compared to 10 years ago do you smoke less/the same/more nowadays?”. We partitioned the current smokers ($n = 32,801$) into the LESS, SAME, and MORE groups (**Supplementary Note 4**). The LESS group had a higher disease count ($1.69, s.e.m. = 0.01$) than the SAME group ($1.56, s.e.m. = 0.01$) but a lower disease count than the MORE group ($1.84, s.e.m. = 0.03$) (**Supplementary Table 12**); these results were different from those observed in AC. In the LESS group, individuals who had reduced CPD because of illness/doctor’s advice had nearly twice the disease count ($2.73, s.e.m. = 0.03$) compared to the mean in the entire sample ($1.45, s.e.m. = 0.002$) or all current smokers ($1.66, s.e.m. = 0.01$), indicating that smoking intensity was also ascertained by disease burden. However, unlike AC, the \hat{r}_g between CPD and common diseases were mostly consistent across the LESS, SAME and MORE groups (**Supplementary Figure 16**), and there were negligible differences between the \hat{r}_g estimated using the CPD GWAS data of the whole sample before and after correcting for MLC (**Methods**; **Supplementary Table 13** and **Supplementary Figure 16**). These results are partly due to the difference in longitudinal change pattern between AC and CPD in the UKB (**Supplementary Tables 1 and 14**). For example, the mean AC in the subgroup of individuals who reduced AC due to illness (7.33 units/week) was lower than that in the entire LESS group (8.56 units/week) but with a significantly higher mean disease count, resulting in a negative correlation between AC and diseases (**Table 2** and **Supplementary Table 12**),

whereas the mean CPD in the subgroup due to illness (12.28 cigarettes/day) was higher than that in the entire LESS group (11.70 cigarettes/day) (**Supplementary Table 12**).

Finally, we investigated physical activities (PA) in the UKB. The PA traits included self-reported METT (Metabolic Equivalent Task in Total) scores, IPAQ (International Physical Activity Questionnaires - short form, **URLs**), and overall acceleration average (OAA, measured by wrist-worn accelerometers). IPAQ is a derived categorical trait (low, moderate, and high) that utilizes information from the METT and its three subsets: walking, moderate, and vigorous activities (**Methods, URLs**). We first estimated r_g between METT, IPAQ and OAA and between METT from the three IPAQ subgroups (**Supplementary Figure 17**). We found a significant genetic heterogeneity between METT and IPAQ ($\hat{r}_g = 0.795$, $s.e. = 0.016$) and a small genetic overlap of either METT or IPAQ with OAA ($\hat{r}_g = 0.232$ with $s.e. = 0.037$ for METT and $\hat{r}_g = 0.390$ with $s.e. = 0.034$ for IPAQ). We then estimated r_g between PA and 18 common diseases. While the \hat{r}_g of IPAQ and OAA with the diseases were mostly negative, METT showed positive \hat{r}_g with most diseases (**Supplementary Table 15 and Supplementary Figure 18**). We also found that the \hat{r}_g of METT from the low IPAQ subgroup with the diseases were highly consistent with those of IPAQ and OAA but mostly in the opposite direction to those of METT from the moderate and high IPAQ subgroups (**Supplementary Figure 18**), indicating potential biases in METT from the moderate and high IPAQ subgroups, in line with the finding from a previous study⁴⁷. In addition, the phenotypic correlation between the first and third assessment ($n = 11,484$) of METT was only 0.431, implying substantial longitudinal changes. Unfortunately, these changes are undocumented for the majority of UKB participants. Given that the \hat{r}_g of IPAQ with diseases were highly consistent (in direction) with those of OAA (**Supplementary Figure 18**), IPAQ appears to be a more robust indicator for PA than METT.

Discussion

In this study, we raised concerns that genetic analyses of human behavioural traits could be biased by misreports and longitudinal changes. AC in the UKB was used as the main example to demonstrate the detrimental effects of MLC on several genetic analyses commonly used to identify variant-trait associations or estimate genetic or causative relationship between traits. Our results showed that disease ascertainment was likely to be a main cause of the MLC biases, which can be largely corrected for using additional information (e.g., intake frequency and medical records) and coarse longitudinal data (e.g., self-reported longitudinal change direction). Our results also showed that the MLC corrections procedure proposed in this study added value to the routine quality controls in GWAS for behavioural traits like AC. Additionally, biases due to longitudinal changes appeared to be larger than that due to misreports, because the longitudinal changes were observed in more than half of the participants, while misreports only accounted for 10~20% of the UKB sample (at least for those

we have identified thus far), as verified in our simulations (**Supplementary Note 2** and **Supplementary Figures 5-8**).

Our findings provide a plausible explanation for the long-standing controversy about the effects of AC on health outcomes in genetic^{4,5} and epidemiological studies^{2,3,19}. While it seems that most inconsistent estimates in previous studies were due to MLC, there are several reasons why some studies suffered from stronger biases than others. First, the average AC level varied across datasets (from 2.9 to 19.3 units/week across 24 studies)⁵, suggesting heterogeneity in drinking behaviours among different regions/populations. Second, since we have demonstrated that biases from MLC were mainly attributable to disease ascertainment, difference in disease prevalence between populations may lead to different patterns of MLC. Third, as MLC are related to other factors, such as SES, adjusting those factors for AC may offset some of the biases in one way or another. Last but not least, MLC could vary for different age or sex groups. For instance, disease ascertainment is expected to have a larger influence in middle-aged populations than in younger populations because younger populations are less likely to be affected by common diseases investigated in this study⁴⁸. This is supported by the observation that the older UKB participants had a higher mean disease count with a higher proportion of them reducing AC due to illness/doctor's advice (**Supplementary Figure 19**). We also observed differences in the male/female ratio between the three groups (0.551 in the LESS group, 0.488 in the SAME group, and 0.373 in the MORE group were male). Note that we fitted age and sex as covariates in GWAS so the biases due to age or sex are likely to be limited.

Our study certainly has limitations as it is almost impossible to correct for all the biases with limited availability of relevant data. First, the 9,064 individuals who were suspected to underreport their AC are very likely to be only a subset of all the underreporting individuals. Thus, more effective methods are needed to identify the remaining underreporting individuals. Second, ~58% of the individuals with reduced alcohol intake reported that the reduction was due to "other reasons" or "do not know" in the survey (**Table 2**). If some of these individuals reduced AC also because of illness, then not taking that into account could retain a bias in the analysis. Third, some participants may have misreported their longitudinal changes, leading to an incorrect classification of longitudinal change groups. Fourth, the coarse longitudinal change information itself is cross-sectional (10 years before the time point of the first assessment), meaning that some of the changes occurred beyond the time frame might not be accounted for in this study. Last but not the least, 15% of the current drinkers who did not report their AC level were removed from the analysis. One solution, as implemented in a previous study⁴⁹, is to impute the missing values based on intake frequency and gender. However, 99.8% of the nonresponsive individuals in the UKB are occasional drinkers while this proportion is only 9.4% for the responsive individuals, which might lead to a systematic error between the observed and imputed data sets.

In conclusion, we advise awareness of the pitfalls when analysing data on behavioural traits in biobank data sets such as the UKB. Misreports and longitudinal changes of behavioural traits by disease ascertainment could create biases and thereby induce spurious signals and a loss of power in GWAS. Biases in GWAS summary statistics due to MLC could further lead to biased estimates in follow-up analyses such as genetic correlation and Mendelian randomization. As more biobank data sets have become accessible, it is important to identify, investigate and correct for these biases in all kinds of behavioural traits including smoking, drinking, diet, physical activity, sleep, and self-rated status. A longitudinal study of 1 million individuals for several decades seems impractical at present, but we have shown that the biases in AC can be largely corrected for by phenotypic QC and longitudinal adjustment when additional phenotype information (intake frequency, medical records, longitudinal change and reasons, etc.) are available. Questionnaires on lifetime use may provide more accurate estimates of the effects of behaviours on health outcomes at a much lower cost than a longitudinal follow-up study. Researchers should be more careful regarding these biases when conducting analyses for behavioural and other modifiable traits using biobank data sets with self-reported records.

Methods

Phenotypic data and quality controls

We obtained behavioural and disease traits from the UK Biobank (UKB) data⁵⁰. UK Biobank has approval from the North West Multicentre Research Ethics Committee (MREC), and informed consent has been obtained from all participants. There were 455,607 individuals of European ancestry with complete information on sex, age and principal components (PCs). The self-reported drinking status classes (data-field ID: 20117) were: never drinkers ($n = 14,488$), previous drinkers ($n = 15,912$), current drinkers ($n = 424,507$), and unknown (446 participants preferred not to answer and 254 provided no response). We removed “former drinkers” from all analyses in this study, considering the occurrence of the “sick quitter phenomenon”⁵¹. Among the 424,507 current drinkers, there were 358,449 individuals who reported their intake level. The AC level was summed up as a weekly total intake score (units/week) of all the alcoholic drink subtypes including beer plus cider, red wine, champagne plus white wine, spirits, and fortified wine. The mean of AC was 10.67 units per week ($s.d. = 10.23$). One unit was defined as one measure for spirits, one glass for red wine/white wine/champagne, or one pint of beer/cider. The raw AC units were transformed by $\log_2(\text{raw AC units} + 1)$ to avoid having a heavily skewed distribution. Smoking intensity was measured in cigarettes per day (CPD) in all current smokers (data-field ID: 3456; $n = 32,801$). Physical activity traits in the UKB were collected from both self-reported questionnaires and devices (wrist-worn accelerometers). METT is a total score of the Metabolic Equivalent Task (MET) minutes per week for walking,

moderate activity, and vigorous activity (data-field IDs: 864, 874, 884, 894, 904, and 914; $n = 417,938$). IPAQ is a derived categorical trait that utilizes the information from the METT and its three subsets mentioned above (see transformation criteria via the link in the **URLs**). The three IPAQ categories are denoted as low, moderate, and high ($n = 100,611$, $190,056$, and $127,271$). OAA (overall acceleration average) is an objective assessment of physical activity using a wrist-worn accelerometer (data-field ID: 90012; $n = 97,006$). The participants were voluntary, and the measurements were collected for seven days (see Doherty et al.⁵² for more details).

We extracted the phenotypic data of common diseases from the UKB following the disease definitions used in Zhu et al.⁴³. There were 22 common diseases in total, and we filtered out 4 diseases with a prevalence $< 3\%$ in the UKB. The mean disease count was 1.45 ($s.d. = 1.56$) in the whole sample and 1.41 ($s.d. = 1.53$) in current drinkers. Body mass index (BMI) was obtained from the physical measurements (data-field: 21001). Educational attainment was indexed by years of school derived from qualification data (data-field ID: 6138). For quantitative traits, extreme phenotypic values outside the mean ± 7 $s.d.$ range in each sex group were excluded (see below for a more stringent QC step to remove phenotypic outliers after standardisation).

Correcting for misreports and longitudinal changes

Our MLC corrections consist of two steps. The first step is a phenotypic quality control (QC) procedure used as an attempt to minimize the effects of misreports. We removed the individuals who self-reported as 1) never drinkers ($n = 14,488$), 2) current drinkers with a reported weekly consumption of zero ($n = 9,064$), and 3) current drinkers who provided no response to AC ($n = 66,058$), and retained a total of $349,385$ individuals. The second step is to account for self-reported longitudinal changes compared to 10 years ago (data-field ID: 1628). We partitioned the individuals who passed the QC above into three groups based on the longitudinal change (i.e., LESS, SAME or MORE) and conducted GWAS within each group. In the LESS group, we further removed individuals who reduced their AC because of being ill or doctor's advice, i.e., longitudinal change due to disease ascertainment (data-field ID: 2664; $n = 11,886$). We then performed an inverse-variance weighted meta-analysis of the GWAS results from the three groups ($n = 336,469$). This partitioning strategy efficiently removed any difference in mean or variance between the three groups. More details of the MLC corrections are shown in **Supplementary Figures 1 and 2**.

Genome-wide association analysis

The UKB genotype data were cleaned and imputed into the Haplotype Reference Consortium (HRC)⁵³ panel by the UKB team²³. We selected a subset of the sample of European ancestry ($n = 456,426$) from the whole UKB cohort by projecting the individuals onto the PCs from the 1000

Genome Project (1KGP). Genotype posterior probabilities were converted to hard-call genotypes using PLINK2 (--hard-call-thresh 0.1)⁵⁴. We removed SNPs with a minor allele count < 5, Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium test P -value < 1×10^{-6} , missing genotype rate > 5%, or imputation info score < 0.3. For binary traits, we performed BOLT-LMM analysis⁵⁵ with sex, age and the first 10 PCs fitted as covariates and then transformed the estimates of SNP effects on the observed 0-1 scale to odds ratios (OR) by LMOR⁵⁶. For quantitative traits, we adjusted the phenotypic values for sex and age, standardised the adjusted phenotypes to z-scores, excluded individuals with $|z| > 5$, and conducted the BOLT-LMM analysis⁵⁵ with the first 10 PCs as fitted as covariates in the model.

Considering a loss of power due to decreased sample size by MLC corrections, we randomly down-sampled the GWAS data by 21,940 individuals and repeated this process 30 times. We used a z-statistic to test if the number of loci that became non-significant (or changed from non-significant to significant) after the MLC corrections is significantly different from that expected by random down-sampling. The average number of loci that became non-significant due to down-sampling was 10.03 (standard error of the mean (*s.e.m.*) = 0.85), significantly ($P = 2.08 \times 10^{-12}$) smaller than the decrease in the number of genome-wide significant loci due to the MLC corrections (i.e., 16). For the GWAS signals that lost due to down-sampling, the average proportion of significant associations with the metabolic/cardiovascular traits in PheWAS was 31.2% (*s.e.m.* = 3.8%), which was significantly lower than the observed 44.9% ($P = 3.61 \times 10^{-4}$), supporting the enrichment of the 16 loci in metabolic/cardiovascular traits (**Supplementary Table 3**). We also identified 10 loci that became genome-wide significant only after the MLC corrections (**Supplementary Table 2**). The down-sampling analysis showed that only 3.27 loci (*s.e.m.* = 0.52) would be expected by chance (**Supplementary Table 3**), indicating that most of the 10 loci were likely to be masked by MLC in the uncorrected GWAS.

Estimating heritability and genetic correlation

We used the LD score regression⁵⁷ (LDSC) to estimate SNP-based heritability for a trait and the bivariate-LDSC³⁵ to estimate genetic correlation between traits using ~1.2 million SNPs in common with those in HapMap 3 (Ref⁵⁸). For the 234 traits for which we obtained GWAS summary data from LD Hub (**URLs**), the LDSC analyses was performed online in LD Hub³⁶. Note that due to the restricted access to the full summary statistics of the 23andMe data sets, we did not perform the genetic correlation analysis for AC using the full GSCAN data⁵.

Mendelian randomization analysis

Mendelian randomization (MR) is a method to estimate causative effect of an exposure on an outcome using instrumental variables (IVs) associated with the exposure^{39,40}. MR assumes that the IVs are independent of possible confounders that may associate with both the exposure and outcome.

Also, the IVs are assumed not to be associated with the outcome other than mediated through the exposure. However, in real data, these assumptions can be violated, leading to a biased estimate of the causal effect⁵⁹. We performed MR analyses to test the causal effect of AC on BMI using IVW, MR-Egger and weighted median implemented in the R package ‘MendelianRandomization’ (URLs), MR-PRESSO in R and GSMR implemented in GCTA (v1.91.8beta) (URLs). The IVs were selected from a clumping analysis of the GWAS summary statistics in GCTA-GSMR (clumping criteria: window size = 1 Mb, $P = 5 \times 10^{-8}$ and LD $r^2 = 0.01$).

Simulating data with disease ascertainment

We carried out simulations to mimic the bias due to disease ascertainment in GWAS and its follow-up analyses. If individuals who are affected by a disease tend to change a behaviour, such a change of behaviour would lead to a spurious correlation between the disease and behaviour. We considered four scenarios in the simulation: I) the disease liability (D) is independent of the behavioural trait (Y), and 100 SNPs are associated with Y only; II) Y had a causal effect on D, and 100 SNPs are associated with Y (and D mediated through Y); III) Y and D are independent, and 100 SNPs are associated with D only; IV) Y had a causal effect on D, 100 SNPs affected Y (and D mediated through Y), and another set of 100 SNPs affected D directly. In each scenario, to mimic the disease ascertainment, we reduced the values of Y for the individuals who had high values of D. More specifically, if the D value of an individual passed a threshold (e.g., top 10%), the corresponding Y value would be subtracted by a constant. We set the disease ascertainment threshold to be 10%, 20%, 30%, or 40% and considered a subtraction from Y value by 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 standard deviations. We then conducted GWAS and estimated SNP effect correlation between Y and D using the r_b approach developed in a previous study⁶⁰ as well as the causal effect of Y on D using GSMR. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our MLC corrections, we performed an adjustment for longitudinal change in our simulation setting under scenario IV. We divided the individuals into two groups (LESS and SAME) and then conducted the GWAS separately, followed by a meta-analysis. Details of the simulation process and parameter specifications can be found in the **Supplementary Note 2**.

URLs

PheWAS: <http://atlas.ctglab.nl/PheWAS>

LDSC: <https://github.com/bulik/ldsc>

LD Hub: <http://ldsc.broadinstitute.org/ldhub/>

GSMR: <http://cnsgenomics.com/software/gsmr/>

MR-PRESSO: <https://github.com/rondolab/MR-PRESSO>

Other MR methods: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MendelianRandomization>

IPAQ data processing: http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/showcase/docs/ipaq_analysis.pdf

Data availability

The individual-level genotype and phenotype data are available through formal application to the UK Biobank (<http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk>).

Acknowledgements

We thank Kyoko Watanabe for the assistance in the PheWAS analysis. This research was supported by the Australian Research Council (FT180100186 and FL180100072), and the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (1107258, 1173790, and 1113400). This study makes use of data from the UK Biobank (project ID: 12505). A full list of acknowledgements can be found in the **Supplementary Note 5**.

Author contributions

JY and AX conceived the study. JY, AX and JZ designed the experiment. AX performed all the analyses and simulations. LJ contributed to the analysis of the physical activity data. ZZ contributed to the GSKMR analysis. PMV and NRW provided critical advice in data analysis and interpretation of the results. AX, JY and JZ wrote the manuscript with the participation of all authors. All the authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

References

1. Holmes, M.V. *et al.* Association between alcohol and cardiovascular disease: Mendelian randomisation analysis based on individual participant data. *Bmj-British Medical Journal* **349**(2014).
2. Griswold, M.G. *et al.* Alcohol use and burden for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet* **392**, 1015-1035 (2018).
3. Burton, R. & Sheron, N. No level of alcohol consumption improves health. *Lancet* **392**, 987-988 (2018).
4. Clarke, T.K. *et al.* Genome-wide association study of alcohol consumption and genetic overlap with other health-related traits in UK Biobank (N=112 117). *Mol Psychiatry* **22**, 1376-1384 (2017).
5. Liu, M. *et al.* Association studies of up to 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol use. *Nat Genet* **51**, 237-244 (2019).
6. Sanchez-Roige, S. *et al.* Genome-wide association study of alcohol use disorder identification test (AUDIT) scores in 20 328 research participants of European ancestry. *Addiction biology* (2017).
7. Sanchez-Roige, S. *et al.* Genome-wide association study meta-analysis of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) in two population-based cohorts. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, appi. ajp. 2018.18040369 (2018).
8. Knott, C., Bell, S. & Britton, A. Alcohol Consumption and the Risk of Type 2 Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Dose-Response Meta-analysis of More Than 1.9 Million Individuals From 38 Observational Studies. *Diabetes Care* **38**, 1804-1812 (2015).
9. Bell, S. *et al.* Association between clinically recorded alcohol consumption and initial presentation of 12 cardiovascular diseases: population based cohort study using linked health records. *Bmj-British Medical Journal* **356**(2017).
10. de Timary, P. *et al.* The loss of metabolic control on alcohol drinking in heavy drinking alcohol-dependent subjects. *PLoS One* **7**, e38682 (2012).
11. Lieber, C.S. Relationships between nutrition, alcohol use, and liver disease. *Alcohol Research & Health* **27**, 220-231 (2003).
12. Kranzler, H.R. *et al.* Genome-wide association study of alcohol consumption and use disorder in 274,424 individuals from multiple populations (vol 10, 1499, 2019). *Nature Communications* **10**(2019).
13. Holmes, M.V. & Davey Smith, G. Problems in interpreting and using GWAS of conditional phenotypes illustrated by 'alcohol GWAS'. *Mol Psychiatry* (2018).
14. Munafò, M.R., Tilling, K., Taylor, A.E., Evans, D.M. & Smith, G.D. Collider scope: when selection bias can substantially influence observed associations. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **47**, 226-235 (2018).
15. Duffy, J.C. & Waterton, J.J. Under-reporting of alcohol consumption in sample surveys: the effect of computer interviewing in fieldwork. *Br J Addict* **79**, 303-308 (1984).
16. Perez-Stable, E.J., Marin, B.V., Marin, G., Brody, D.J. & Benowitz, N.L. Apparent underreporting of cigarette consumption among Mexican American smokers. *Am J Public Health* **80**, 1057-1061 (1990).
17. Stockwell, T. *et al.* Under-reporting of alcohol consumption in household surveys: a comparison of quantity-frequency, graduated-frequency and recent recall. *Addiction* **99**, 1024-1033 (2004).
18. Hazell, L. & Shakir, S.A. Under-reporting of adverse drug reactions : a systematic review. *Drug Saf* **29**, 385-396 (2006).
19. Wood, A.M. *et al.* Risk thresholds for alcohol consumption: combined analysis of individual-participant data for 599 912 current drinkers in 83 prospective studies. *Lancet* **391**, 1513-1523 (2018).
20. Kerr, W.C., Fillmore, K.M. & Bostrom, A. Stability of alcohol consumption over time: Evidence from three longitudinal surveys from the United States. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* **63**, 325-333 (2002).

21. Paavola, M., Vartiainen, E. & Haukkala, A. Smoking, alcohol use, and physical activity: A 13-year longitudinal study ranging from adolescence into adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health* **35**, 238-244 (2004).
22. Moore, A.A. *et al.* Longitudinal patterns and predictors of alcohol consumption in the United States. *Am J Public Health* **95**, 458-465 (2005).
23. Bycroft, C. *et al.* The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature* **562**, 203-209 (2018).
24. Rehm, J. *et al.* Are lifetime abstainers the best control group in alcohol epidemiology? On the stability and validity of reported lifetime abstention. *Am J Epidemiol* **168**, 866-871 (2008).
25. Boniface, S., Scholes, S., Shelton, N. & Connor, J. Assessment of Non-Response Bias in Estimates of Alcohol Consumption: Applying the Continuum of Resistance Model in a General Population Survey in England. *PLoS One* **12**, e0170892 (2017).
26. Althubaiti, A. Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. *J Multidiscip Healthc* **9**, 211-217 (2016).
27. Lavrakas, P.J. *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*, (Sage Publications, 2008).
28. Boniface, S., Kneale, J. & Shelton, N. Drinking pattern is more strongly associated with under-reporting of alcohol consumption than socio-demographic factors: evidence from a mixed-methods study. *BMC public health* **14**, 1297 (2014).
29. Latkin, C.A. *et al.* Social desirability response bias and other factors that may influence self-reports of substance use and HIV risk behaviors: a qualitative study of drug users in Vietnam. *AIDS Education and Prevention* **28**, 417-425 (2016).
30. Lemmens, P., Knibbe, R.A. & Tan, F. Weekly recall and dairy estimates of alcohol consumption in a general population survey. *J Stud Alcohol* **49**, 131-135 (1988).
31. Ekholm, O. Influence of the recall period on self-reported alcohol intake. *Eur J Clin Nutr* **58**, 60-63 (2004).
32. Klatsky, A.L., Gunderson, E.P., Kipp, H., Udaltsova, N. & Friedman, G.D. Higher prevalence of systemic hypertension among moderate alcohol drinkers: an exploration of the role of underreporting. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* **67**, 421-428 (2006).
33. Lahaut, V.M., Jansen, H.A., van de Mheen, D. & Garretsen, H.F. Non-response bias in a sample survey on alcohol consumption. *Alcohol Alcohol* **37**, 256-260 (2002).
34. Watanabe, K. *et al.* A global overview of pleiotropy and genetic architecture in complex traits. *Nat Genet* **51**, 1339-1348 (2019).
35. Bulik-Sullivan, B. *et al.* An atlas of genetic correlations across human diseases and traits. *Nat Genet* **47**, 1236-1241 (2015).
36. Zheng, J. *et al.* LD Hub: a centralized database and web interface to perform LD score regression that maximizes the potential of summary level GWAS data for SNP heritability and genetic correlation analysis. *Bioinformatics* **33**, 272-279 (2017).
37. Collins, S.E. Associations Between Socioeconomic Factors and Alcohol Outcomes. *Alcohol Research-Current Reviews* **38**, 83-94 (2016).
38. Davies, N.M., Dickson, M., Davey Smith, G., van den Berg, G.J. & Windmeijer, F. The Causal Effects of Education on Health Outcomes in the UK Biobank. *Nat Hum Behav* **2**, 117-125 (2018).
39. Smith, G.D. & Ebrahim, S. 'Mendelian randomization': can genetic epidemiology contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *International Journal of Epidemiology* **32**, 1-22 (2003).
40. Lawlor, D.A., Harbord, R.M., Sterne, J.A.C., Timpson, N. & Smith, G.D. Mendelian randomization: Using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in epidemiology. *Statistics in Medicine* **27**, 1133-1163 (2008).
41. Burgess, S., Butterworth, A. & Thompson, S.G. Mendelian Randomization Analysis With Multiple Genetic Variants Using Summarized Data. *Genetic Epidemiology* **37**, 658-665 (2013).
42. Bowden, J., Davey Smith, G. & Burgess, S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J Epidemiol* **44**, 512-525 (2015).

43. Zhu, Z. *et al.* Causal associations between risk factors and common diseases inferred from GWAS summary data. *Nature communications* **9**, 224 (2018).
44. Bowden, J., Smith, G.D., Haycock, P.C. & Burgess, S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. *Genetic Epidemiology* **40**, 304-314 (2016).
45. Verbanck, M., Chen, C.Y., Neale, B. & Do, R. Detection of widespread horizontal pleiotropy in causal relationships inferred from Mendelian randomization between complex traits and diseases. *Nat Genet* **50**, 693-698 (2018).
46. Millwood, I. *et al.* Conventional and genetic evidence on alcohol and vascular disease aetiology: prospective study of 500,000 Chinese adults. *Lancet* (2018).
47. Sabia, S. *et al.* Association Between Questionnaire- and Accelerometer-Assessed Physical Activity: The Role of Sociodemographic Factors. *Am J Epidemiol* **179**, 781-790 (2014).
48. Knott, C.S., Coombs, N., Stamatakis, E. & Biddulph, J.P. All cause mortality and the case for age specific alcohol consumption guidelines: pooled analyses of up to 10 population based cohorts. *Bmj-British Medical Journal* **350**(2015).
49. Evangelou, E. *et al.* New alcohol-related genes suggest shared genetic mechanisms with neuropsychiatric disorders. *Nat Hum Behav* (2019).
50. Bycroft, C. *et al.* Genome-wide genetic data on~ 500,000 UK Biobank participants. *bioRxiv*, 166298 (2017).
51. Klatsky, A.L. & Udaltsova, N. Abounding confounding: sick quitters and healthy drinkers. *Addiction* **108**, 1549-1552 (2013).
52. Doherty, A. *et al.* Large Scale Population Assessment of Physical Activity Using Wrist Worn Accelerometers: The UK Biobank Study. *PLoS One* **12**, e0169649 (2017).
53. McCarthy, S. *et al.* A reference panel of 64,976 haplotypes for genotype imputation. *Nat Genet* **48**, 1279-1283 (2016).
54. Chang, C.C. *et al.* Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *Gigascience* **4**, 7 (2015).
55. Loh, P.R. *et al.* Efficient Bayesian mixed-model analysis increases association power in large cohorts. *Nat Genet* **47**, 284-290 (2015).
56. Lloyd-Jones, L.R., Robinson, M.R., Yang, J. & Visscher, P.M. Transformation of Summary Statistics from Linear Mixed Model Association on All-or-None Traits to Odds Ratio. *Genetics, genetics*. 300360.302017 (2018).
57. Bulik-Sullivan, B.K. *et al.* LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nature Genetics* **47**, 291-295 (2015).
58. International HapMap, C. *et al.* Integrating common and rare genetic variation in diverse human populations. *Nature* **467**, 52-58 (2010).
59. Evans, D.M. & Davey Smith, G. Mendelian Randomization: New Applications in the Coming Age of Hypothesis-Free Causality. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet* **16**, 327-350 (2015).
60. Qi, T. *et al.* Identifying gene targets for brain-related traits using transcriptomic and methylomic data from blood. *Nat Commun* **9**, 2282 (2018).




Figure 1. PheWAS results for the 16 AC GWAS signals that became non-significant after the MLC corrections. The colour denotes the domain of the associated trait. There were 136 traits associated with the 16 SNPs with $P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$, and 61 (44.9%) of them were metabolic/cardiovascular traits.




Figure 2. Estimates of genetic correlation between AC and common diseases in the UKB. The rows denote 8 GWAS summary data sets for AC with the sample size labelled in the bracket. The columns are 18 common diseases and disease count. The nominal significant effects ($P < 0.05$) are labelled with \hat{r}_g [95% confidence interval] (P -value), and the significant effects after multiple testing correction ($P < 0.05/152$) are labelled with an additional asterisk. “Current drinkers excluding underreporting” represents current drinkers excluding 9,064 individuals who likely underreported their AC levels. LESS, SAME, and MORE represent current drinkers whose AC levels were reduced, maintained the same, and increased, respectively, compared to 10 years ago. “LESS with illness removed” represents the LESS group excluding the participants who reduced their AC intake level due to illness or doctor’s advice.




Figure 3. Estimates of genetic correlation between AC and complex traits using data from the UKB and other published studies. Genetic correlation was estimated by the bivariate-LDSC in LD Hub. The y-axis shows the estimate of r_g , and the x-axis shows different complex traits. The error bars denote the standard errors of the estimates. The results using the summary statistics from our analysis were compared to those from Clarke et al. (2017, Molecular Psychiatry)⁴, who used self-reported AC from the interim release of the UKB data, and Liu et al. (2019, Nature Genetics)⁵, a meta-analysis that included the full release of the UKB data.




Figure 4. Estimates of causal effect of AC on BMI using different MR methods. The colour denotes five different GWAS summary data sets for AC. The y-axis shows the estimate of causal effects, and the x-axis shows different MR methods. The error bars denote the standard errors of the estimates.

Table 1. Alcohol consumption and health-related traits of current drinkers in different response and longitudinal change groups

Intake level reported?	Longitudinal change group	N	Mean phenotype			Disease prevalence			
			AC	BMI	Disease count	CVD	T2D	DYSLIPID	HYPER
Yes	All	358,449	10.67	27.17	1.372	0.154	0.051	0.169	0.184
	LESS	152,854	8.56	27.77	1.506	0.178	0.072	0.192	0.211
	SAME	134,808	10.82	26.72	1.274	0.141	0.038	0.158	0.167
	MORE	68,855	15.11	26.68	1.266	0.128	0.031	0.141	0.154
No	All	66,058	/	28.28	1.630	0.177	0.082	0.181	0.213
	LESS	38,799	/	28.70	1.730	0.194	0.096	0.195	0.229
	SAME	25,055	/	27.70	1.474	0.153	0.061	0.159	0.189
	MORE	1,599	/	27.40	1.448	0.138	0.049	0.147	0.162

LESS, SAME, and MORE denote the current drinkers who reduced, maintained, and increased their alcohol consumption, respectively, compared to 10 years ago. N, sample size; AC, alcohol consumption measured by units per week; BMI, body mass index; Disease count, number of common diseases affected; CVD: cardiovascular disease; T2D: type 2 diabetes; DYSLIPID: dyslipidaemia; and HYPER: hypertensive disease. The proportion of the LESS group was 42.6% in the current drinkers who reported the intake level and 58.7% in the current drinkers who did not report the intake level.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the reasons for reducing alcohol intake

Intake level reported?	Reason of reducing	N	Mean phenotype			
			AC	BMI	Disease count	EA
Yes	Illness or ill health	8,555	7.33	28.53	2.77	12.81
	Doctor's advice	3,331	14.72	29.49	2.58	12.65
	Health precaution	48,483	9.98	27.44	1.54	14.17
	Financial reasons	7,323	10.27	28.54	1.74	11.57
	Other reason	68,066	7.54	27.71	1.28	13.90
	Prefer not to answer	268	5.77	27.69	1.75	10.90
	Do not know	16,729	7.28	27.96	1.35	13.00
No	Illness or ill health	3,541	/	29.28	2.81	12.35
	Doctor's advice	462	/	29.99	2.77	11.90
	Health precaution	6,767	/	28.26	1.87	12.86
	Financial reasons	1,600	/	29.05	1.91	11.26
	Other reason	21,362	/	28.62	1.51	12.88
	Prefer not to answer	101	/	28.23	2.10	9.56
	Do not know	4,934	/	28.79	1.53	11.89

N, sample size; AC, alcohol consumption (units per week); BMI, body mass index; Disease count, number of common diseases affected; EA, educational attainment (years of schooling). A total of 132 individuals did not have records for their reasons for reducing their alcohol intake.