SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

"Simultaneous assessment of genetic and epigenetic contributions to plasma lipid levels with respect to cardiovascular risk"

Fumihiko Takeuchi et al.

Table of Contents

SU	PLEMENTARY METHODS	. 3
1.	Study population	. 3
2.	Gene sequencing	. 3
3.	Genotyping	. 4
4.	Rare variant annotation	. 4
5.	Target CpG selection	. 4
6.	Methylation risk score for lipid traits	. 4
SUI	PPLEMENTARY TABLES	. 6
SUI	PPLEMENTARY FIGURES	12
SUF	PPLEMENTARY REFERENCES	21

SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS

1. Study population

In NCGM, adult patients of Japanese descent were recruited via two separate projects: a bioresource collection project focused on cardiovascular disease, named BIO-CVD, and the NCGM Biobank project. They were then categorized into three subgroups based on their LDL-C levels and coronary artery disease (CAD) status: high LDL-C (\geq 160 mg/dl) without CAD, CAD, and non-CAD. We made a detailed assessment of CAD for samples in BIO-CVD, of which 353 (306 CAD and 47 non-CAD) subjects were used for resequencing of 5 target genes related to familial hypercholesterolemia (FH) and GWAS array genotyping. Here, CAD was defined as previously reported.¹ Briefly, the CAD criteria included (i) a validated history of either myocardial infarction (MI) or coronary revascularization (coronary artery bypass grafting or percutaneous coronary intervention), or (ii) subjective symptoms of angina pectoris with 1 or more major coronary vessels showing \geq 75% stenosis documented by coronary angiography. Also, we examined the NCGM Biobank samples showing an elevated level of plasma LDL cholesterol (LDL-C \geq 160 mg/dl) (*N* = 300), which were chosen from patients visiting NCGM for treatment of chronic illness. Besides the genetic analyses, we used these BIO-CVD and NCGM Biobank samples for DNA methylation analysis.

Independent of participants in the two projects above, we used many individuals derived from the general or non-targeted population of Japanese descent for genetic and DNA methylation analyses as follows. For low-frequency (or rare) genetic variants, we utilized whole genome sequencing data of participants (N = 8.3K) in the Tohoku Medical Megabank (TMM) project, which is publicly available. For common single nucleotide variants (SNVs), we also utilized GWAS array genotyping data for participants in three population-based cohort studies—Kita-Nagoya (N = 2,437), Amagasaki (N = 550) and Ehime (N = 463)—plus a hospital-based cohort study at NCGM (named NCGM hospital cohort; N = 351) previously reported,^{2,3} which we referred to hereafter as reference individuals (N = 3,801) in total. Furthermore, for DNA methylation signature, we utilized EWAS-array assayed data for part (N = 314) of the Kita-Nagoya Genomic Epidemiology (KING) Study samples previously reported.⁴

2. Gene sequencing

Mutations were screened in five FH-related genes (*LDLR*, *APOB*, *PCSK9*, *LDLRAP1*, and *APOE*) by nextgeneration sequencing with the KAPA HyperChoice Kit (KAPA BioSystems, Wilmington, MA, U.S.A.) on an Illumina MiSeq or NextSeq 500. This covered the targets with a median read depth of 50× for coding DNA sequences, exon-intron junctions, and untranslated regions of the target genes. Read depth exceeded 20× for >90% of the target overall. The sequences were aligned to a human genome reference sequence (GRCh37/hg19). SNVs and insertion/deletion (Indel) were called and annotated using software GATK (https://gatk.broadinstitute.org/), McCortex (https://github.com/mcveanlab/mccortex), and VarSeq (https://www.goldenhelix.com/products/VarSeq/).

3. Genotyping

In this study, 644 samples were newly genotyped with the Infinium OmniExpress-24 BeadChip (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). Besides, GWAS array genotyping data for reference individuals were utilized. Data cleaning and analysis were performed using PLINK (version 1.07), and the imputation of genotypes to the 1000 Genomes Phase 3 set was carried out using Minimac3 software (version 2.0.1) as previously reported.²

4. Rare variant annotation

We retrieved rare (MAF <0.01), putatively pathogenic variants, including SNVs that cause nonsynonymous, nonsense, or splice-site substitutions and are predicted to be deleterious by ClinVar, LOVD or *in silico* prediction algorithms in dbNSFP (SIFT, Polyphen2, MutationTaster, MutationAssessor, FATHMM, and FATHMM-MKL).⁵ For the rare variants of putative functional significance, we arbitrarily classified them into three distinct categories—(1) disruptive (frameshift or splice-donor), (2) damaging, and (3) all other non-synonymous variants—similar to the previous study⁶ with some modifications. That is, for damaging variants, we defined them principally by missense variants annotated as either pathogenic/likely pathogenic in the reputable database or deleterious with ≥4 (out of 6) prediction algorithms in dbNSFP besides nominal significance level (*P* <0.05) in the comparison of MAF (by chi-squared test) between case and reference groups.

5. Target CpG selection

We performed a literature search on lipid-related EWASs and generated an initial list of target CpG methylation sites that show robust and reproducible association with any lipid traits; the lipid-related phenotypes include lipoprotein subfraction,^{7,8} plasma lipids,⁹⁻¹⁴ postprandial lipemia,¹⁵ statin use,¹⁶ and metabolic syndrome components.¹⁷ Subsequently, we selected 13 CpGs to show a strong association with any lipid traits in the multi-ethnic EWAS, i.e., CpG markers with a significant correlation between Europeans and non-Europeans (e.g., African Americans).¹⁸ Here, cg12556569 in the *APOA5* gene was excluded from the list since its probes for measuring DNA methylation show clustered distributions due to the underlying SNP (rs10750097, which is a relatively common variant in both Europeans and Asians) in the probe.¹⁹

6. Methylation risk score for lipid traits

Methylation risk scores (MRSs) were created for lipid traits using the weighted sums of beta values from individuals' methylation intensities at 13 CpG sites. The weights were determined as the effect sizes, represented as Z-scores, derived from a previous multi-ancestry EWAS for lipid traits [SuppData2, MODEL4.ALL in the research article by Jhun et al.¹⁸]. For each CpG site, we standardized the methylation beta values across the study population. The standardized values were then weighted and summed to derive the *raw* MRS for each individual. Following this, we performed a further standardization process to obtain the *standardized* MRS. To convert the *standardized* MRS to units of mg/dL, we utilized linear regression, aligning the *standardized* MRS with lipid measurements. The resulting scaling factors are 1.83 for LDL-C, 4.33 for HDL-C, and 19.0 for TG, respectively.

	Р	opulation-based cohor	rt	NCGM hospital
	Kita-Nagoya	Amagasaki	Ehime	cohort
No. of individuals (F/M)	2437 (1272 /1165)	550 (173 /377)	463 (277/186)	351 (133/218)
Age, yr	63.9 ± 6.3	46.5 ± 12.5	64.4 ± 10.2	69.4 ± 8.4
BMI. kg/m ²	22.8 ± 2.9	22.8 ± 2.9	23.2 ± 3.0	24.4 ± 3.4
LDL-C, mg/dl	131.1 ± 32.0 (F)	122.0 ± 29.2 (F)	124.3 ± 30.7	113.2 ± 30.4
HDL-C, mg/dl	62.6 ± 16.2	58.7 ± 15.8	65.2 ± 16.5	55.4 ± 14.8
Triglycerides, mg/dl	113.3 ± 57.2	113.4 ± 69.4	106.6 ± 57.3	140.5 ± 83.4
Smoking habit Current / Past / Never	333/489/1602 (13 missing)	213/60/275 (2 missing)	33/119/311	125/106/113 (7 missing)
Complication				
Hypertension, n (%)	1149 (47%)	106 (19%)	174 (38%)	287 (82%)
Diabetes, n (%)	262 (11%)	37 (7%)	46 (10%)	260 (74%)
Dyslipidemia*, n (%)	1049 (43%)	150 (27%)	211 (46%)	132 (38%)
Statin, n (%)	—	—	89 (19%)	134 (38%)
CAD, n (%)	62 (3%)	8 (1%)	15 (3%)	128 (36%)

 Table S1. Participant characteristics of reference groups

*In many cases, dyslipidemia is diagnosed as hyper-LDL-cholesterolemia. Hyper-LDL-cholesterolemia is defined when basal LDL-C \geq 140 mg/dl (irrespective of treatment with lipid-lowering drugs, statin and/or ezetimibe) has been indicated by medical records. Detailed information about statin use was not recorded in the Kita-Nagoya and Amagasaki study cohorts.

CharDea						N -f C			Alt alle	e_freq.				
(GRCh37,	SNP	Ref/Alt allele	Gene	Sequence	Clinical	Predicted as	MKL Coding	LOVD_clas	Control	HI +CAD	χ^2 test,	gnomAD	LDL-C	Notes
hg19)			Name	ontology "	significance	Damaging ^c	Pred (C) d	sification	(ToMMo; n=8380)	(n=610)	P-value	PopMax '	(mg/ai)	
1:25880491	rs752849346	C/T	LDLRAP1	missense	VUS	4 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.00125	0.0033	0.067	1E-04	216 ± 26	PMID: 20124734
					Conflicting									PCSK9 V4I reported in multiple
1:55505520	rs186669805	G/A	PCSK9	missense	(VUS/LB)	0 of 6	Tolerated	Р	0.01325	0.0098	0.31	7E-04	170 ± 12	Japanese FH-affected individuals (PMID: 26374825, 27206942)
1:55505581	N/A	G/A	PCSK9	missense	N/A	1 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	N/A	193	p.Gly(G)24Asp(D)
1:55505604	rs564427867	G/A	PCSK9	missense	Conflicting (P/VUS/LP)	1 of 6	Damaging	Р	0.01104	0.0082	0.35	0.001	185 ± 17	PCSK9 E32K reported in FH- affected individuals
1:55518408	rs749573024	G/A	PCSK9	missense	Conflicting (VUS/LB)	3 of 6	Damaging	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	7E-05	179	p.Arg(R)248His(H); increased proteolytic activity (PMID:
1:55518452	rs200146448	G/A	PCSK9	missense	Conflicting	3 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.00698	0.0049	0.40	6E-04	164 ± 24	29259136)
1:55529108	rs143291739	G/A	PCSK9	missense	(VUS/LB) VUS	0 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	0.00352	0.0033	0.89	3E-04	201 ± 17	
10-11215026	rc201102461	GIA		missonso	VUS	3 of 6	Damaging	IP	0.00442	0.0025	0.31	0.002	210 + 31	known as FH Fukuoka or p.R94H
10.11210020	13201102401	G/A	LDLIN		V00	5010	Talaata		0.00442	0.0025	0.51	0.002	210 ± 51	(PMID: 12837857)
19:11215977	rs/51519676	G/A	LDLR	missense	N/A Conflicting	1 of 6	lolerated	N/A	0.0003	0.0008	0.34	1E-04	162	
19:11216033	rs763233960	G/A	LDLR	missense	(P/LB)	2 of 6	Damaging	LB (ACGS)	0.00012	0.0008	0.07	2E-05	180	
19:45409136	rs373985746	G/A	APOE	missense	N/A	0 of 6	Tolerated	VUS	0.00221	0.0049	0.061	0.004	176 ± 7	
19:45409900	N/A	G/C	APOE	missense	N/A	4 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	0.00036	0.0008	0.43	N/A	165	
19:45411034	rs121918392	G/A	APOE	missense	Р	2 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.00215	0.0025	0.82	3E-04	175 ± 1	APOE5 allele, E21K. PMID: 7586659, 12069856
19:45411064	rs201672011	G/A	APOE	missense	Р	1 of 6	Damaging	VUS	0.00012	0.0008	0.07	0.003	162	APOE5 allele, E31K. PMID: 7586659, 12069856
19:45412062	N/A	C/T	APOE	missense	N/A	1 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	N/A	170	
19:45412337	rs140808909	G/A	APOE	missense	Р	3 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	0.00817	0.0057	0.36	0.0026	188 ± 13	APOE7, cooccurrence with
19:45412340	rs190853081	G/A	APOE	missense	Р	3 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.00817	0.0057	0.36	0.0026		rs190853081. PMID: 33928131 APOE7, cooccurrence with
2.21225472	N/A	T/Δ	APOR	missonso	N/A	0 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	0.00066	0.0008	0.83	N/A	218	rs140808909. PMID: 33928131
2.21225472	17/5	1/6	ADOD		Conflicting	0100	Tuluntud	N/A	0.00000	0.0000	0.05	0.0000	210	
2:21225713	rs570782024	A/G	APOB	missense	(LB/VUS/B)	1 01 6	lolerated	N/A	0.00304	0.0049	0.26	0.0022	161 ± 15	
2:21227149	N/A	T/C	APOB	missense	N/A	2 of 6	Damaging	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	N/A	183	
2:21229422	rs13306192	A/C	APOB	missense	VUS	5 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.00227	0.0008	0.29	3E-04	171	
2:21229716	N/A	AVI	APOB	missense	N/A	5 01 6	Damaging	N/A	0.00054	0.0008	0.69	N/A	164	
2:21230147	N/A	C/G	APOB	missense	N/A	1 01 6 2 of 6	Domosing	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	N/A	170	
2.21230091	rs374556458	A/G		missense	VU3	2 01 0 0 of 6	Tolorated	N/A	0.00000 N/A	0.0008	0.03	2E-05	161	GnomAD exame (Asian): 0/49006
2.21231337	N/A	СЛ		missense	N/A	0 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	2E-03	179	GilomAD_exome (Asian), 0/45000.
2:21231629	rs201874707	G/A	APOB	missense	VUS	4 of 6	Damaging	VUS	0.00095	0.0008	0.88	6E-05	169	
2:21231639	rs774720452	T/C	APOB	missense	V00	4 of 6	Damaging	N/A	6E-05	0.0008	0.015	N/A	170	
2:21232011	rs200231583	T/G	APOB	missense	B/LB	0 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	0.0003	0.0008	0.34	1E-04	171	cooccurrence with rs201152495
2:21232016	rs201152495	T/A	APOB	missense	LB	2 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.0003	0.0008	0.34	1E-04	171	cooccurrence with rs200231583
2:21232517	rs140027955	G/A	APOB	missense	Conflicting (LB/VUS)	4 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.0003	0.0008	0.34	0.002	170	
2:21232775	N/A	A/C	APOB	missense	N/A	1 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	0.00089	0.0008	0.93	N/A	194	
2:21233351	N/A	T/A	APOB	missense	N/A	2 of 6	Damaging	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	N/A	174	
2:21233503	rs747979961	T/G	APOB	missense	N/A	0 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	0.00042	0.0008	0.52	6E-05	162	
2:21234963	N/A	T/C	APOB	missense	N/A	0 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	N/A	182	
2:21235265	N/A	A/C	APOB	missense	N/A	2 of 6	Damaging	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	N/A	166	
2:21236085	rs13306187	C/T	APOB	missense	Conflicting (B/LB/VUS)	0 of 6	Tolerated	В	0.00465	0.0008	0.05	0.001	161 ± 26	Interpretation based on variant allele frequency (too common for FH)
2:21236105	rs754597311	G/T	APOB	missense	Conflicting (VUS/LB)	0 of 6	Tolerated	N/A	0.0031	0.0049	0.28	5E-04	207 ± 21	Interpretation based on variant allele frequency (too common for FH)
2:21241962	rs1663539785	G/C	APOB	missense	VUS	5 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.00125	0.0008	0.68	3E-04	163	
2:21247843	rs183950016	G/T	APOB	missense	VUS	4 of 6	Damaging	N/A	0.00292	0.0016	0.42	3E-04	204 ± 19	
2:21259972	N/A	C/T	APOB	missense	N/A	3 of 6	Damaging	N/A	N/A	0.0008	0.00021	N/A	182	
2:21266769	rs1197289618	GCGCAG/-	APOB	deletion	N/A	_	—	VUS	0.00394	0.0025	0.42	6E-05	184 ± 48	

* The highest priority ontology found among the variant-transcript interactions. The terms used are the standard feature descriptions given by the Sequence Ontology Project.

^b Clinical significance is the consensus interpretation of the submissions for all conditions for this variant. Primarily based on ACMG Classifications: P, pathogenic; LP, likely pathogenic; VUS, variant of uncertain significance; LB, likely benign; B, benign.

^cVariant effect predictor tools tested are: SIFT, PolyPhen2, Mutation Taster, Mutation Assessor, FATHMM and FATHMM-MKL.

^d If a FATHMM-MKL coding score (PMID: 25583119) is >0.5 (or rank score >0.28317), the corresponding nsSNV is predicted as "DAMAGING"; otherwise it is predicted as "TOLERATED".

e Variant classification and interpretation by the Association for Clinical Genomic Science (ACGS) is shown when applicable. For abbreviations, refer to the ACMG Classifications above.

^fPopMax refers to the gnomAD subpopulation with the highest allele frequency

Cana	Ca Caraba	Com	bined sa	mple	High	LDL-C sa	mple	CAD sample			P het	Transethnic EWAS*
Gene	CpG probe	BETA	SE	Ρ	BETA	SE	Р	BETA	SE	Ρ	high LDL- C vs CAD	Effect, Discovery/ Replication
ABCG1	cg06500161	0.0015	0.0004	0.0003	0.0017	0.0006	0.004	0.0011	0.0006	0.05	0.45	34.8 / 19.9
DHCR24	cg17901584	-0.002	0.001	0.14	-0.002	0.0014	0.09	-0.001	0.0015	0.41	0.55	-13.7 / -7.3
DHCR24	cg10073091	0.0005	0.0003	0.08	0.0004	0.0004	0.39	0.0006	0.0005	0.17	0.71	_
SC4MOL	cg05119988	0.0006	0.0006	0.34	0.001	0.0009	0.27	0.0003	0.0009	0.72	0.60	_
SARS	cg03725309	-9E-05	0.0003	0.78	-3E-04	0.0005	0.53	2E-06	0.0004	0.997	0.63	-24.8 / -8.2
PHGDH	cg14476101	-0.001	0.001	0.29	0.0002	0.0014	0.86	-0.003	0.0014	0.07	0.15	-14.5 / -8.9
TXNIP	cg19693031	-0.002	0.0007	0.004	-0.003	0.001	0.003	-8E-04	0.0009	0.39	0.11	_
SLC7A11	cg06690548	-6E-04	0.0004	0.18	-1E-04	0.0005	0.77	-8E-04	0.0007	0.21	0.40	-6.3/-11.7
GARS	cg21429551	-9E-04	0.001	0.35	-6E-04	0.0013	0.64	-0.001	0.0015	0.43	0.77	-6.9/-4.7
CPT1A	cg00574958	-5E-04	0.0002	0.002	-4E-04	0.0002	0.07	-7E-04	0.0002	0.003	0.32	-40.2/-21.3
SREBF1	cg11024682	0.0023	0.0007	0.0004	0.0027	0.0009	0.002	0.0016	0.001	0.10	0.39	32.5 / 22.7
PHOSPHO1	cg02650017	7E-05	0.0001	0.57	0.0003	0.0002	0.10	-1E-04	0.0002	0.45	0.09	-28.6 / -15.2
SLC1A5	cg02711608	-1E-04	0.0003	0.64	3E-05	0.0004	0.95	-5E-04	0.0004	0.19	0.34	-17.2 / -10.6

Table S3A. BMI-CpG association in the current study

*Data are drawn from a study of transethnic EWAS for BMI (ref.24).

Table 53B. Triglycerides–CpG association in the current study	Table S3B.	. Triglycerides	-CpG association	n in the currer	nt study
---	------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	----------

			Triglycerides-CpG association									
Gene	CpG probe	Com	bined sa	mple	High I	_DL-C s	ample	C	AD samp	le	P het	Multi-ethnic EWAS*
		BETA	SE	Р	BETA	SE	Р	BETA	SE	Ρ	high LDL- C vs CAD	BETA
ABCG1	cg06500161	9E-05	2E-05	2E-05	1E-04	3E-05	0.003	7E-05	3E-05	0.004	0.56	0.016
DHCR24	cg17901584	-6E-05	5E-05	0.24	-2E-04	8E-05	0.05	2E-05	7E-05	0.78	0.09	-0.009
DHCR24	cg10073091	8E-06	2E-05	0.62	-3E-05	2E-05	0.23	4E-05	2E-05	0.08	0.04	_
SC4MOL	cg05119988	1E-05	3E-05	0.68	1E-05	5E-05	0.81	5E-06	4E-05	0.89	0.92	-0.005
SARS	cg03725309	-3E-05	2E-05	0.03	-4E-05	3E-05	0.10	-3E-05	2E-05	0.15	0.60	-0.006
PHGDH	cg14476101	-6E-05	5E-05	0.26	-6E-05	8E-05	0.44	-6E-05	7E-05	0.38	0.99	-0.016
TXNIP	cg19693031	-1E-04	3E-05	2E-05	-1E-04	5E-05	0.0098	-2E-04	4E-05	0.0002	0.77	-0.021
SLC7A11	cg06690548	-4E-05	2E-05	0.08	-6E-05	3E-05	0.04	-2E-05	3E-05	0.49	0.38	-0.011
GARS	cg21429551	-1E-04	5E-05	0.006	-4E-05	7E-05	0.59	-2E-04	7E-05	0.003	0.10	-0.013
CPT1A	cg00574958	-3E-05	8E-06	0.0004	-3E-05	1E-05	0.02	-3E-05	1E-05	0.008	0.99	-0.009
SREBF1	cg11024682	9E-05	3E-05	0.0098	3E-05	5E-05	0.58	0.0001	4E-05	0.004	0.12	0.011
PHOSPHO1	cg02650017	3E-06	6E-06	0.64	-1E-06	9E-06	0.90	8E-06	8E-06	0.32	0.46	—
SLC1A5	cg02711608	-5E-05	2E-05	0.002	-3E-05	2E-05	0.20	-6E-05	2E-05	0.0009	0.31	-0.006

*Data are drawn from a study of multi-ethnic EWAS for lipids (ref.18).

		HDL-C-CpG association										
Gene	CpG probe	Com	bined sa	mple	High	LDL-C sa	Imple	CAD sample			P het	Multi-ethnic EWAS*
		BETA	SE	Р	BETA	SE	Ρ	BETA	SE	Р	high LDL- C vs CAD	BETA
ABCG1	cg06500161	-4E-04	1E-04	0.0002	-2E-04	0.0001	0.09	-6E-04	0.0002	0.0002	0.06	-0.019
DHCR24	cg17901584	0.0007	0.0002	0.003	0.0007	0.0003	0.03	0.0008	0.0004	0.05	0.76	0.029
DHCR24	cg10073091	8E-05	8E-05	0.33	8E-05	9E-05	0.40	5E-05	0.0001	0.72	0.85	0.005
SC4MOL	cg05119988	0.0001	0.0002	0.37	-1E-04	0.0002	0.55	0.0007	0.0003	0.009	0.01	0.015
SARS	cg03725309	5E-05	8E-05	0.53	8E-05	0.0001	0.46	1E-05	0.0001	0.90	0.69	_
PHGDH	cg14476101	-6E-05	0.0002	0.80	5E-05	0.0003	0.86	-2E-04	0.0004	0.72	0.70	_
TXNIP	cg19693031	-1E-04	0.0002	0.37	-1E-04	0.0002	0.60	-2E-04	0.0003	0.55	0.88	_
SLC7A11	cg06690548	0.0001	0.0001	0.14	0.0002	0.0001	0.04	6E-05	0.0002	0.78	0.47	—
GARS	cg21429551	0.0003	0.0002	0.19	0.0001	0.0003	0.62	0.0007	0.0004	0.14	0.33	_
CPT1A	cg00574958	5E-06	4E-05	0.90	2E-05	4E-05	0.64	-2E-05	7E-05	0.72	0.58	_
SREBF1	cg11024682	-3E-04	0.0002	0.06	-3E-04	0.0002	0.19	-4E-04	0.0003	0.21	0.73	-0.010
PHOSPHO1	cg02650017	8E-05	3E-05	0.007	5E-05	3E-05	0.13	0.0001	5E-05	0.04	0.41	0.004
SLC1A5	cg02711608	-6E-06	7E-05	0.94	-4E-06	1E-04	0.97	3E-05	0.0001	0.81	0.83	—

Table S3C. HDL-C–CpG association in the current study

*Data are drawn from a study of multi-ethnic EWAS for lipids (ref.18).

Table S3D. LDL-C–C	pG association in the	current study
--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

					LDL-C-	CpG asso	ociation					
Gene	CpG probe	Com	bined sar	nple	High	LDL-C sa	mple	С	AD samp	le	P het	Multi-ethnic EWAS*
		BETA	SE	Ρ	BETA	SE	Р	BETA	SE	Ρ	high LDL- C vs CAD	BETA
ABCG1	cg06500161	-2E-05	6E-05	0.69	0.0002	0.0001	0.06	-1E-04	7E-05	0.03	0.005	—
DHCR24	cg17901584	0.0003	0.0001	0.06	8E-05	0.0002	0.73	0.0003	0.0002	0.06	0.43	_
DHCR24	cg10073091	9E-05	4E-05	0.04	4E-05	7E-05	0.57	0.0001	5E-05	0.04	0.46	3E-05
SC4MOL	cg05119988	8E-05	8E-05	0.34	-2E-05	0.0001	0.90	0.0001	0.0001	0.15	0.36	9E-05
SARS	cg03725309	-2E-05	4E-05	0.57	-4E-05	8E-05	0.59	-3E-05	5E-05	0.55	0.86	_
PHGDH	cg14476101	0.0001	0.0001	0.34	0.0002	0.0002	0.41	5E-05	0.0002	0.76	0.62	—
TXNIP	cg19693031	-1E-04	9E-05	0.28	-3E-05	0.0002	0.86	-1E-04	0.0001	0.26	0.63	_
SLC7A11	cg06690548	8E-05	6E-05	0.16	6E-05	8E-05	0.44	8E-05	8E-05	0.28	0.86	_
GARS	cg21429551	-5E-05	0.0001	0.71	0.0001	0.0002	0.57	-2E-04	0.0002	0.38	0.32	_
CPT1A	cg00574958	-3E-06	2E-05	0.90	-4E-05	4E-05	0.27	1E-05	3E-05	0.61	0.23	_
SREBF1	cg11024682	0.0002	9E-05	0.02	0.0003	0.0002	0.08	0.0001	0.0001	0.23	0.51	_
PHOSPHO1	cg02650017	2E-05	2E-05	0.21	9E-06	3E-05	0.75	3E-05	2E-05	0.15	0.57	_
SLC1A5	cg02711608	-4E-05	4E-05	0.35	-1E-04	8E-05	0.06	-5E-06	5E-05	0.92	0.12	_

*Data are drawn from a study of multi-ethnic EWAS for lipids (ref.18).

Table S4A. Association of PRS and MRS with triglycerides in a regression model

		PRS			MRS		PRS+MRS	Interaction [PR	S×MRS]
	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)	R-squared	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)	R-squared	R-squared	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)
High LDL-C	6.932 (2.884)	0.017	0.026	14.744 (4.162)	4.6E-04	0.049	0.065	1.185 (3.220)	0.713
CAD	7.903 (3.383)	0.020	0.022	19.238 (4.340)	1.3E-05	0.066	0.080	4.721 (3.165)	0.137
KING	5.008 (2.355)	0.034	0.012	15.826 (3.076)	4.8E-07	0.076	0.087	-2.158 (2.392)	0.368
non-CAD	-1.560 (5.274)	0.768	-0.005	7.082 (6.652)	0.289	0.002	-0.004	-4.153 (5.541)	0.455

We used a regression model to analyze the association between the independent variables (PRS, MRS, or PRS+MRS) and the dependent variable (triglycerides) addjusted for sex, age, smoking status and BMI. The independent variables were standardized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. To calculate the MRS for triglycerides, we multiplied the methylation extent measurements for 11 CpGs (listed in Table S3) with corresponding Z-scores from literature (Jhun et al., 10.1038/s41467-021-23899-y SuppData2, MODEL4.ALL) at each locus, and then integrated the products. Abbreviations used: PRS (polygenic risk score) and MRS (methylation risk score).

Table S4B. Association of PRS and MRS with HDL-C in a regression model

		PRS			MRS		PRS+MRS	Interaction [PR	S×MRS]
_	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)	R-squared	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)	R-squared	R-squared	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)
High LDL-C	2.650 (0.652)	6.4E-05	0.056	2.298 (1.033)	0.027	0.016	0.070	0.302 (0.708)	0.670
CAD	1.367 (0.411)	9.9E-04	0.036	2.924 (0.678)	2.2E-05	0.059	0.090	0.284 (0.440)	0.519
KING	2.782 (0.490)	3.1E-08	0.094	0.697 (0.788)	0.377	0.002	0.093	0.378 (0.546)	0.489
non-CAD	0.595 (0.678)	0.381	-0.006	3.908 (1.266)	0.002	0.047	0.045	0.375 (0.733)	0.610

We used a regression model to analyze the association between the independent variables (PRS, MRS, or PRS+MRS) and the dependent variable (HDL-C) addjusted for sex, age, smoking status and BMI. The independent variables were standardized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. To calculate the MRS for triglycerides, we multiplied the methylation extent measurements for 6 CpGs (listed in Table S3) with corresponding Z-scores from literature (Jhun et al., 10.1038/s41467-021-23899-y SuppData2, MODEL4.ALL) at each locus, and then integrated the products. Abbreviations used: PRS (polygenic risk score) and MRS (methylation risk score).

Table S4C. Association of PRS and MRS with LDL-C in a regression model

	PRS				MRS		PRS+MRS	Interaction [PRS×MRS]	
Sub-group	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)	R-squared	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)	R-squared	R-squared	Estimate (SE)	Pr(> t)
High LDL-C	8.577 (2.195)	1.2E-04	0.041	0.134 (1.355)	0.921	-0.003	0.051	-0.642 (2.197)	0.770
CAD	1.639 (2.883)	0.570	-0.002	4.182 (1.744)	0.017	0.01	0.008	3.470 (3.137)	0.270
KING	3.906 (1.757)	0.027	0.015	2.838 (1.712)	0.098	0.008	0.02	0.023 (1.791)	0.013
non-CAD	1.954 (3.978)	0.624	-0.005	2.039 (2.102)	0.333	0.001	-0.008	0.910 (3.656)	0.804

We used a regression model to analyze the association between the independent variables (PRS, MRS, or PRS+MRS) and the dependent variable (LDL-C) addjusted for sex, age, smoking status and BMI. The independent variables were standardized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. LDL-C values with imputation were used for regression analysis except in the case of MRSs; LDL-C values without imputation were utilized for calculating MRSs in high LDL-C, CAD, and non-CAD subgroups to reflect the condition at the time of blood collection. For LDL-C in the KING Study, no imputation was performed. To calculate the MRS for LDL-C, we multiplied the methylation extent measurements for 2 CpGs (listed in Table S3) with corresponding Z-scores from literature (Jhun et al., 10.1038/s41467-021-23899-y SuppData2, MODEL4.ALL) at each locus, and then integrated the products.

Abbreviations: PRS, polygenic risk score; MRS, methylation risk score.

	Trait	CRP	Blood pressure	Alcohol consumption	Hepatic fat	γ-glutamyl transferase	Gene expression	BMI/WC	Statin use	Triglycerides	HDL	LDL	T2D	Insulin	HbA1c	FPG
	PMID	27955697	29198723	31789449	30936141	28624579	33752734	28002404/ 29099282	32033992	34183656	34183656	34183656	35169870	31197173	26643952	31197173
Gene	No. of CpGs CpG probe	58 CpGs	13 CpGs	1414 CpGs	22 CpGs	4 CpGs	148-1741 CpG- transcript pairs	187 loci/ 82 CpGs	5 CpGs	216 CpGs	110 CpGs	39 CpGs	64 CpGs	18 CpGs	1 CpG	7 CpGs
ABCG1	cg06500161				0		0	©/null	O	O	O		O	O		
DHCR24	cg17901584				\bigtriangleup		O	0/0	O	O	O			\bigtriangleup		
DHCR24	cg10073091										0	0				
SC4MOL	cg05119988							∆/null	0	0	0	0				
SARS	cg03725309	\bigtriangleup	0		\bigtriangleup			⊖/null		0						
PHGDH	cg14476101	0	O	O	\bigtriangleup	\bigtriangleup	0	©/null		0			0			
TXNIP	cg19693031		O	O	0			null/〇		0			O		0	
SLC7A11	cg06690548	0	O	O	0	O		0/0		0						0
GARS	cg21429551	\bigtriangleup	0	0	\bigtriangleup			⊖/null		0						
CPT1A	cg00574958		0	0	0		O	0/0		0			0	0		0
SREBF1	cg11024682	0			\bigtriangleup	\bigtriangleup	0	0/0		0	0		0	\bigtriangleup		\bigtriangleup
PHOSPHO1	cg02650017	0						©/null			O		0			
SLC1A5	cg02711608	0	O	O	\bigtriangleup		0	⊖/null		O			0			

Table S5. Overlap of DNA methylation-cardiometabolic trait association at 13 CpG sites tested in the present study

Positive hits (P<5E-8) are drawn from the EWAS Catalog (http://www.ewascatalog.org) as of 2023.0830.

Positive signals are arbitrarily categorized into three classes according to the P-value: triangle (Δ), 5E-8>P \geq 1E-10; circle (\circ), 1E-10>P \geq 1E-20; and double circle (\odot), P<1E-20.



Fig. S1: Reduction rate in LDL-C according to medication.

The treatment-induced reduction rate in LDL-C was calculated in Japanese by a retrospective analysis of data from 36 individuals with high LDL-C in whom plasma LDL-C measurements were available both before and within 18 months after initiating statins and ezetimibe. The arrows indicate the mean of the reduction rate in each treatment group. In populations of European descent, while the treatment-induced reduction rate in LDL-C has been reported to be 0.2 to >0.5 according to dose and type of statins,²⁰ a reduction rate of 0.3 is generally used for imputation of LDL-C measured in those on statin treatment.^{21,22} Given the difference between Asian and Western groups in the LDL-C lowering effect of statins (i.e., the dosages are significantly lower in Asian than in Western groups to attain a target effect),²³ we deemed 0.4 appropriate for statins in Japanese.



Fig. S2: Estimating standardized impacts of a PRSLDL-C on plasma LDL-C level in Japanese.

First, to define the standardized PRS_{LDL-C} decile classes in Japanese (referred to as the 'Japanese standard PRS for LDL-C'), we utilized data from three population-based cohorts (Amagasaki, Ehime, and Kita-Nagoya [KING]), whose areas are somewhat geographically distant from each other in Japan. Next, to convert the PRS_{LDL-C} from high LDL-C and CAD subgroups into LDL-C predictions, we used the mean of the LDL-C measurements from the NCGM hospital cohort (i.e., an external reference group) belonging to the same population as the above two subgroups recruited at NCGM. **A:** Histograms of PRS_{LDL-C} in three cohorts. **B:** Box-and-whisker plots of LDL-C by PRS_{LDL-C} decile in three cohorts. **C:** Line graphs of PRS_{LDL-C} in Japanese at each decile point for the combined three cohort data. Box-and-whisker plots of LDL-C measurements from the NCGM hospital cohort (**D**) and the high LDL-C and CAD subgroups (**E**).



Fig. S3: Distribution of LDL-C and PRS_{LDL} in two hospital-based cohorts at NCGM.

Histograms of plasma LDL-C level (**A**) and PRS_{LDL-C} (**B**) in the BIO-CVD (top panels) and NCGM hospital cohort (bottom panels) projects. BIO-CVD is a bioresource collection project focused on cardiovascular disease, which includes 306 CAD and 47 non-CAD (see Fig. 1). On the other hand, the NCGM hospital cohort (N = 351) was separately recruited without screening for cardiovascular disease. In the histograms of Fig. S3A, CAD (and non-CAD) subjects are colored in blue (and grey), and the arrows indicate the mean of LDL-C in individual project samples. Besides, non-CAD (N = 125) subjects from BIO-CVD were added to GWAS array genotyping.



Fig. S4: Distribution of metabolic traits in three subgroups newly recruited.

Histograms of lipid traits and body mass index (BMI) are shown for three subgroups—high LDL-C (≥160 mg/dl), CAD (regardless of LDL-C level), and non-CAD individuals—newly recruited via two bioresource projects (BIO-CVD and NCGM Biobank). LDL-C was imputed for subjects taking lipid-lowering medications (statins or ezetimibe), and the imputed values (second column from left) were utilized in regression analysis except in the case of MRSs. The arrows indicate the mean of each metabolic trait in individual study groups.



Fig. S5: Correlation of DNA methylation measurement between ddPCR and EPIC array.

Scatter plots show a fair correlation between two analytical methods—ddPCR (in the *x*-axis) and EPIC array (in the *y*-axis)—at 13 CpGs examined in this study.



Fig. S6: Distribution of MRSs for lipid traits calculated with 13 CpGs in high LDL-C, CAD, and general subject groups.

Histograms of MRSs for lipid traits are shown for two subgroups—high LDL-C (≥160 mg/dl) and CAD individuals—at NCGM and a general subject group (part of the KING study cohort). For those taking lipid-lowering medications (statins or ezetimibe), LDL-C without imputation was used to calculate MRSs in high LDL-C and CAD subgroups to accurately reflect the condition at the time of blood collection. The arrows indicate the mean of lipid MRSs in individual study groups. We made an intergroup comparison of MRSs between the high LDL-C subgroup vs. others.



Fig. S7: Scatter plots demonstrating the correlation between predicted and actual lipid levels using three risk score models.

Correlation strengths are compared between predicted (in the *x*-axis) and actual (in the *y*-axis) lipid trait values (LDL-C, top panels; HDL-C, middle panels; triglycerides, bottom panels) in each plot using three risk score models: PRS (left column), MRS (middle column), and PRS + MRS (right column). To convert PRS for lipid traits to units of mg/dL, we aligned the PRS with actual lipid measurements in linear regression within the relevant sample, i.e., individuals newly recruited at NCGM (BIO-CVD + NCGM Biobank) for rare variant search besides PRS and MRS calculations (N = 653, refer to Fig. 1). For LDL-C, the conversion methods are different between the top panels (of this figure) and Fig. 3D-F, in which an additional conversion formula is used to predict LDL-C for the incorporation of rare variant effects.



Fig. S8: Proposed use of dyslipidemia prediction models in clinical practice.

A policy to prevent or treat dyslipidemia can be determined in clinical practice by using a risk prediction index integrating the composite genetic risk score (or cGRS), which is calculated based on lipid trait-associated SNPs (i.e., PRS) and rare functional variants, and the methylation risk score (MRS). A: In terms of the distribution of each risk score in the population, it is broadly classified into a "low-risk group" lower than the first quartile, a "middle-risk group" in the quartile range (first quartile to third quartile), and a "high-risk group" higher than the third quartile. **B**: Specific examples of the GRS and MRS ranges for each lipid trait in the "low-risk," "middle-risk," and "high-risk" groups (based on this study's dataset) are shown in the table. Here, GRSs are based on PRS only, and PRS ranges are based on combined data from three regional populations of Japanese descent (Fig.3A). C: Using a matrix table combining two risk scores as a decision support tool, the relative contribution of genetic predisposition and DNA methylation (possible indicators of lifestyle habits) to dyslipidemia can be estimated to standardize and refine policymaking. A higher cGRS reflecting genetic susceptibility tends to indicate a higher need for drug treatment, while a higher MRS reflecting lack of moderation tends to indicate a higher need for lifestyle modification. D: For rare functional variant carriers, the predicted value of LDL-C based on the cGRS can be obtained by adding to each person's PRSLDL-C the estimated changes from non-carriers for each rare variant category (see Methods). If there is a large reference population for which fine quantile information is available, the LDL-C predictions with the correction values for rare functional variants added on top can also be displayed as a percentile.

SUPPLEMENTARY REFERENCES

- Takeuchi F, Yokota M, Yamamoto K, Nakashima E, Katsuya T, Asano H, Isono M, Nabika T, Sugiyama T, Fujioka A, et al. Genome-wide association study of coronary artery disease in the Japanese. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2012;20:333-340.
- Takeuchi F, Akiyama M, Matoba N, Katsuya T, Nakatochi M, Tabara Y, Narita A, Saw WY, Moon S, Spracklen CN, et al. Interethnic analyses of blood pressure loci in populations of East Asian and European descent. *Nat Commun.* 2018;9:5052.
- Asano H, Izawa H, Nagata K, Nakatochi M, Kobayashi M, Hirashiki A, Shintani S, Nishizawa T, Tanimura D, Naruse K, et al. Plasma resistin concentration determined by common variants in the resistin gene and associated with metabolic traits in an aged Japanese population. *Diabetologia*. 2010;53:234-246.
- Nakatochi M, Ichihara S, Yamamoto K, Ohnaka K, Kato Y, Yokota S, Hirashiki A, Naruse K, Asano H, Izawa H, et al. Epigenome-wide association study suggests that SNPs in the promoter region of RETN influence plasma resistin level via effects on DNA methylation at neighbouring sites. *Diabetologia*. 2015;58:2781-2790.
- Liu X, Li C, Mou C, Dong Y, Tu Y. dbNSFP v4: a comprehensive database of transcript-specific functional predictions and annotations for human nonsynonymous and splice-site SNVs. *Genome Med.* 2020;12:103.
- 6. Tajima T, Morita H, Ito K, Yamazaki T, Kubo M, Komuro I, Momozawa Y. Blood lipid-related lowfrequency variants in LDLR and PCSK9 are associated with onset age and risk of myocardial infarction in Japanese. *Sci Rep.* 2018;8:8107.
- Frazier-Wood AC, Aslibekyan S, Absher DM, Hopkins PN, Sha J, Tsai MY, Tiwari HK, Waite LL, Zhi D, Arnett DK. Methylation at CPT1A locus is associated with lipoprotein subfraction profiles. *J Lipid Res.* 2014;55:1324-1330.
- 8. Gomez-Alonso MDC, Kretschmer A, Wilson R, Pfeiffer L, Karhunen V, Seppälä I, Zhang W, Mittelstraß K, Wahl S, Matias-Garcia PR, et al. DNA methylation and lipid metabolism: an EWAS of 226 metabolic measures. *Clin Epigenetics*. 2021;13:7.
- Irvin MR, Zhi D, Joehanes R, Mendelson M, Aslibekyan S, Claas SA, Thibeault KS, Patel N, Day K, Jones LW, Liang L, Chen BH, Yao C, Tiwari HK, Ordovas JM, Levy D, Absher D, Arnett DK. Epigenomewide association study of fasting blood lipids in the Genetics of Lipid-lowering Drugs and Diet Network study. *Circulation*. 2014;130:565-572.
- Pfeiffer L, Wahl S, Pilling LC, Reischl E, Sandling JK, Kunze S, Holdt LM, Kretschmer A, Schramm K, Adamski J, Klopp N, Illig T, Hedman ÅK, Roden M, Hernandez DG, Singleton AB, Thasler WE, Grallert H, Gieger C, Herder C, Teupser D, Meisinger C, Spector TD, Kronenberg F, Prokisch H,

Melzer D, Peters A, Deloukas P, Ferrucci L, Waldenberger M. DNA methylation of lipid-related genes affects blood lipid levels. *Circ Cardiovasc Genet*. 2015;8:334-342.

- 11. Sayols-Baixeras S, Subirana I, Lluis-Ganella C, Civeira F, Roquer J, Do AN, Absher D, Cenarro A, Muñoz D, Soriano-Tárraga C, Jiménez-Conde J, Ordovas JM, Senti M, Aslibekyan S, Marrugat J, Arnett DK, Elosua R. Identification and validation of seven new loci showing differential DNA methylation related to serum lipid profile: an epigenome-wide approach. The REGICOR study. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2016;25:4556-4565.
- 12. Hedman ÅK, Mendelson MM, Marioni RE, Gustafsson S, Joehanes R, Irvin MR, Zhi D, Sandling JK, Yao C, Liu C, Liang L, Huan T, McRae AF, Demissie S, Shah S, Starr JM, Cupples LA, Deloukas P, Spector TD, Sundström J, Krauss RM, Arnett DK, Deary IJ, Lind L, Levy D, Ingelsson E. Epigenetic Patterns in Blood Associated With Lipid Traits Predict Incident Coronary Heart Disease Events and Are Enriched for Results From Genome-Wide Association Studies. *Circ Cardiovasc Genet*. 2017;10:e001487.
- Braun KVE, Dhana K, de Vries PS, Voortman T, van Meurs JBJ, Uitterlinden AG; BIOS consortium; Hofman A, Hu FB, Franco OH, Dehghan A. Epigenome-wide association study (EWAS) on lipids: the Rotterdam Study. *Clin Epigenetics*. 2017;9:15.
- Xie T, Gorenjak V, G Stathopoulou M, Dadé S, Marouli E, Masson C, Murray H, Lamont J, Fitzgerald
 P, Deloukas P, Visvikis-Siest S. Epigenome-Wide Association Study (EWAS) of Blood Lipids in
 Healthy Population from STANISLAS Family Study (SFS). *Int J Mol Sci.* 2019;20:1014.
- 15. Lai CQ, Wojczynski MK, Parnell LD, Hidalgo BA, Irvin MR, Aslibekyan S, Province MA, Absher DM, Arnett DK, Ordovás JM. Epigenome-wide association study of triglyceride postprandial responses to a high-fat dietary challenge. *J Lipid Res.* 2016;57:2200-2207.
- 16. Ochoa-Rosales C, Portilla-Fernandez E, Nano J, Wilson R, Lehne B, Mishra PP, Gao X, Ghanbari M, Rueda-Ochoa OL, Juvinao-Quintero D, Loh M, Zhang W, Kooner JS, Grabe HJ, Felix SB, Schöttker B, Zhang Y, Gieger C, Müller-Nurasyid M, Heier M, Peters A, Lehtimäki T, Teumer A, Brenner H, Waldenberger M, Ikram MA, van Meurs JBJ, Franco OH, Voortman T, Chambers J, Stricker BH, Muka T. Epigenetic Link Between Statin Therapy and Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2020;43:875-884.
- 17. Nuotio ML, Pervjakova N, Joensuu A, Karhunen V, Hiekkalinna T, Milani L, Kettunen J, Järvelin MR, Jousilahti P, Metspalu A, Salomaa V, Kristiansson K, Perola M. An epigenome-wide association study of metabolic syndrome and its components. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10:20567.
- 18. Jhun MA, Mendelson M, Wilson R, Gondalia R, Joehanes R, Salfati E, Zhao X, Braun KVE, Do AN, Hedman ÅK, et al. A multi-ethnic epigenome-wide association study of leukocyte DNA methylation and blood lipids. *Nat Commun.* 2021;12:3987.

- 19. Andrews SV, Ladd-Acosta C, Feinberg AP, Hansen KD, Fallin MD. "Gap hunting" to characterize clustered probe signals in Illumina methylation array data. *Epigenetics Chromatin*. 2016;9:56.
- Ruel I, Aljenedil S, Sadri I, de Varennes É, Hegele RA, Couture P, Bergeron J, Wanneh E, Baass A, Dufour R, et al. Imputation of Baseline LDL Cholesterol Concentration in Patients with Familial Hypercholesterolemia on Statins or Ezetimibe. *Clin Chem*. 2018;64:355-362.
- Khera AV, Won HH, Peloso GM, Lawson KS, Bartz TM, Deng X, van Leeuwen EM, Natarajan P, Emdin CA, Bick AG, et al. Diagnostic Yield and Clinical Utility of Sequencing Familial Hypercholesterolemia Genes in Patients With Severe Hypercholesterolemia. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2016;67:2578-2589.
- 22. Natarajan P, Peloso GM, Zekavat SM, Montasser M, Ganna A, Chaffin M, Khera AV, Zhou W, Bloom JM, Engreitz JM, et al. Deep-coverage whole genome sequences and blood lipids among 16,324 individuals. *Nat Commun*. 2018;9:3391.
- 23. Li YF, Feng QZ, Gao WQ, Zhang XJ, Huang Y, Chen YD. The difference between Asian and Western in the effect of LDL-C lowering therapy on coronary atherosclerotic plaque: a meta-analysis report. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*. 2015;15:6.
- 24. Wahl S, Drong A, Lehne B, Loh M, Scott WR, Kunze S, Tsai PC, Ried JS, Zhang W, Yang Y, et al. Epigenome-wide association study of body mass index, and the adverse outcomes of adiposity. *Nature*. 2017;541:81-86.