

## Supplementary Material

### METHODS

#### *Cognitive functioning measures*

**Working memory.** Participants continuously monitored a series of numbers presented on a computer screen and pressed '1' if the number was the same as the number presented  $N$  numbers ago, or '2' if it was not. Stimuli were numbers 0–9, presented in black on white background with a random spatial jitter of 180 pixels in y-axis and 200 pixels in x-axis. Each target was presented for 500 ms, followed by a 3,000 ms response window. The practice block consisted of 12 trials containing two targets. The experimental block consisted of 48 trials, containing 8 targets, where the target was the number that was identical to the one presented 2 trials back. Three outcomes were examined for the  $N$ -back task (i) number of hits, or the percentage of matching numbers correctly identified as matches, (ii) false alarms, or the percentage of non-matching numbers incorrectly identified as matches, and (iii) discriminability index,  $d'$ , which is a signal-detection metric that takes into account both hits and false alarms to derive an overall estimate of signal-detection ability (1).  $d'$  was calculated using the Stata syntax adapted from (2). Of the participants assessed with cognitive tasks at age 24 ( $n=3,312$ ),  $n=182$  did not provide any data on the task;  $n=70$  were omitted due to negative  $d'$  scores and/or not responding to over 50% of the trials.

$$d' = \text{invnorm}(\text{hits}) - \text{invnorm}(\text{false alarms})$$

**Response inhibition.** Participants were asked to sit in front of a computer monitor and their two index fingers were placed in two stimulus boxes, one labelled X and one labelled O. Two types of trials were performed, 'go' trials and stop signal trials. In the 'go' trials, participants were asked to fixate on a plus sign (+) in the centre of the computer screen. An X or O was presented on the screen and the participant had to press the corresponding button as quickly as possible. On 25% of the trials, a beep is heard (stop signal), randomly after the X and O appears. Participants were told to not press a response button when the beep was sounded, and to wait for the next trial to begin. If the beep was not heard the participant was asked to press the corresponding key according to what was presented on screen. When the beep was sounded, the participant was to refrain from pressing the response button.

32 practice trials were presented. The task consisted of 256 trials, comprised of 4 blocks of 64 trials. Each block of 64 trials consists of 4 sub-blocks of 16 trials. Each sub-block consists of 12 trials without a stop-signal and 4 trials with a stop-signal. Mean response times were calculated. Four metrics were examined for the stop signal task: (i) an estimate of stop signal reaction (SSRT) was calculated and used as the primary outcome as it is a reliable measure of inhibitory control, with shorter SSRT's indicating slower inhibition; secondary outcomes include: (ii) 'go' reaction time; (iii) 'go' accuracy; and (iv) 'stop' accuracy.

$$\text{SSRT}_{\text{med}} = \text{Go Reaction Time}_{\text{med}} - \text{Stop Signal Delay}_{\text{med}}$$

Stop Signal Delay<sub>med</sub> (SSD) was calculated for each session using a weighted least squares linear regression to predict SSD based on the probability of responding given a stop-

signal. This was then used to estimate the SSD where the probability of the participant failing to inhibit was 50%.

*Emotion recognition.* Prototypical composite images of the six basic facial expressions of emotion were generated from 12 individual male faces showing each of the six expressions. The 12 original images were each delineated with 172 feature points, which allowed both shape and colour information to be averaged across the faces to generate 'average' anger, sadness, surprise, disgust, fear, happiness, using established techniques. An overall emotional prototype face was then generated by averaging the exemplars for each emotional expression. Facial images showing a specific emotion were displayed on the screen one at a time. Images were presented for 200 ms, followed by a backwards mask (white noise) of 250 ms. Participants were required to select the descriptor that best described the emotion that was present in the face, using the computer mouse. Emotion intensity is varied across 8 stimuli within each emotion on a scale from the most prototypical emotion to an almost neutral emotion. Each individual stimulus is presented twice, giving a total of 96 trials. The task was delivered using E-Prime Professional v. 2.0 software (3).

For each of the specific emotions an unbiased hit rate was derived and used as the secondary outcome. This is based on work by Wagner (4) who proposed an alternative score, the "unbiased hit rate" ( $H_u$ ), designed to account for response biases.  $H_u$  for each participant is calculated as the squared frequency of correct responses for a target emotion divided by the product of the number of stimuli representing this emotion and the overall frequency of this emotion category being chosen.  $H_u$  has a range of zero to one, one indicating that all stimuli of an emotion have been correctly identified and the respective emotion has never been falsely chosen for a different emotion. Results from the secondary analyses are presented in Tables S8a-d.

#### *Potential confounders*

Confounders included: income (quintiles), maternal education (<O level: indicating no qualification; O level: indicating completion of school examinations at age 16; and >O level: indicating completion of college or university education at or after age 18), socioeconomic position (SEP, grouped into four categories: (a) unskilled or semiskilled manual; (b) skilled manual or non-manual; (c) managerial and technical and (d) professional), housing tenure (mortgaged, subsidised renting and private renting), sex, and maternal smoking during first trimester in pregnancy (yes/no).

A computerized version of the Counting Span task (5) was included at approximately 11 years ( $M=10$  years 8 months,  $SD=3$  months) to assess working memory performance during a clinic visit. A span score was based on the number of correctly recalled sets (maximum score of 5 in increments of 0.5). Since adolescents who have experienced head injury perform poorly in working memory tasks compared with age-matched peers (6), we covaried for head injury/unconsciousness before the age of 11,  $n=113$  (3.4%). Finally, prior substance use was assessed using ever having consumed alcohol or used tobacco before 13 years of age (yes/no).

#### *Missing data*

Missing data on cannabis and tobacco use were dealt with using full information maximum likelihood. SES confounders assessed largely in pregnancy had minimal missing

data (e.g., parental social class had the most missing data: 1,069/8,093 (13%), while the cognitive measures assessed up to age 11 years and substance use assessed at age 16.5 years had moderate missing data 2,034/8,093 (25%). Given that the BCH method uses listwise deletion for the outcome measures,  $n=2,073$  participants had complete information on cannabis use, 2,059 had complete information on tobacco use and outcome and confounder data and at least one measure of tobacco use.

#### *Inverse probability weighting*

Weights were derived from logistic regression models using variables associated with nonresponse, including maternal age, grandmother having a history of severe depression, maternal alcohol use in pregnancy, financial problems, maternal cannabis use and financial problems. We weighted the included respondents by the inverse of the probability of attending and used the Hosmer-Lemeshow test to assess model fit.

#### *Model fit LLCA of tobacco and cannabis use*

Criteria for best fit included i) information-theoretic methods with lower values indicating better fit to the data i.e., sample size adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (SSABIC) (7), Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC) (8), Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) (9); ii) likelihood ratio statistical test methods comparing the model with K classes to a model with K-1 classes i.e., Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test (LRT) (10), bootstrap likelihood ratio test (BLRT) (11), and iii) entropy-based criterion goodness-of-fit indices based on the uncertainty of classification, ranging from 0 to 1 with a high score indicating good fit (entropy) (12). We repeated the estimation procedure while varying the amount of missing data.

#### *Genetic data*

ALSPAC children were genotyped using the Illumina HumanHap550 quad chip genotyping platforms by 23andme subcontracting the Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, Cambridge, UK and the Laboratory Corporation of America, Burlington, NC, US. The resulting raw genome-wide data were subjected to standard quality control methods. Individuals were excluded on the basis of gender mismatches; minimal or excessive heterozygosity; disproportionate levels of individual missingness (>3%) and insufficient sample replication ( $IBD < 0.8$ ). Population stratification was assessed by multidimensional scaling analysis and compared with HapMap II (release 22) European descent (CEU), Han Chinese, Japanese and Yoruba reference populations; all individuals with non-European ancestry were removed. SNPs with a minor allele frequency of < 1%, a call rate of < 95% or evidence for violations of Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium ( $p < 5 \times 10^{-7}$ ) were removed. Cryptic relatedness was measured as proportion of identity by descent ( $IBD > 0.1$ ). Related subjects that passed all other quality control thresholds were retained during subsequent phasing and imputation. 9,115 subjects and 500,527 SNPs passed these quality control filters. ALSPAC mothers were also genotyped following a similar procedure, details of which are reported elsewhere (13).

We combined 477,482 SNP genotypes in common between the sample of mothers and sample of children. We removed SNPs with genotype missingness above 1% due to poor quality (11,396 SNPs removed) and removed a further 321 subjects due to potential ID mismatches. This resulted in a dataset of 17,842 subjects containing 6,305 duos and 465,740 SNPs (112 were removed during liftover and 234 were out of HWE after combination). We estimated haplotypes using ShapeIT (v2.r644) which utilises relatedness

during phasing. We obtained a phased version of the 1000 genomes reference panel (Phase 1, Version 3) from the Impute2 reference data repository (phased using ShapeIT v2.r644, haplotype release date Dec 2013). Imputation of the target data was performed using Impute V2.2.2 against the reference panel (all polymorphic SNPs excluding singletons), using all 2186 reference haplotypes (including non-Europeans). This resulted in 8,237 eligible ALSPAC children with available genotype data after exclusion of related subjects using cryptic relatedness measures described previously.

### *Genetic Analyses*

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) were conducted for each cognitive measure (working memory, emotion recognition and response inhibition) using all ALSPAC participants who completed the cognitive assessments and had available genetic data ( $n = 2,471$ ,  $n = 2,560$ , and  $n = 2,446$ , respectively). The same cognitive outcomes as in the observational analyses were used. Linear regression was conducted using SNPtest.2.5.0 to test associations between each single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) and each cognitive phenotype under an additive model, controlling for age, sex, and the first 10 genetic principal components (to account for population stratification). Phenotypes were quantile normalized (using SNPtest) prior to analysis. Quality control checks were conducted on the summary data. SNPs were excluded if they deviated from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (at  $p < 5 \times 10^{-7}$ ), info of  $< 80\%$ , and/or a minor allele frequency of  $< 1\%$ . SNPs reaching  $p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$  were considered genome-wide significant. SNPs were then clumped to ensure independence at linkage disequilibrium (LD)  $r^2 = 0.001$  and a distance of 10,000 kb, using the “clump\_data” command in the TwoSampleMR R package (14).


Genome-wide association analyses (GWAS) were conducted using ALSPAC participants who completed cognitive assessments ( $n \sim 2,500$ ). The same cognitive measures used in the observational analyses were used:  $d'$  as a measure of working memory, SSRT as a measure of response inhibition, and total number of recognised emotions as a measure of emotion recognition. Linear regression was conducted using SNPtest.2.5.0 to test associations between each single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) and each cognitive phenotype under an additive model, controlling for age, sex, and the first 10 genetic principal components (to account for population stratification). SNPs reaching  $p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$  were identified as genome-wide significant. Further details on the GWAS of cognitive functioning is provided by (15).

### *Mendelian randomisation (MR)*

Two-sample MR was used to test the hypothesised causal effect of smoking initiation and lifetime cannabis use on cognitive functioning. The two-sample MR approach requires summary level data from GWAS, enabling SNP-outcome and SNP-exposure effects to be derived from different data sources. As the genetic instrument for smoking we used 378-independent genome-wide significant SNPs associated with smoking initiation identified by the GWAS & Sequencing Consortium of Alcohol and Nicotine use (GSCAN <https://gscan.sph.umich.edu/>) based on a sample of  $N \sim 1,200,000$ . For cannabis use, we used 8-independent genome-wide significant SNPs associated with lifetime cannabis use based on the largest GWAS to date ( $N = 184,765$ ) (16). As outcomes, we used GWAS conducted in ALSPAC for each of our three primary outcome measures: i) working memory

assessed using  $d'$ ; ii) response inhibition assessed using SSRT; and iii) emotion recognition assessed using total number of recognised emotions.

Analyses were performed using the TwoSampleMR R package, part of MR-Base (14). The inverse-variance weighted (IVW) approach was used as a primary analysis, with three complementary estimation methods as sensitivity analyses which each make different assumptions about the nature of horizontal pleiotropy (where the genetic variant associates with the outcome via an independent pathway to the exposure): MR Egger (17), weighted median (18), and weighted mode (19). A consistent effect across all of these methods would provide the most confidence that any observed effects are not due to pleiotropy. The association between smoking initiation genetic score/ lifetime cannabis use and baseline confounders (gender, maternal smoking in pregnancy, housing tenure, maternal education, income, social position, head injury/unconsciousness before 11 years of age, working memory at 11 years of age, and alcohol use before age 14 years) were compared (Tables S9a and S9b). We found evidence on an association between our smoking initiation score and mothers who had >O level education, and alcohol use before 14 years of age. In terms of lifetime cannabis use, we found evidence of an association with head injury/unconsciousness, working memory at age 11 years, and alcohol use before 14 years of age.



**Figure S1.** Sample attrition in ALSPAC.

Note: RI: response inhibition; WM: working memory; ER: emotion recognition




Figure S2. Timeline for data collection.

**Table S1a.** Comparison of model fit indices for tobacco use comparing 1 to 5 classes

	# param	AIC	BIC	SSABIC	Entropy	Min class	LRT	BLRT
1 class	17	31904	32024	31970	-	-	-	-
2 class	35	27447	27692	27581	0.76	22.5%	<0.0001	<0.0001
3 class	53	26668	27041	26873	0.69	11.9%	<0.0001	<0.0001
4 class	71	26485	26985	26760	0.72	3.4%	0.22	<0.0001
5 class	89	26425	27052	26769	0.73	2.7%	0.24	<0.0001

Note: SSABIC: Bayesian Information Criterion; AIC: Akaike's Information Criteria; BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion; LRT: likelihood ratio test; BLRT: bootstrap likelihood ratio test

**Table S1b.** Comparison of model fit indices for cannabis use comparing 1 to 5 classes

	# param	AIC	BIC	SSABIC	Entropy	Min class	LRT	BLRT
1 class		18931	18931	18977	-	-	-	-
2 class		16551	16726	16646	0.77	14.4%	<0.0001	<0.0001
3 class		16247	16513	16392	0.75	3.8%	<0.0001	<0.0001
4 class		16119	16476	16476	0.77	2.9%	<0.0001	<0.0001
5 class		-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: SSABIC: Bayesian Information Criterion; AIC: Akaike's Information Criteria; BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion; LRT: likelihood ratio test; BLRT: bootstrap likelihood ratio test; the 5-class model did not converge



**Table S2a.** Prevalence of tobacco use at each timepoint estimated using all available data

	13	%	14	%	15	%	16	%	17	%	18	%
	6,115		5,926		4,497		5,066		4,199		3,334	
Non-smoker	5,964	97.5	5,579	94.1	3,558	79.1	4,070	80.3	3,019	71.9	2,438	73.1
Occasional smoker	47	0.8	154	2.6	381	8.5	369	7.3	461	11.0	357	10.7
Weekly smoker	104	1.7	75	1.3	202	4.5	215	4.2	195	4.6	156	4.7
Daily smoker	-	-	118	2.0	356	7.9	412	8.1	524	12.5	383	11.5

Note: Clinic assessments at ages 13, 15, and 17; questionnaires assessments at ages 14, 16, and 18

**Table S2b.** Prevalence of cannabis use at each timepoint estimated using all available data

	13	%	14	%	15	%	16	%	17	%	18	%
	5,786		5,658		5,060		4,843		3,915		3,207	
Non-user	5,589	96.6	5,518	97.5	4,578	90.5	4,365	90.1	3,166	80.8	2,688	83.8
Occasional use	179	3.1	107	1.9	328	6.5	319	6.6	578	14.8	371	11.6
Frequent use	18	0.3	33	0.6	154	3.00	159	3.2	171	4.3	148	4.6

Note: Clinic assessments at ages 13, 15, and 17; questionnaires assessments at ages 14, 16, and 18

**Table S3.** Selective attrition for cognitive functioning assessed at the age 24 clinic

		Available (n=3,201) n (%)	Not available (n=10, 777) n (%)	OR (95% CI)
<b>Gender:</b>				
	Males	1,208 (37.7)	6,009 (55.8)	0.48 (0.44, 0.52)
<b>Income:</b>				
	Low 20%	359 (126)	1,630 (23.1)	ref
	40%	486 (17.0)	1,480 (21.0)	0.67 (0.58, 0.78)
	60%	575 (20.1)	1,401 (19.8)	0.53 (0.46, 0.62)
	80%	679 (23.7)	1,306 (18.5)	0.42 (0.37, 0.49)
	Highest %	760 (26.6)	1,247 (17.7)	0.36 (0.31, 0.42)
<b>Maternal education:</b>				
	<O level	1,559 (50.1)	2,826 (30.4)	ref
	O level	1,040 (33.5)	3,247 (35.0)	1.72 (1.57, 1.89)
	>O level	509 (16.4)	3,214 (34.6)	3.48 (3.11, 3.90)
<b>Social:</b>				
	i	89 (3.0)	593 (7.0)	ref
	ii	929 (30.1)	3,547 (48.8)	0.57 (0.45, 0.72)
	iii	1,379 (45.9)	3,420 (40.3)	0.37 (0.30, 0.47)
	iv-v	605 (20.2)	919 (10.8)	0.23 (0.18, 0.29)
<b>Tenure:</b>				
	Mortgaged	2,687 (86.4)	6,853 (69.3)	ref
	Private rent	233 (7.5)	1,152 (11.6)	1.94 (1.67, 2.24)
	Sub rent	190 (6.1)	1,890 (19.1)	3.90 (3.34, 4.56)
<b>Maternal smoking:</b>				
	Yes	354 (12.0)	2,172 (23.5)	2.27 (2.00, 2.56)
<b>Head injury:</b>				
	Yes	106 (3.4)	225 (3.4)	0.98 (0.80, 1.21)
<b>Cigarette/cannabis:</b>				
	None	2,321 (87.0)	2,212 (84.0)	ref
	Smoking only	178 (6.7)	234 (8.9)	1.38 (1.13, 1.69)
	Smoking and cannabis	168 (6.3)	187 (7.1)	1.17 (0.94, 1.45)
<b>WM at age 11:</b>				
	M (SD)		M (SD)	
	Linear term	3.51 (0.83)	3.36 (0.86)	0.82 (0.77, 0.86)

Note: Maternal education: <O level indicating no qualification; O level: indicating completion of school examinations at age 16; and >O level: indicating completion of college or university education at or after age 18; SEP grouped into 4 categories: i—professional, ii—managerial, iii—skilled non-manual/skilled manual to iv-v—semi-skilled and unskilled occupations; lifetime cigarette smoking up to 16.5 years of age; lifetime cannabis use up to 16.5 years of age

**Table S4a.** Factors associated with tobacco use latent class membership

		<i>N (%)</i>	Experimenters <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	<i>Omnibus</i> <i>p</i> value
<b>Gender:</b>						
	Males	3,780 (46.9)	0.78 (0.57, 0.98)	0.35 (0.15, 0.55)	0.86 (0.49, 1.24)	0.09
<b>Income:</b>						
	Lowest 20%	1,143 (16.3)	ref	ref	ref	<0.001
	40%	1,333 (19.0)	0.38 (-0.09, 0.65)	-0.26 (-0.59, 0.06)	-0.35 (-0.83, 0.14)	
	60%	1,428 (20.4)	-0.14 (-0.52, 0.25)	-0.43 (-0.75, -0.11)	-0.73 (-1.24, -0.21)	
	80%	1,514 (21.6)	0.35 (-0.00, 0.71)	-0.64 (-0.98, -0.30)	-1.01 (-1.58, -0.43)	
	Highest	1,589 (22.7)	0.41 (0.06, 0.75)	-0.65 (-0.98, -0.32)	-2.56 (-3.88, -1.25)	
<b>Maternal education:</b>						
	<O level	3,247 (42.0)	ref	ref	ref	<0.001
	O level	2,695 (34.9)	-0.26 (-0.47, -0.04)	0.34 (0.10, 0.58)	0.77 (0.25, 1.29)	
	>O level	1,776 (23.0)	-0.61 (-0.90, -0.32)	0.48 (0.22, 0.74)	1.42 (0.93, 1.92)	
<b>Social:</b>						
	Semi/un-skilled	322 (4.4)	ref	ref	ref	<0.001
	Skilled (non)manual	2,576 (35.1)	-0.29 (-0.80, 0.23)	-0.22 (-0.74, 0.29)	-0.91 (-1.50, -0.31)	
	Managerial	3,269 (44.5)	-0.16 (-0.66, 0.35)	-0.30 (-0.81, 0.21)	-1.25 (-1.85, -0.65)	
	Professional	1,172 (16.0)	0.07 (-0.45, 0.60)	-1.18 (-1.81, -0.54)	-2.48 (-3.60, -1.37)	
<b>Tenure:</b>						
	Mortgaged	6,369 (81.8)	ref	ref	ref	<0.001
	Sub rent	651 (8.4)	0.09 (-0.26, 0.44)	0.55 (0.23, 0.86)	0.63 (0.02, 1.24)	
	Private rent	762 (9.8)	-0.59 (-1.05, -0.12)	0.58 (0.27, 0.89)	1.67 (1.28, 2.05)	
<b>Maternal smoking:</b>						
	Yes	1,097 (14.9)	0.03 (-0.29, 0.34)	0.90 (0.65, 1.15)	1.74 (1.37, 2.12)	<0.01
<b>Head injury:</b>						
	Yes	269 (3.7)	0.38 (-.10, .86)	0.21 (-.35, .77)	0.77 (0.06, 1.48)	0.16
<b>Ever alcohol use at age 13:</b>						
	Yes	1,848 (30.6)	1.05 (0.82, 1.27)	1.14 (0.90, 1.39)	2.20 (1.74, 2.67)	0.08

WM at age 11:		M (SD)				
	Linear term	3.44 (0.8)	1.05 (0.92, 1.19)	0.82 (0.72, 0.94)	0.73 (0.61, 0.87)	0.11

---

**Table S4b.** Factors associated with cannabis use latent class membership

		<i>N (%)</i>	Late-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	<i>Omnibus</i> <i>p</i> value
<b>Gender:</b>						
	Males	3,803 (47.0)	0.09 (-0.13, 0.32)	-0.06 (-.49, .37)	-1.03 (-1.39, -0.66)	0.03
<b>Income:</b>						
	Lowest 20%	1,147 (16.3)	ref	ref	ref	<0.001
	40%	1,336 (19.0)	-0.13 (-0.55, 0.30)	0.08 (-0.68, 0.85)	0.07 (-0.45, 0.58)	
	60%	1,431 (20.4)	0.06 (-0.34, 0.45)	-0.31 (-1.16, 0.54)	-0.10 (-0.63, 0.42)	
	80%	1,518 (21.6)	-0.09 (-0.50, 0.31)	0.15 (-0.56, 0.87)	-0.92 (-1.62, -0.22)	
	Highest	1,592 (22.7)	0.34 (-0.03, 0.72)	0.11 (-0.64, 0.85)	-0.03 (-0.55, 0.49)	
<b>Maternal education:</b>						
	<O level	3,260 (42.1)	ref	ref	ref	<0.001
	O level	2,702 (34.9)	-0.78 (-1.05, -0.51)	-0.48 (-0.99, 0.05)	-0.05 (-0.44, 0.35)	
	>O level	1,784 (23.0)	-0.98 (-1.34, -0.63)	-0.27 (-0.82, 0.28)	0.23 (-0.17, 0.63)	
<b>Social:</b>						
	Semi/un-skilled	321 (4.4)	ref	ref	ref	<0.001
	Skilled (non)manual	2,585 (35.1)	0.28 (-0.59, 1.15)	-0.06 (-1.23, 1.13)	-0.63 (-1.23, -0.03)	
	Managerial	3,282 (44.5)	0.86 (0.01, 1.71)	-0.08 (-1.27, 1.11)	-0.63 (-1.23, -0.03)	
	Professional	1,177 (16.0)	1.02 (0.15, 1.89)	0.37 (-0.85, 1.59)	-1.22 (-2.07, -0.37)	
<b>Tenure:</b>						
	Mortgaged	6,387 (81.8)	ref	ref	ref	<0.001
	Sub rent	653 (8.4)	0.12 (-0.27, 0.52)	0.02 (-0.92, 0.95)	0.85 (0.40, 1.30)	
	Private rent	764 (9.8)	-0.49 (-1.01, 0.04)	0.80 (0.24, 1.35)	0.85 (0.43, 1.27)	
<b>Maternal smoking:</b>						
	Yes	1,102 (14.9)	0.15 (-0.18, 0.48)	0.78 (0.26, 1.30)	0.88 (0.52, 1.24)	0.11
<b>Head injury:</b>						
	Yes	273 (3.7)	0.30 (-0.25, 0.85)	0.30 (-0.82, 1.43)	0.64 (-0.02, 1.30)	0.27
<b>Ever alcohol use at age 13:</b>						
	Yes	1,857 (30.7)	0.63 (0.38, 0.88)	1.29 (1.01, 1.56)	1.06 (0.82, 1.29)	0.41

**Tobacco at age 13**

Yes	737 (12.2)	0.55 (0.12, 0.97)	2.77 (2.28, 3.27)	2.38 (1.99, 2.77)	<0.01
WM at age 11:		M (SD)			
Linear term	3.44 (0.8)	0.33 (0.17, 0.49)	-0.02 (-0.28, 0.24)	-0.32 (-0.57, -0.07)	0.04

---

**Table S5a.** Tobacco use from 13 to 18 years and working memory indices at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<i>n</i> =3,032 for all models	No smoking Reference group	Experimenter <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
<b>Unadjusted models</b>					
Number of hits	-	-0.93 (-9.56, 7.70)	-22.13 (-36.90, 7.63)	-53.47 (-80.54, -26.43)	13.88 (3) <i>p</i> <0.01
False alarms		-0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.03 (-0.01, 0.08)	0.06 (-0.04, 0.16)	5.22 (3) <i>p</i> =0.15
<b>Adjusted for SES</b>					
Number of hits	-	0.01 (-0.01, 0.04)	-0.45 (-0.09, 0.00)	-0.13 (-0.26, 0.00)	10.90 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
False alarms		-0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.03 (-0.01, 0.07)	0.05 (-0.05, 0.15)	3.53 (3) <i>p</i> =0.31
<b>Adjusted for SES/WM/HI</b>					
Number of hits	-	0.01 (-0.01, 0.04)	-0.44 (-0.09, 0.00)	-0.13 (-0.27, -0.00)	11.28 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
False alarms		-0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.03 (-0.01, 0.07)	0.06 (-0.05, 0.16)	3.73 (3) <i>p</i> =0.29
<b>Fully adjusted models</b>					
Number of hits	-	0.01 (-0.01, 0.04)	-0.44 (-0.09, 0.00)	-0.13 (-0.27, -0.00)	11.11 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
False alarms		-0.02 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.03 (-0.01, 0.07)	0.06 (-0.05, 0.16)	3.83 (3) <i>p</i> =0.28

**Table S5b.** Cannabis use from 13 to 18 years and working memory indices at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<i>n</i> =3,032 for all models	No smoking Reference group	Experimenter <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
<b>Unadjusted models</b>					
Number of hits	-	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.08 (0.01, 0.14)	-0.08 (-0.18, 0.01)	7.45 (3) <i>p</i> =0.06
False alarms	-	0.00 (-0.03, 0.02)	-0.03 (-0.06, -0.01)	0.08 (-0.01, 0.18)	9.22 (3) <i>p</i> =0.03
<b>Adjusted for SES</b>					
Number of hits	-	0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.07 (0.01, 0.13)	-0.09 (-0.18, 0.01)	6.90 (3) <i>p</i> =0.07
False alarms	-	0.00 (-0.02, 0.03)	-0.03 (-0.05, -0.00)	0.08 (-0.02, 0.17)	5.75 (3) <i>p</i> =0.13
<b>Adjusted for SES/WM/HI</b>					
Number of hits	-	0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.06 (-0.00, 0.13)	-0.09 (-0.18, 0.01)	7.11 (3) <i>p</i> =0.07
False alarms	-	0.00 (-0.02, 0.03)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.08 (-0.02, 0.17)	5.32 (3) <i>p</i> =0.15
<b>Fully adjusted models</b>					
Number of hits	-	0.02 (-0.05, 0.02)	0.07 (-0.01, 0.14)	-0.09 (-0.18, 0.01)	7.07 (3) <i>p</i> =0.07
False alarms	-	0.01 (-0.02, 0.03)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.08 (-0.02, 0.17)	4.97 (3) <i>p</i> =0.17



**Table S6a.** Tobacco use from 13 to 18 years and response inhibition indices at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<i>n</i> =3,032 for all models	No smoking Reference group	Experimenter <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
<b>Unadjusted models</b>					
Go reaction time	-	1.74 (-3.93, 7.42)	-1.34 (-10.90, 8.22)	14.51 (-1.36, 30.37)	3.45 (3) <i>p</i> =0.33
Go accuracy		-0.00 (0.01, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.05, -0.01)	-0.06 (-0.11, 0.02)	22.12 (3) <i>p</i> =0.0001
Stop accuracy		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	-0.06 (-0.10, -0.02)	-0.13 (-0.22, 0.05)	24.52 (3) <i>p</i> <0.0001
<b>Adjusted for SES</b>					
Go reaction time	-	1.16 (-4.55, 6.87)	-2.42 (-11.97, 7.14)	11.00 (6.30, 28.29)	1.73 (3) <i>p</i> =0.63
Go accuracy		-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.01)	-0.06 (-0.11, 0.01)	18.88 (3) <i>p</i> <0.001
Stop accuracy		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	-0.05 (-0.09, -0.02)	-0.12 (-0.21, 0.03)	19.51 (3) <i>p</i> <0.001
<b>Adjusted for SES/WM/HI</b>					
Go reaction time	-	1.19 (-4.53, 6.92)	-2.53 (-12.08, 7.02)	11.66 (-5.63, 28.96)	1.96 (3) <i>p</i> =0.58
Go accuracy		-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.01)	-0.06 (-0.11, 0.02)	19.26 (3) <i>p</i> <0.001
Stop accuracy		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	-0.05 (-0.09, -0.02)	-0.12 (-0.21, 0.04)	19.96 (3) <i>p</i> <0.001
<b>Fully adjusted models</b>					
Go reaction time	-	1.13 (-4.77, 7.03)	-2.63 (-12.35, 7.09)	11.53 (-5.83, 28.90)	1.89 (3) <i>p</i> =0.60
Go accuracy		-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.01)	-0.06 (-0.11, 0.01)	17.30 (3) <i>p</i> <0.001
Stop accuracy		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	-0.05 (-0.09, -0.02)	-0.13 (-0.21, 0.04)	20.06 (3) <i>p</i> <0.001

**Table S6b.** Cannabis use from 13 to 18 years and response inhibition indices at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<i>n</i> =3,032 for all models	No smoking Reference group	Experimenter <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
<b>Unadjusted models</b>					
Go reaction time	-	-0.75 (-7.81, 6.30)	1.26 (-14.91, 17.43)	-2.06 (-22.03, 17.92)	0.10 (3) <i>p</i> =0.99
Go accuracy		-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.02, 0.03)	-0.09 (-0.15, -0.03)	8.73 (3) <i>p</i> =0.03
Stop accuracy		-0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.10, 0.04)	-0.14 (-0.23, -0.05)	12.21 (3) <i>p</i> =0.003
<b>Adjusted for SES</b>					
Go reaction time	-	0.48 (-6.59, 7.55)	1.11 (-15.40, 17.62)	0.43 (-19.65, 20.50)	0.05 (3) <i>p</i> =1.00
Go accuracy		-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.03)	-0.09 (-0.15, -0.03)	8.80 (3) <i>p</i> =0.03
Stop accuracy		-0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.10, 0.04)	-0.14 (-0.23, -0.05)	13.50 (3) <i>p</i> =0.004
<b>Adjusted for SES/WM/HI</b>					
Go reaction time	-	1.17 (-5.94, 8.29)	1.53 (-15.05, 18.10)	0.62 (-19.62, 20.85)	0.16 (3) <i>p</i> =0.98
Go accuracy		-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.03)	-0.09 (-0.15, -0.03)	9.82 (3) <i>p</i> =0.02
Stop accuracy		-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	-0.03 (-0.10, 0.04)	-0.14 (-0.22, -0.05)	15.81 (3) <i>p</i> =0.001
<b>Fully adjusted models</b>					
Go reaction time	-	1.14 (-6.24, 8.52)	1.46 (-15.57, 18.49)	0.58 (-19.66, 20.81)	0.13 (3) <i>p</i> =0.99
Go accuracy		-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.03)	-0.09 (-0.15, -0.03)	9.17 (3) <i>p</i> =0.03
Stop accuracy		-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	-0.04 (-0.11, 0.04)	-0.14 (-0.23, -0.05)	15.94 (3) <i>p</i> =0.001

**Table S7a.** Tobacco use from 13 to 18 years and specific emotion sensitivity at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<b>Unadjusted models</b> <i>N</i> =3,032	Low risk Reference group	Experimenters <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Anger	-	0.01 (-.02, .03)	-0.01 (-.06, .03)	-0.10 (-.20, .01)	4.71 (3) <i>p</i> =0.19
Disgust	-	0.02 (-.01, .04)	-0.04 (-.08, .01)	-0.06 (-.17, .05)	6.43 (3) <i>p</i> =0.09
Fear	-	0.00 (-.04, .03)	-0.08 (-.13, -.03)	-0.01 (-.15, .12)	9.35 (3) <i>p</i> =0.02
Happy	-	-0.01 (-.03, .01)	-0.03 (-.06, .00)	-0.02 (-.08, .04)	5.00 (3) <i>p</i> =0.17
Sad	-	-0.01 (-.03, .01)	-0.04 (-.07, -.01)	-0.06 (-.12, .00)	11.50 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
Surprise	-	-0.01 (-.02, .01)	-0.05 (-.08, -.02)	0.01 (-.05, .08)	11.69 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01

**Table S7b.** Tobacco use from 13 to 18 years and specific emotion sensitivity at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<b>Models adjusted for SES</b> <i>N</i> =3,032	Low risk Reference group	Experimenters <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Anger	-	0.01 (-.02, .03)	0.00 (-.05, .04)	-0.09 (-.19, .02)	3.00 (3) <i>p</i> =0.39
Disgust	-	0.01 (-.01, .04)	-0.03 (-.07, .01)	-0.06 (-.17, .06)	4.60 (3) <i>p</i> =0.20
Fear	-	0.01 (-.04, .03)	-0.07 (-.12, -.01)	0.00 (-.13, .13)	6.47 (3) <i>p</i> =0.09
Happy	-	-0.01 (-.03, .01)	-0.03 (-.06, .00)	-0.03 (-.09, .04)	5.30 (3) <i>p</i> =0.15
Sad	-	-0.01 (-.04, .01)	-0.03 (-.06, .00)	-0.06 (-.12, -.00)	11.11 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
Surprise	-	-0.01 (-.03, .01)	-0.05 (-.07, -.02)	0.02 (-.05, .08)	10.03 (3) <i>p</i> =0.02

**Table S7c.** Tobacco use from 13 to 18 years and specific emotion sensitivity at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<b>adjusted for SES/WM/HI</b> <i>N</i> =3,032	Low risk Reference group	Experimenters <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Anger	-	0.01 (-.02, .03)	0.00 (-.05, .04)	-0.09 (-.20, .02)	3.14 (3) <i>p</i> =0.37
Disgust	-	0.01 (-.01, .04)	-0.03 (-.07, .01)	-0.06 (-.17, .05)	4.79 (3) <i>p</i> =0.19
Fear	-	-0.01 (-.04, .03)	-0.06 (-.12, -.01)	-0.01 (-.14, .13)	6.40 (3) <i>p</i> =0.09
Happy	-	-0.01 (-.03, .01)	-0.03 (-.06, .00)	-0.03 (-.09, .04)	5.38 (3) <i>p</i> =0.15
Sad	-	-0.01 (-.04, .01)	-0.03 (-.06, .00)	-0.07 (-.13, -.00)	11.26 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
Surprise	-	-0.01 (-.03, .01)	-0.04 (-.07, -.02)	0.02 (-.05, .08)	9.85 (3) <i>p</i> =0.02

**Table S7d.** Tobacco use from 13 to 18 years and specific emotion sensitivity at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<b>Fully adjusted models</b> <i>N</i> =3,032	Low risk Reference group	Experimenters <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Late-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Anger	-	0.01 (-.02, .03)	0.00 (-.05, .05)	-0.09 (-.20, .02)	3.24 (3) <i>p</i> =0.36
Disgust	-	0.01 (-.02, .04)	-0.03 (-.08, .01)	-0.07 (-.19, .04)	5.72 (3) <i>p</i> =0.12
Fear	-	-0.01 (-.05, .03)	-0.07 (-.12, -.01)	-0.01 (-.14, .13)	5.91 (3) <i>p</i> =0.12
Happy	-	-0.01 (-.03, .01)	-0.03 (-.06, .00)	-0.03 (-.10, .03)	5.72 (3) <i>p</i> =0.13
Sad	-	-0.01 (-.04, .01)	-0.03 (-.06, .00)	-0.07 (-.13, -.00)	16.09 (3) <i>p</i> =0.001
Surprise	-	-0.01 (-.03, .01)	-0.04 (-.07, -.02)	0.02 (-.05, .08)	9.21 (3) <i>p</i> =0.03

**Table S8a.** Cannabis use from 13 to 18 years and specific emotion sensitivity at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<b>Unadjusted models</b> <i>N</i> =3,032	Low risk Reference group	Late-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Anger	-	0.03 (.00, .06)	0.09 (.04, .16)	-0.09 (-.19, .01)	14.66 (3) <i>p</i> <0.01
Disgust	-	0.03 (.00, .06)	0.09 (.03, .16)	-0.08 (-.18, .02)	12.12 (3) <i>p</i> <0.01
Fear	-	0.02 (-.02, .06)	0.07 (-.04, .17)	-0.08 (-.17, .02)	4.38 (3) <i>p</i> =0.22
Happy	-	-0.03 (-.05, -.00)	-0.01 (-.07, .05)	-0.07 (-.14, .00)	10.90 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
Sad	-	-0.00 (-.03, .02)	0.01 (-.06, .09)	-0.06 (-.13, .01)	3.10 (3) <i>p</i> =0.38
Surprise	-	-0.00 (-.02, .02)	0.02 (-.03, .07)	-0.08 (-.14, -.01)	5.14 (3) <i>p</i> =0.16

**Table S8b.** Cannabis use from 13 to 18 years and specific emotion sensitivity at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<b>Models adjusted for SES</b> <i>N</i> =3,032	Low risk Reference group	Late-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Anger	-	0.03 (.00, .06)	0.09 (.02, .15)	-0.07 (-.17, .02)	12.97 (3) <i>p</i> <0.01
Disgust	-	0.03 (.00, .06)	0.08 (.02, .15)	-0.06 (-.16, .04)	9.66 (3) <i>p</i> =0.02
Fear	-	0.01 (-.03, .05)	0.05 (-.05, .15)	-0.05 (-.14, .04)	2.28 (3) <i>p</i> =0.52
Happy	-	-0.03 (-.05, -.00)	-0.02 (-.07, .04)	-0.06 (-.12, .01)	8.79 (3) <i>p</i> =0.03
Sad	-	-0.00 (-.03, .02)	-0.00 (-.06, .07)	-0.04 (-.11, .02)	1.85 (3) <i>p</i> =0.60
Surprise	-	-0.00 (-.02, .02)	0.02 (-.04, .07)	-0.06 (-.13, .00)	3.62 (3) <i>p</i> =0.30



**Table S8c.** Cannabis use from 13 to 18 years and specific emotion sensitivity at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<b>adjusted for SES/WM/Hi</b> <i>N</i> =3,032	Low risk Reference group	Late-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Anger	-	0.03 (.00, .06)	0.08 (.02, .14)	-0.07 (-.17, .02)	11.63 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
Disgust	-	0.03 (.01, .06)	0.08 (.01, .15)	-0.06 (-.16, .03)	9.06 (3) <i>p</i> =0.03
Fear	-	0.01 (-.03, .05)	0.05 (-.05, .15)	-0.05 (-.14, .04)	1.93 (3) <i>p</i> =0.59
Happy	-	-0.03 (-.05, -.00)	-0.02 (-.07, .04)	-0.06 (-.12, .01)	9.36 (3) <i>p</i> =0.02
Sad	-	-0.00 (-.03, .02)	-0.01 (-.07, .07)	-0.04 (-.11, .02)	1.95 (3) <i>p</i> =0.58
Surprise	-	-0.00 (-.03, .02)	0.02 (-.04, .07)	-0.06 (-.12, .00)	3.84 (3) <i>p</i> =0.28

**Table S8d.** Cannabis use from 13 to 18 years and specific emotion sensitivity at age 24 (high scores reflect better performance)

<b>Fully adjusted models</b> <i>N</i> =3,032	Low risk Reference group	Late-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Early-onset occasional <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Regular <i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Anger	-	0.04 (.00, .07)	0.09 (.03, .16)	-0.07 (-.16, .03)	12.83 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
Disgust	-	0.03 (.01, .06)	0.08 (.01, .15)	-0.06 (-.16, .04)	8.56 (3) <i>p</i> =0.04
Fear	-	0.01 (-.03, .05)	0.05 (-.05, .16)	-0.05 (-.14, .04)	2.02 (3) <i>p</i> =0.57
Happy	-	-0.03 (-.05, -.00)	-0.02 (-.08, .04)	-0.06 (-.13, .01)	9.13 (3) <i>p</i> =0.03
Sad	-	-0.01 (-.03, .02)	-0.01 (-.08, .06)	-0.05 (-.11, .02)	2.71 (3) <i>p</i> =0.44
Surprise	-	-0.00 (-.02, .02)	0.02 (-.04, .07)	-0.06 (-.12, .00)	3.71 (3) <i>p</i> =0.29

**Table S9a.** Associations between genetic instrument for smoking initiation and confounders

		Smoking PRS			Smoking observed	
	N	Estimate (95% CI)	<i>p</i>	Estimate (95% CI)	<i>p</i>	
Gender	2,444					
	Female	53.1%	ref			
	Male	46.9%	-108.8 (-344.3, 126.8)	0.37	-	
Mat smoking in preg	2,284					
	No	85.1%	ref			
	Yes	14.9%	348.9 (-26.1, 723.9)	0.70	-	
Tenure	2,407					
	Mortgaged	81.8%	ref			
	Subs	8.4%	119.2 (-327.5, 566.0)	0.60	-	
	Priv	9.8%	145.7 (-385.2, 676.7)	0.59	-	
Mat educ	2,401					
	<O level	50.1%	ref			
	O level	16.4%	233.1 (-24.54, 490.8)	0.08	-	
	>O level	33.5%	404.5 (60.8, 748.2)	0.02	0.40 (0.10, 0.68) 0.007	
Income	2,219					
	Lowest 20%	16.3%	ref			
	21-40%	19.0%	44.3 (-420.1, 508.8)	0.85	-	
	41-60%	20.4%	-197.2 (-644.7, 250.3)	0.39	-	
	61-80%	21.6%	-93.9 (-524.6, 336.9)	0.67	-	
	Highest 20%	22.7%	-115.9 (-538.7, 306.9)	0.59	-	
Social	2,322					
	Semi/un-skilled	4.4%	ref			
	Skilled (non)manual	35.1%	-54.40 (-815.8, 707.0)	0.89	-	
	Managerial	44.5%	417.7 (77.7, 757.6)	0.02	0.51 (0.19, 0.83) 0.002	
	Professional	16.0%	259.4 (-49.9, 568.8)	0.10	-	
Head injury	2,386					
	No	96.6%	ref			
	Yes	3.4%	-288.0 (-906.7, 330.7)	0.36	-	
Working memory	2,069	-33.84 (-139.9, 72.3)	0.53	-		
Alcohol use < age 14	2,099					
	No	69.3%	ref			
	Yes	30.7%	473.4 (219.6, 727.2)	<0.001	2.01 (1.74, 2.29) <0.001	

Note: observed observations are reported where there as evidence of an association between genetic score and confounders

**Table S9b.** Associations between genetic instrument for lifetime cannabis use and confounders

		Cannabis PRS		Cannabis observed	
	N	Estimate (95% CI)	<i>p</i>	Estimate (95% CI)	<i>p</i>
Gender	2,444				
	Female	53.1%	ref		
	Male	46.9%	-2.70 (-12.16, 6.75)	0.58	-
Mat smoking in preg	2,284				
	No	85.1%	ref		
	Yes	14.9%	-0.46 (-15.42, 14.50)	0.95	-
Tenure	2,407				
	Mortgaged	81.8%	ref		
	Subs	8.4%	-6.03 (-24.06, 11.99)	0.51	-
	Priv	9.8%	18.43 (-2.28, 39.15)	0.08	-
Mat educ	2,401				
	<O level	50.1%	ref		
	O level	16.4%	-3.13 (-13.42, 7.16)	0.55	-
	>O level	33.5%	-0.21 (-13.89, 13.46)	0.98	-
Income	2,219				
	Lowest 20%	16.3%	ref		
	21-40%	19.0%	18.94 (0.10, 37.79)	0.50	-
	41-60%	20.4%	13.18 (-5.04, 31.40)	0.16	-
	61-80%	21.6%	15.03 (-2.52, 32.57)	0.09	-
	Highest 20%	22.7%	10.80 (-6.45, 28.06)	0.22	-
Social	2,322				
	Semi/un-skilled	4.4%	ref		
	Skilled (non)manual	35.1%	15.88 (-13.80, 45.58)	0.29	-
	Managerial	44.5%	-0.40 (-13.87, 13.08)	0.95	-
	Professional	16.0%	-1.17 (-13.46, 11.12)	0.85	-
Head injury	2,386				
	No	96.6%	ref		
	Yes	3.4%	-25.94 (-51.83, -0.04)	0.05	0.70 (-0.09, 1.50) 0.08
Working memory	2,069	-4.63 (-8.85, -0.40)	0.03	0.11 (-0.07, 0.29)	0.23
Alcohol use < age 14	2,099				
	No	69.3%	ref		
	Yes	30.7%	12.06 (2.06, 22.06)	0.02	3.27 (2.27, 4.28) <0.001

**Table S10.** Tests of the unweighted and weighted regression dilution  $I^2_{GX}$ 

	$I^2_{GX}$ Unweighted	$I^2_{GX}$ Weighted	mF
<b>Smoking</b>			
Smoking initiation > working memory	0.608	0.390	44.88
Smoking initiation > response inhibition	0.608	0.390	44.88
Smoking initiation > emotion recognition	0.608	0.390	44.88
<b>Cannabis</b>			
Cannabis lifetime > working memory	0.704	0.288	38.65
Cannabis lifetime > response inhibition	0.704	0.286	38.65
Cannabis lifetime > emotion recognition	0.704	0.285	38.65

Note. Unweighted estimates only take into account dilution in the SNP-exposure effects, whereas weighted estimates account for the SE of the SNP-outcome effects (16). mF is the mean F-statistic.

**Table S11.** Tests of heterogeneity in the SNP-exposure association using the IVW method

	<b>Cochran's Q</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Smoking</b>			
Smoking initiation > working memory	346.42	340	0.39
Smoking initiation > response inhibition	400.56	340	0.01
Smoking initiation > emotion recognition	368.64	340	0.14
<b>Cannabis</b>			
Cannabis lifetime > working memory	2.49	6	0.87
Cannabis lifetime > response inhibition	5.11	6	0.53
Cannabis lifetime > emotion recognition	9.63	6	0.14

1. McNicol D. A Primer of Signal Detection Theory. Norwich: George Allen & Unwin Ltd; 1972.
2. Stanislaw H, Todorov N. Calculation of signal detection theory measures. *Behav Res Methods, Instruments, Comput.* 1999;3(I):137–49.
3. Schneider W, Eschman A, Zuccolotto A. E-Prime User's Guide. Pittsburgh: Psychology Software Tool Inc.; 2002.
4. Wagner HL. On measuring performance in category judgment studies of nonverbal behavior. *J Nonverbal Behav.* 1993;17(1):3–28.
5. Case R, Kurland DM, Goldberg J. Operational efficiency and the growth of short-term memory span. *J Exp Child Psychol.* 1982;33:386–404.
6. Newsome MR, Scheibel RS, Steinberg JL, Troyanskaya M, Sharma RG, Rauch RA, et al. Working memory brain activation following severe traumatic brain injury. *Cortex.* 2007;43(1):95–111.
7. Sclove L. Application of model-selection criteria to some problems in multivariate analysis. *Psychometrika.* 1987;52:333–43.
8. Akaike H. Factor analysis and AIC. *Psychometrika.* 1987;52:317–32.
9. Schwarz G. Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann Stat.* 1978;6:461–4.
10. Lo YB, Mendell NR, Rubin DB. Testing the number of components in a normal mixture. *Biometrika.* 2001;88(3):767–78.
11. McCutcheon A. Latent Class Analysis. CA: Sage Publications; 1987.
12. Jedidi K, Ramaswamy V, Desarbo W. A maximum likelihood method for latent class regression involving a censored dependent variable. *Psychometrika.* 1993;58(3):375–94.
13. Taylor AE, Jones HJ, Sallis H, Euesden J, Stergiakouli E, Davies NM, et al. Exploring the association of genetic factors with participation in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2018;47(4):1207–16.
14. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, Wade KH, Haberland V, Baird D, et al. The MR-Base platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. *Elife.* 2018 May;7.
15. Mahedy L, Suddell S, Skirrow C, Wootton R, Fernandes GS, Heron J, et al. Alcohol use and cognitive functioning in young adults: an observational and Mendelian randomisation study. *medRxiv.* 2019;19003327.
16. Pasma JA, Verweij KJH, Gerring Z, Stringer S, Sanchez-Roige S, Treur JL, et al. GWAS of lifetime cannabis use reveals new risk loci, genetic overlap with psychiatric traits, and a causal influence of schizophrenia. *Nat Neurosci.* 2018;21(9):1161–70.
17. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2015;44(2):512–25.
18. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent estimation in Mendelian randomization with some invalid instruments using a weighted median

estimator. *Genet Epidemiol.* 2016;40(4):304–14.

19. Hartwig FP, Davey Smith G, Bowden J. Robust inference in summary data Mendelian randomization via the zero modal pleiotropy assumption. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2017;46(6):1985–98.