The causal relationship between immune-mediated inflammatory diseases and aortic aneurysm: A bidirectional two-sample Mendelian randomization study

Sijia Sun¹, Mengxian Sun², Jie He², Songtao Tan², Ge Wang², Yuan Zheng², and Xiaoping Fan²

¹Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine ²The Second Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine

January 30, 2024

Abstract

Introduction: Many observational studies have identified aortic aneurysm (AA) as a cardiovascular complication of immunemediated inflammatory diseases (IMIDs). However, due to the effects of various confounders, it is still uncertainty whether this association holds or whether reverse causality is involved. Here we conducted a two-sample bidirectional MR study to infer the causal relationships between the two diseases. Method: We obtained genetic association datasets from public GWAS databases in populations of European ancestry. Abiding by the assumptions of Mendelian randomization (MR), we selected valid instrumental variables from genetic variants. Different statistic methods were performed for MR analysis and sensitivity analysis, and the inverse variance weighted (IVW) method was regarded as the most efficient estimate of the causal effect in this study. Results: The IVW method found evidence that genetically predicted AA had a causal effect on rheumatoid arthritis (RA) (OR = 1.06, 95%CI = 1.01-1.12, p = 0.029), but not of RA or other IMIDs on AA. Besides, no evidence showed that AA may increase the risk of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), Crohn's disease (CD), ulcerative colitis (UC), systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) and psoriasis (PSO). The sensitivity analysis confirmed the absence of heterogeneity or horizontal pleiotropy effect. Conclusion: In summary, our study discovered that genetically predicted AA may increase the risk of RA, while no evidence was found that patients with RA had an increased risk of AA. Furthermore, we confirmed no evidence of association between IBD, CD, UC, SLE, PSO and AA. This is in accordance with other reports that demonstrated the human leukocyte antigen molecule in inflammatory aortic aneurysm was a genetic risk loci. Our study provides directions for future research on genetic susceptibility to inflammatory aortic aneurysm.

The causal relationship between immune-mediated inflammatory diseases and aortic aneurysm: Abidirectional two-sample Mendelian randomization study

Sijia Sun¹, Mengxian Sun², Jie He², Songtao Tan², Ge Wang², Yuan Zheng², Xiaoping Fan^{2*}

1Second Clinical Medical College, Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine, Guangzhou, China

2Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Guangdong Provincial Hospital of Chinese Medicine, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine, Guangdong, China

* Correspondence:

Xiaoping Fan

fukui-hanson@hotmail.com.

Abstract

Introduction: Many observational studies have identified aortic aneurysm (AA) as a cardiovascular complication of immune-mediated inflammatory diseases (IMIDs). However, due to the effects of various confounders, it is still uncertainty whether this association holds or whether reverse causality is involved. Here we conducted a two-sample bidirectional MR study to infer the causal relationships between the two diseases.

Method: We obtained genetic association datasets from public GWAS databases in populations of European ancestry. Abiding by the assumptions of Mendelian randomization (MR), we selected valid instrumental variables from genetic variants. Different statistic methods were performed for MR analysis and sensitivity analysis, and the inverse variance weighted (IVW) method was regarded as the most efficient estimate of the causal effect in this study.

Results: The IVW method found evidence that genetically predicted AA had a causal effect on rheumatoid arthritis (RA) (OR = 1.06, 95%CI = 1.01-1.12, p = 0.029), but not of RA or other IMIDs on AA. Besides, no evidence showed that AA may increase the risk of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), Crohn's disease (CD), ulcerative colitis (UC), systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) and psoriasis (PSO). The sensitivity analysis confirmed the absence of heterogeneity or horizontal pleiotropy effect.

Conclusion: In summary, our study discovered that genetically predicted AA may increase the risk of RA, while no evidence was found that patients with RA had an increased risk of AA. Furthermore, we confirmed no evidence of association between IBD, CD, UC, SLE, PSO and AA. This is in accordance with other reports that demonstrated the human leukocyte antigen molecule in inflammatory aortic aneurysm was a genetic risk loci. Our study provides directions for future research on genetic susceptibility to inflammatory aortic aneurysm.

Keywords: aortic aneurysm, immune-mediated inflammatory diseases, Mendelian randomization, inflammatory aortic aneurysm, rheumatoid arthritis.

Introduction

Aortic aneurysm (AA) is a chronic condition of the aorta characterized by localized distension or weakening of its wall, which may lead to rupture and severe internal bleeding resulting in shock(1). With an incidence rate of approximately 3 per 100,000 individuals worldwide(2), AA ranks second only to atherosclerosis in prevalence and represents the most common disease affecting the aorta(3). AA is considered to be a chronic degenerative disease caused by local damage to the aortic wall, mainly related to chronic inflammatory infiltration(4). Ruptured aortic aneurysms can result in immediate fatality. For patients with apparent symptoms or large diameter aortic aneurysms, open surgery or endovascular repair remains the sole treatment option(4, 5).

Immune-mediated inflammatory diseases (IMIDs) are a collection of chronic inflammatory disorders that involve multiple systems and organs, characterized by common mechanisms of inflammation and immune dysregulation(6). IMIDs comprise a spectrum of disorders, and the presence of multiple systemic symptoms impose a significant burden on healthcare resources (7). Individuals with immune-mediated inflammatory diseases (IMIDs) are at a significantly increased risk of cardiovascular complications, due to both the disease itself and certain corticosteroid medications used in its treatment (8, 9). Of note, a therosclerosis (10) and large vessel vasculitis(11), which are prone to the development of dilated aortic aneurysms, are considered to be immune system-mediated processes. This suggests a potential common genetic etiology or pathogenesis between AA and IMIDs. Although observational studies (12-20) have linked IMIDs with cardiovascular disease (CVD), it is still unclear whether patients with AA are at increased risk of IMIDs. Reverse causation may also account for the association, whereby AA increases the risk of IMIDs rather than vice versa(21). Confounding factors can easily distort the interpretation from observational studies, leading to a fallacious inference of causality. Meanwhile, despite being the standard epidemiological design for establishing causal relationships, randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have some limitations. These include the significant investment of time, manpower and financial resources required to conduct them, as well as strict inclusion and exclusion criteria that can limit the representativeness and external validity of research findings. Therefore, more robust methods are required to assess causality using available data.

Mendelian randomization (MR) experiments use variants of genetic loci as instrumental variables (IVs) to investigate the association between exposure and health outcomes. Unlike conventional RCTs and observational studies, MR studies are not suffered to confounders. In MR, genetic variants serve as IVs for exposures to help the identification potential causal effect with disease-related outcomes(22, 23). Generally, the IVs must fulfill these three assumptions: (1) the IVs are strongly associated with the exposure; (2) the IVs are independent of other factors that may affect the inference of causal relationship; and (3) the IVs do not affect the outcome except with its potential effect on the exposure(24). Besides, germ-line genotypes are established during conception and precede the observed variables in temporal sequence, thus avoiding issues of reverse causality(25). Here, we obtained public datasets from various genome-wide association studies (GWASs) of IMIDs (including IBD, CD, UC, RA, SLE, and PSO) and AA in populations of European ancestry and performed a two-sample bidirectional MR study to infer the magnitude and direction of causal associations between the two diseases.

Methods

2.1 Data sources and study design

To explore the causal relationship between IMIDs and AA, we utilized summary genetic association datasets of European ancestry for both IMIDs and AA from the IEU OpenGWAS Database Project (https://gwas.mrcieu.ac.uk/). The GWAS summary statistics for AA (GWAS ID: finn-b-I9_AORTA-NEUR) were obtained from the FinnGen cohorts' Aortic aneurysm GWAS summary statistics, which included 2,825 cases and 206,541 controls with 16,380,417 SNPs (https://r5.finngen.fi/pheno/I9_AOR-TANEUR). In FinnGen Release 5, the diagnostic criteria for AA are defined in the following link (https://r5.risteys.finngen.fi/phenocode/I9_AORTANEUR). The GWAS datasets for IBD, CD, and UC were established by FinnGen Biobank with the respective GWAS ID numbers of "finn-b-K11_IBD", "finn-b-K11_-CROHN" and "finn-b-K11_ULCER". Specifically, the GWAS study related to IBD involved 5,673 cases and 213,119 controls and was further divided into K11_CROHN (2,056 cases and 210,300 controls) and K11_ULCER (4,320 cases and 210,300 controls) endpoints. The PSO dataset, identified by the GWAS ID "finn-b-L12_PSORIASIS", was also received from FinnGen Biobank and comprises a sample size of 4,510 cases and 212,242 controls. The GWAS datasets associated with RA and SLE were obtained from European Bioinformatics Institute under the ID numbers "ebi-a-GCST90013534" (14,361 cases and 43,923 controls) (26) and "ebi-a-GCST003156" (5,201 cases and 9,066 controls) (27), respectively. Detailed information of these GWAS datasets are provided in Supplementary Table S1. Based on requirements of STROBE-MR standards(28), we report the design, methods and results analysis of this study. Schematic representation of this MR study is presented in Figure 1A.

2.2 Genetic instrumental variables selection

To obtain robust instrumental variables that are sufficiently correlated with the exposure of interest, SNPs related to IMIDs were chosen with a genome-wide significance threshold of p < 5e-08. Only two potential instrumental variables associated with AA were identified at the threshold of p < 5e-08. Therefore, we modified a more lenient threshold of p < 5e-06 for genome-wide significance to search for additional SNPs. Then, we set parameters related to linkage disequilibrium (r2 = 0.001, distance = 10000 kb) to clump these genetic loci, in which all loci exhibit complete independence in order to avoid double-count the contribution of any particular variants(29). Next, with the help of the online tool PhenoScanner v2 (*http://www.phenoscanner.medschl.cam.ac.uk/*), we checked genotype-phenotype associations between potential IVs and outcome(30), and removed SNPs associated with confounders. Then, SNP harmonization was conducted to correct the orientation of the alleles(31). Finally, we assessed IVs strength by calculating the genetic instruments (R²) and F-statistic for each instrumental variable. R² and F-statistic was calculated as following formula: R²=[2 $\beta^2 \times MAF \times (1-MAF)$] / [2 $\beta^2 \times MAF \times (1-MAF)+2\beta^2 \times MAF \times (1-MAF) \times N \times SE$], and F=[R² × (N-k-1) /k(1-R²)] (where β = effect estimate of the SNP in the exposure, MAF = minor allele frequency, N = sample size of the GWAS dataset, k = number of IVs, SE=the standard error of genetic effect) (32). Theoretically, all selected genetic IVs should have F-statistics greater than 10.

2.3 Statistical analysis

We used the "TwoSampleMR" and "MRPRESSO", "mr.raps" packages of the R software (version 4.2.2) to perform MR analysis. Multiple MR approaches were utilized to explore causal relationships between exposure and outcome. Causal effect estimates from the IVW was considered the criterion for establishing a causal relationship between exposure and outcome(33). It is suggested that if the IVs meet the three major assumption of MR and the selected SNPs are all valid IVs, result from IVW model provides an efficient and reliable estimate for the causal effect (34). As an extension to IVW, MR-PRESSO approach attempts to remove outliers based on their contributions to heterogeneity, while other MR Methods were regarded as a supplement and reference (35). After MR analysis, we assessed the quality of the harmonization and whether the variants were difficult to harmonize by performing Cochran's Q test and MR Egger regression analysis, as well as leave-one-out method. The IVW model was applied to the heterogeneity analysis, where Cochran's Q statistic provided evidence for heterogeneity and invalid instruments, with p value greater than 0.05 indicating the absence of heterogeneity (34). The intercept of MR-Egger regression was used to explore and account for the impact of horizontal pleiotropy, and p value greater than 0.05 is evidence for credible instrumental variables (36). To further assess the reliability of the MR results, we evaluated the impact of one single SNP for estimates by performing the leave-one-out method, in which new MR results was recalculated after leaving out each SNP in turn. Finally, we visualized the main results of the MR analysis using scatter plots, forest plots, and funnel plots. Figure 1B shows a detailed flowchart of this MR study.

Results

3.1 The causal effect of IMIDs on AA

A total of 179 independent SNPs associated with IMIDs were collected following the established screening criteria for the MR relevance hypothesis. In order to meet MR independence and exclusion assumption, we conducted a literature review and found $\operatorname{smoking}(1)$, high blood $\operatorname{pressure}(37)$, $\operatorname{obesity}(38)$, and $\operatorname{alcohol}$ consumption (39) as established risk factors for AA. After excluding palindromic SNPs and SNPs associated with these confounding variables, 154 independent SNPs remained (10 SNPs for IBD on AA, 6 SNPs for CD on AA, 7 SNPs for UC on AA, 77 SNPs for RA on AA, 39 SNPs for SLE on AA, 15 SNPs for PSO on AA). Most of the F-statistics of these IVs are greater than 10, indicating a low risk of weak instrument bias. Complete information about the IVs is summarized in Supplementary Table S3. In the MR analysis, the result of IVW with fixed effects model indicated that no causal relationship was found between IBD and AA (OR = 0.91, 95%CI = 0.81-1.01, p = 0.072), as well as CD and AA (OR = 0.97, 95%CI = 0.88-1.07, p = 0.544, UC and AA (OR = 0.95, 95%CI = 0.84-1.07, p = 0.363), RA and AA (OR = 0.97, 95%CI = 0.92-1.02, p = 0.204), SLE and AA (OR = 0.99, 95%CI = 0.96-1.02, p = 0.547), and PSO and AA (OR = 0.96, 95%CI = 0.91-1.03, p = 0.245). Meanwhile, the results of other MR methods were also similar to IVW-FE mode (Figure 2). In MR sensitivity analysis, p value of Cochran Q-test revealed no significant heterogeneity was observed (all p > 0.05, Table 2). The intercept of MR-Egger regression showed there was no intercept deviated from zero and all p values were greater than 0.05, explaining no impact of horizontal pleiotropy (Table 2). Indeed, these results were also confirmed in the funnel plot with symmetrical distribution (Supplementary Figure S2). Further, the leave-one-out method indicated that no single SNP differed apparently from the overall odds ratio (Supplementary Figure S1).

3.2 The causal effect of AA on IMIDs

The initial screening identified 138 potentially independent SNPs that meet the inclusion criteria. Genetic variables associated with depression, anxiety, smoking, glucocorticoids and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs use, obesity or malnutrition(12, 40, 41), as known to have causal associations with IMIDs, were removed. After harmonizing the exposure and outcome datasets, a total of 112 SNPs were obtained with most F-statistics greater than 10 (21 SNPs for AA on IBD, 21 SNPs for AA on CD, 21 SNPs for AA on UC, 15 SNPs for AA on RA, 13 SNPs for AA on SLE, 21 SNPs for AA on PSO, Supplementary Table S2). 112 independent SNPs associated with AA were selected as IVs to explore the effect of AA on IMIDs. As shown in Figure 2 and the scatter plot (Supplementary Figure S3), the IVW method indicated that patients with

AA had a 6% increased risk of RA (OR = 1.06, 95%CI = 1.01-1.12, p = 0.029). MR-PRESSO method also presented unanimous evidence of causality between AA and RA (OR = 1.06, 95% CI = 1.01-1.11, p = 0.019). Cochran's Q test showed there was no heterogeneity in IVs related to RA (Q = 11.82, p = 0.621). Moreover, both results of MR-PRESSO (no outlier was found, Table 1) and MR-Egger regression (intercept = -0.01, p = 0.570, Figure 2) provided no evidence of horizontal pleiotropy. However, the effect of genetically predicted AA on IBD, CD, UC, SLE, PSO did not reach statistical significance in either IVW or MR-PRESSO method (Figure 2 and Table 1). Sensitivity analysis of the above MR results suggested that there was no underlying heterogeneity and horizontal pleiotropy (all p value of Cochran's Q and Egger-intercept > 0.05, Table 2).

Discussion

We conducted a two-sample bidirectional MR study to investigate the causal relationship between IMIDs (mainly including IBD, CD, UC, RA, SLE, and PSO) and AA. We found evidence of a causal effect of AA on RA, but not of RA or other IMIDs on AA. Although evidence from previous observational studies supported a causal relationship between some certain types of IMIDs and AA(12-20), causal inference cannot be made with great certainty in these studies for the possibility of residual confounding factors and various bias.

A retrospective case-control study with age- and gender-matched cohort from Israel, which adjust for different factors including socioeconomic and smoking, found that AA is more prevalent in patients with RA compared with controls (OR: 1.406, 95% CI: 1.094-1.789, p = 0.006). It is worth mentioning that the information regarding the treatment of RA patients and assessment of RA severity had not been formally investigated, as well as congenital diseases predisposing for AA(12). Contrary to above findings, a cohort study in England showed no evidence of a link between RA and AA, even after adjusting for age, gender, cardiovascular disease risk factors or anti-inflammatory drugs(13). Nonetheless, these studies lacked detailed information on daily tobacco use and alcohol consumption, family history of AA, as well as the imaging data, which all could bias causal inference towards a positive or negative direction. In addition, selection bias is also a problem that cannot be ignored. The same problems existed in studies of the association between SLE and AA(14, 15). People with SLE may experience a variety of symptoms and receive examination more frequently than people without SLE, therefore, they are more likely to be diagnosed with AA. Similarly, the two cohort studies on psoriasis failed to account for confounders such as body weight, smoking status, detail imaging findings, and assessment of psoriasis severity (16, 17). Moreover, the estimates from these observational studies are subject to substantial uncertainty with a wide confidence interval, indicating causal effects and their magnitude should be viewed with caution. Several isolated case reports have claimed that CD and UC were frequently observed comorbidities in AA patients (18-20), thus, we also conducted an investigation to explore the causal association of these diseases in AA individuals. However, either by forward or backward analysis, we did not fnd causal association between IBD, CD, UC and AA.

Genetic predisposition to AA is present from birth, therefore the MR results of our study would not be affected by the acquired drug treatment or other known or unknown exposure factors of AA patients. However, the exact mechanism by which genetically predisposed AA increases the risk of RA is still not completely understood. A study investigated the incidence of autoimmune diseases in patients with inflammatory aortic aneurysm (IAA). The serologic tests and biopsy findings were analyzed for the presence of autoimmune diseases before surgery in all cases. Autoimmune diseases were shown to be statistically significant in the inflammatory aortic group compared with the non-inflammatory aortic aneurysm group(21). Previous studies have provided evidence that a genetic predisposition to IAA exists and suggested that it may be related to human leukocyte antigen (HLA) molecule in IAA. HLA molecules play a critical role in the immune recognition process of specific antigen-presenting cells, which can be expressed by macrophages and dendritic cells. Amino acid polymorphism of HLA-DR molecule mediates immune responses to different antigens in different individuals and have also been found to be associated with the development of many diseases. A study investigating the genetic risk associated with HLA-DR gene polymorphism in patients with IAA revealed that HLA-DR B1*15 and HLA-DR B1*0404 allele were significantly enriched in these patients compared to control subjects (42). Moreover, observation with B-cell-enriched lymphoid follicles and CD3-positive T cells from the aneurysm wall of IAA patient suggested that a potential shared pathogenesis with IgG4-related diseases(43). The etiology of RA remains elusive, and several studies have consistently demonstrated its association with genetic factors. As early as 1976, Stastny(44) reported a correlation between RA and the HLA-DR4 allele of the human leukocyte antigen class II. Many studies have confirmed the association between RA and HLA-DR4 in a various of different ethnic groups, but the subtypes of HLA-DR4 and other types of HLA-DR vary widely among ethnic groups (45-48). Given the limited sample size and racial difference in previous studies, more large-scale research should focus on investigating the genetic contribution of HLA risk loci in IAA patients worldwide. Furthermore, the investigation of the genetic determinants and their role in the pathogenesis of RA necessitates further explore. Hopefully, the efficacy of autoantigen immunoregulation in treating RA has been demonstrated in animal studies. Clinical trials of autologous modified dendritic cells exposed to citrulline peptide by percutaneous injection are currently underway (49).

Unlike previous observational studies examining the association between IMIDs and AA, we used MR method to deal with known and unknown confounding factors such as smoking, alcohol or fallacies caused by reverse causation. Thus, our results overcome the limitations of observational studies to reflect causal associations and effects of IMIDs and AA. Our work also had some limitations. While we concluded that exposure to genetically predisposed AA increased the lifetime risk of RA, this does not mean that this conclusion can be used directly to infer the possible impact of interventions targeting genetically predisposed AA patients on RA risk. Besides, owing to constraints within the GWAS database, we did not distinguish the anatomic site of the aortic aneurysm. Although the thoracic aorta and the abdominal aorta share certain anatomical features, these two disease subtypes exhibit marked differences with respect to their pathophysiological mechanisms. Finally, our study was dependent on data from European population, which limits generalizability to other racial populations.

Conclusion

In summary, our study has showed genetically predicted AA may increase the risk of RA, while there was no evidence that RA had an increased risk of AA. Furthermore, we found no evidence of association between IBD, CD, UC, SLE, PSO and AA. This finding is in line with other research that demonstrated the genetic risk determinants are linked to HLA molecules in IAA patients. IAA may be a separate entity with similar pathogenesis with IgG4-related disease. Our study provides directions for future research on genetic susceptibility to IAA. The antigen binding role of IAA risk genes in the disease origin of RA needs additional investigation.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

No extra ethical approval or informed consent is required.

Consent for publication

All authors contributed to this article and approved the submitted version.

Availability of data and materials

The summary genetic association datasets for IMIDs and AA are accessible through the IEU OpenGWAS Database Project (https://gwas.mrcieu.ac.uk/) or the published article and its supplementary files. For further inquiries, please contact the corresponding author.

Competing interests

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Funding

No financial support was received for this study.

Authors' contributions

XF guided and funded this study. SS designed, conducted the MR analysis and draft of the manuscript. JH, GW, YZ, ST provided insightful feedback on both the study and manuscript. MS assisted in organizing the tables and figures. SS, MS and JH shared equal contribution of this article.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the IEU Open GWAS project for the publicly available data and to all those involved in the FinnGen and European Bioinformatics Institute studies.

Figure legends

Figure 1. (A) Schematic view of this MR study for the association between IMIDs and AA. IMIDs, Immune-mediated inflammatory diseases, including inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), Crohn's disease (CD), ulcerative colitis (UC), rheumatoid arthritis (RA), systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) and psoriasis (PSO). AA, aortic aneurysm. (B) Detailed flowchart of the study design. IVs, instrumental variables.

Figures 2. Main result of estimates from MR analysis with forward and reverse direction. (A) (B), forward analysis. (C) (D), reverse analysis. IBD, inflammatory bowel disease, CD, Crohn's disease, UC, ulcerative colitis, RA, rheumatoid arthritis, SLE, systemic lupus erythematosus, and PSO, psoriasis. CI, confidence interval.

Supplementary Figure S1 Leave-one-out sensitivity analysis. (A) IBD and AA, (B) CD and AA, (C) UC and AA, (D) RA and AA, (E) SLE and AA, (F) PSO and AA, (G) AA and IBD, (H) AA and CD, (I) AA and UC, (J) AA and RA, (K) AA and SLE, (L) AA and PSO.

Supplementary Figure S2 Funnel plot for IVW and MR-Egger method. (A) IBD and AA, (B) CD and AA, (C) UC and AA, (D) RA and AA, (E) SLE and AA, (F) PSO and AA, (G) AA and IBD, (H) AA and CD, (I) AA and UC, (J) AA and RA, (K) AA and SLE, (L) AA and PSO.

Supplementary Figure S3 Scatter plot with all IVs. (A) IBD and AA, (B) CD and AA, (C) UC and AA, (D) RA and AA, (E) SLE and AA, (F) PSO and AA, (G) AA and IBD, (H) AA and CD, (I) AA and UC, (J) AA and RA, (K) AA and SLE, (L) AA and PSO.

Tables

 Table 1. Results of supplemented MR methods

Exposure	Outcome	MR	\mathbf{MR}	MR	\mathbf{MR}
		Methods	\mathbf{Beta}	OR (95%CI)	P value
IBD	AA	MR PRESSO	-0.06	0.94(0.88, 1.00)	0.100
		Mr raps	-0.06	0.94(0.83, 1.06)	0.320
CD	AA	MR PRESSO	-0.03	0.97(0.90, 1.05)	0.488
		Mr raps	/	/	/
UC	AA	MR PRESSO	-0.06	0.94(0.88, 1.01)	0.139
		Mr raps	-0.06	0.94(0.83, 1.06)	0.336
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{A}$	AA	MR PRESSO	-0.04	0.96(0.92, 1.01)	0.146
		Mr raps	-0.04	0.96(0.91, 1.01)	0.117
SLE	AA	MR PRESSO	-0.01	0.99(0.96, 1.02)	0.593
		Mr raps	-0.01	0.99(0.96, 1.03)	0.691
PSO	AA	MR PRESSO	-0.01	0.99(0.94, 1.04)	0.678
		Mr raps	0.00	1.00(0.94, 1.05)	0.870
AA	IBD	MR PRESSO	0.04	1.04(0.99, 1.09)	0.154
		Mr raps	0.04	1.04(0.97, 1.11)	0.273
AA	CD	MR PRESSO	0.06	1.06(0.97, 1.16)	0.207
		Mr raps	0.06	1.06(0.95.1.18)	0.290

AA	UC	MR PRESSO Mr raps	$0.02 \\ 0.02$	1.02(0.96,1.08) 1.02(0.95,1.10)	$0.529 \\ 0.613$
AA	RA	MR PRESSO	0.06	1.06(1.01,1.11)	0.019
AA	SLE	Mr raps MR PRESSO	0.06 -0.03	$1.06(1.00,1.12) \\ 0.97(0.88,1.07)$	$0.034 \\ 0.561$
۸۸	PSO	Mr raps	-0.04	0.96(0.87, 1.07) 1.01(0.05, 1.08)	0.453
	1.50	Mr raps	0.01	$1.01(0.93,1.08) \\ 1.01(0.94,1.09)$	$0.091 \\ 0.791$

Table 2. Heterogeneity and pleiotropy analysis

Exposure	Outcome	Heterogeneity	Heterogeneity	Heterogeneity	Pleiotropy	Pleiotro
		Methods	Cochran's Q	P value	${f Egger-intercept}(95\%{f CI})$	P value
IBD	AA	IVW	2.88	0.969	-0.02(-0.06,0.03)	0.491
CD	AA	IVW	3.28	0.656	0.00(-0.06, 0.06)	0.929
UC	AA	IVW	2.48	0.871	0.00(-0.05, 0.06)	0.911
RA	AA	IVW	72.14	0.604	0.01(-0.01, 0.02)	0.353
SLE	AA	IVW	30.16	0.810	0.02(-0.01, 0.05)	0.157
PSO	AA	IVW	11.51	0.645	0.00(-0.04, 0.03)	0.897
AA	IBD	IVW	12.72	0.889	0.01(-0.02, 0.05)	0.405
AA	CD	IVW	16.40	0.691	0.03(-0.03, 0.08)	0.353
AA	UC	IVW	13.22	0.868	0.01(-0.03, 0.05)	0.596
AA	$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{A}$	IVW	11.82	0.621	-0.01(-0.04, 0.02)	0.570
AA	SLE	IVW	7.44	0.827	0.03(-0.05, 0.10)	0.507
AA	PSO	IVW	18.99	0.522	0.01(-0.03, 0.04)	0.772

Supplementary tables

Supplementary table S1. Characteristics of GWAS datasets in the study

Supplementary table S2. Instrumental variables related to aortic aneurysm

Supplementary table S3. Instrumental variables related to Immune-mediated inflammatory diseases

References:

1. Bossone E, Eagle KA. Epidemiology and Management of Aortic Disease: Aortic Aneurysms and Acute Aortic Syndromes. *Nature reviews Cardiology* (2021) 18(5):331-48. Epub 2020/12/24. doi: 10.1038/s41569-020-00472-6.

2. Mutlu O, Salman HE, Al-Thani H, El-Menyar A, Qidwai UA, Yalcin HC. How Does Hemodynamics Affect Rupture Tissue Mechanics in Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm: Focus on Wall Shear Stress Derived Parameters, Time-Averaged Wall Shear Stress, Oscillatory Shear Index, Endothelial Cell Activation Potential, and Relative Residence Time. *Computers in biology and medicine* (2023) 154:106609. Epub 2023/02/02. doi: 10.1016/j.compbiomed.2023.106609.

3. Erbel R, Aboyans V, Boileau C, Bossone E, Bartolomeo RD, Eggebrecht H, et al. 2014 Esc Guidelines on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Aortic Diseases: Document Covering Acute and Chronic Aortic Diseases of the Thoracic and Abdominal Aorta of the Adult. The Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Aortic Diseases of the European Society of Cardiology (Esc). *European heart journal* (2014) 35(41):2873-926. Epub 2014/09/01. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehu281.

4. Gao J, Cao H, Hu G, Wu Y, Xu Y, Cui H, et al. The Mechanism and Therapy of Aortic Aneurysms. *Signal transduction and targeted therapy* (2023) 8(1):55. Epub 2023/02/04. doi: 10.1038/s41392-023-01325-7.

5. Golledge J. Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm: Update on Pathogenesis and Medical Treatments. *Nature reviews Cardiology* (2019) 16(4):225-42. Epub 2018/11/18. doi: 10.1038/s41569-018-0114-9.

6. Scherlinger M, Richez C, Tsokos GC, Boilard E, Blanco P. The Role of Platelets in Immune-Mediated Inflammatory Diseases. *Nature reviews Immunology* (2023):1-16. Epub 2023/01/29. doi: 10.1038/s41577-023-00834-4.

7. McInnes IB, Gravallese EM. Immune-Mediated Inflammatory Disease Therapeutics: Past, Present and Future. *Nature reviews Immunology*(2021) 21(10):680-6. Epub 2021/09/15. doi: 10.1038/s41577-021-00603-1.

8. Conrad N, Verbeke G, Molenberghs G, Goetschalckx L, Callender T, Cambridge G, et al. Autoimmune Diseases and Cardiovascular Risk: A Population-Based Study on 19 Autoimmune Diseases and 12 Cardiovascular Diseases in 22 Million Individuals in the Uk. *Lancet (London, England)* (2022) 400(10354):733-43. Epub 2022/08/31. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(22)01349-6.

9. Agca R, Smulders Y, Nurmohamed M. Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Immune-Mediated Inflammatory Diseases: Recommendations for Clinical Practice. *Heart (British Cardiac Society)* (2022) 108(1):73-9. Epub 2021/03/07. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2019-316378.

10. Gisterå A, Hansson GK. The Immunology of Atherosclerosis. *Nature reviews Nephrology* (2017) 13(6):368-80. Epub 2017/04/11. doi: 10.1038/nrneph.2017.51.

11. Schmidt J, Sunesen K, Kornum JB, Duhaut P, Thomsen RW. Predictors for Pathologically Confirmed Aortitis after Resection of the Ascending Aorta: A 12-Year Danish Nationwide Population-Based Cross-Sectional Study. Arthritis research & therapy (2011) 13(3):R87. Epub 2011/06/17. doi: 10.1186/ar3360.

12. Shovman O, Tiosano S, Comaneshter D, Cohen AD, Amital H, Sherf M. Aortic Aneurysm Associated with Rheumatoid Arthritis: A Population-Based Cross-Sectional Study. *Clinical rheumatology* (2016) 35(11):2657-61. Epub 2016/08/10. doi: 10.1007/s10067-016-3372-0.

13. Pujades-Rodriguez M, Duyx B, Thomas SL, Stogiannis D, Rahman A, Smeeth L, et al. Rheumatoid Arthritis and Incidence of Twelve Initial Presentations of Cardiovascular Disease: A Population Record-Linkage Cohort Study in England. *PloS one* (2016) 11(3):e0151245. Epub 2016/03/16. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0151245.

14. Wang SH, Chang YS, Liu CJ, Lai CC, Chen TJ, Chen WS. Incidence and Risk Analysis of Aortic Aneurysm and Aortic Dissection among Patients with Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: A Nationwide Population-Based Study in Taiwan. *Lupus* (2014) 23(7):665-71. Epub 2014/02/21. doi: 10.1177/0961203314523868.

15. Guy A, Tiosano S, Comaneshter D, Tekes-Manova D, Shovman O, Cohen AD, et al. Aortic Aneurysm Association with Sle - a Case-Control Study. *Lupus* (2016) 25(9):959-63. Epub 2016/01/27. doi: 10.1177/0961203316628999.

16. Khalid U, Egeberg A, Ahlehoff O, Smedegaard L, Gislason GH, Hansen PR. Nationwide Study on the Risk of Abdominal Aortic Aneurysms in Patients with Psoriasis. *Arteriosclerosis, thrombosis, and vascular biology* (2016) 36(5):1043-8. Epub 2016/04/16. doi: 10.1161/atvbaha.116.307449.

17. Chiu HY, Lo PC, Huang WF, Tsai YW, Tsai TF. Increased Risk of Aortic Aneurysm (Aa) in Relation to the Severity of Psoriasis: A National Population-Based Matched-Cohort Study. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology* (2016) 75(4):747-54. Epub 2016/07/31. doi: 10.1016/j.jaad.2016.06.002.

18. Talathi S, Mannion M, Colvin E, Beck A, Dabal R, Maclin J, et al. Aortitis with an Aneurysm at Initial Presentation of Crohn Disease. *Journal of pediatric gastroenterology and nutrition* (2018) 67(1):e12-e3. Epub 2018/06/22. doi: 10.1097/mpg.00000000001945.

19. Taddio A, Maschio M, Martelossi S, Barbi E, Ventura A. Crohn's Disease and Takayasu's Arteritis: An Uncommon Association. *World journal of gastroenterology* (2013) 19(35):5933-5. Epub 2013/10/15. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v19.i35.5933.

20. Kashima K, Kawasaki D, Yotsumoto G, Hatake S, Yamashita E, Nagayoshi S, et al. Rapid Progression of Aortic Regurgitation with Thoracic Aortic Aneurysm Due to Takayasu Arteritis Associated with Ulcerative Colitis. *Internal medicine (Tokyo, Japan)* (2010) 49(11):1007-11. Epub 2010/06/04. doi: 10.2169/internalmedicine.49.3122.

21. Haug ES, Skomsvoll JF, Jacobsen G, Halvorsen TB, Saether OD, Myhre HO. Inflammatory Aortic Aneurysm Is Associated with Increased Incidence of Autoimmune Disease. *Journal of vascular surgery* (2003) 38(3):492-7. Epub 2003/08/30. doi: 10.1016/s0741-5214(03)00340-9.

22. Tin A, Köttgen A. Mendelian Randomization Analysis as a Tool to Gain Insights into Causes of Diseases: A Primer. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology : JASN* (2021) 32(10):2400-7. Epub 2021/06/18. doi: 10.1681/asn.2020121760.

23. Gupta V, Walia GK, Sachdeva MP. 'Mendelian Randomization': An Approach for Exploring Causal Relations in Epidemiology. *Public health* (2017) 145:113-9. Epub 2017/04/01. doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2016.12.033.

24. Boef AG, Dekkers OM, le Cessie S. Mendelian Randomization Studies: A Review of the Approaches Used and the Quality of Reporting. *International journal of epidemiology* (2015) 44(2):496-511. Epub 2015/05/09. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv071.

25. Zheng J, Baird D, Borges MC, Bowden J, Hemani G, Haycock P, et al. Recent Developments in Mendelian Randomization Studies. Current epidemiology reports (2017) 4(4):330-45. Epub 2017/12/12. doi: 10.1007/s40471-017-0128-6.

26. Ha E, Bae SC, Kim K. Large-Scale Meta-Analysis across East Asian and European Populations Updated Genetic Architecture and Variant-Driven Biology of Rheumatoid Arthritis, Identifying 11 Novel Susceptibility Loci. *Annals of the rheumatic diseases* (2021) 80(5):558-65. Epub 2020/12/15. doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-219065.

27. Bentham J, Morris DL, Graham DSC, Pinder CL, Tombleson P, Behrens TW, et al. Genetic Association Analyses Implicate Aberrant Regulation of Innate and Adaptive Immunity Genes in the Pathogenesis of Systemic Lupus Erythematosus. *Nature genetics* (2015) 47(12):1457-64. Epub 2015/10/27. doi: 10.1038/ng.3434.

28. Skrivankova VW, Richmond RC, Woolf BAR, Yarmolinsky J, Davies NM, Swanson SA, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology Using Mendelian Randomization: The Strobe-Mr Statement. *Jama* (2021) 326(16):1614-21. Epub 2021/10/27. doi: 10.1001/jama.2021.18236.

29. Jansen H, Samani NJ, Schunkert H. Mendelian Randomization Studies in Coronary Artery Disease. *European heart journal* (2014) 35(29):1917-24. Epub 2014/06/12. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehu208.

30. Staley JR, Blackshaw J, Kamat MA, Ellis S, Surendran P, Sun BB, et al. Phenoscanner: A Database of Human Genotype-Phenotype Associations. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* (2016) 32(20):3207-9. Epub 2016/06/19. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btw373.

31. 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) 7. Epub 2018/05/31. doi: 10.7554/eLife.34408.

32. Papadimitriou N, Dimou N, Tsilidis KK, Banbury B, Martin RM, Lewis SJ, et al. Physical Activity and Risks of Breast and Colorectal Cancer: A Mendelian Randomisation Analysis. *Nature communications* (2020) 11(1):597. Epub 2020/02/01. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-14389-8.

33. Lin Z, Deng Y, Pan W. Combining the Strengths of Inverse-Variance Weighting and Egger Regression in Mendelian Randomization Using a Mixture of Regressions Model. *PLoS genetics* (2021) 17(11):e1009922. Epub 2021/11/19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1009922.

34. Bowden J, Del Greco MF, Minelli C, Zhao Q, Lawlor DA, Sheehan NA, et al. Improving the Accuracy of Two-Sample Summary-Data Mendelian Randomization: Moving Beyond the Nome Assumption. *International journal of epidemiology* (2019) 48(3):728-42. Epub 2018/12/19. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyy258.

35. Verbanck M, Chen CY, Neale B, Do R. Detection of Widespread Horizontal Pleiotropy in Causal Relationships Inferred from Mendelian Randomization between Complex Traits and Diseases. *Nature genetics* (2018) 50(5):693-8. Epub 2018/04/25. doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0099-7.

36. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian Randomization with Invalid Instruments: Effect Estimation and Bias Detection through Egger Regression. *International journal of epidemiology* (2015) 44(2):512-25. Epub 2015/06/08. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv080.

37. Werner N, Nickenig G, Sinning JM. Complex Pci Procedures: Challenges for the Interventional Cardiologist. *Clinical research in cardiology : official journal of the German Cardiac Society* (2018) 107(Suppl 2):64-73. Epub 2018/07/07. doi: 10.1007/s00392-018-1316-1.

38. Björck M, Wanhainen A. Pathophysiology of Aaa: Heredity Vs Environment. *Progress in cardiovascular diseases* (2013) 56(1):2-6. Epub 2013/09/03. doi: 10.1016/j.pcad.2013.05.003.

39. Wood AM, Kaptoge S, Butterworth AS, Willeit P, Warnakula S, Bolton T, et al. Risk Thresholds for Alcohol Consumption: Combined Analysis of Individual-Participant Data for 599 912 Current Drinkers in 83 Prospective Studies. *Lancet (London, England)* (2018) 391(10129):1513-23. Epub 2018/04/21. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)30134-x.

40. Ananthakrishnan AN, Kaplan GG, Bernstein CN, Burke KE, Lochhead PJ, Sasson AN, et al. Lifestyle, Behaviour, and Environmental Modification for the Management of Patients with Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: An International Organization for Study of Inflammatory Bowel Diseases Consensus. *The lancet Gastroenterology & hepatology* (2022) 7(7):666-78. Epub 2022/04/30. doi: 10.1016/s2468-1253(22)00021-8.

41. Pujades-Rodriguez M, Morgan AW, Cubbon RM, Wu J. Dose-Dependent Oral Glucocorticoid Cardiovascular Risks in People with Immune-Mediated Inflammatory Diseases: A Population-Based Cohort Study. *PLoS medicine* (2020) 17(12):e1003432. Epub 2020/12/04. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003432.

42. Rasmussen TE, Hallett JW, Jr., Metzger RL, Richardson DM, Harmsen WS, Goronzy JJ, et al. Genetic Risk Factors in Inflammatory Abdominal Aortic Aneurysms: Polymorphic Residue 70 in the Hla-Dr B1 Gene as a Key Genetic Element. *Journal of vascular surgery* (1997) 25(2):356-64. Epub 1997/02/01. doi: 10.1016/s0741-5214(97)70358-6.

43. Sakata N, Tashiro T, Uesugi N, Kawara T, Furuya K, Hirata Y, et al. Igg4-Positive Plasma Cells in Inflammatory Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm: The Possibility of an Aortic Manifestation of Igg4-Related Sclerosing Disease. *The American journal of surgical pathology* (2008) 32(4):553-9. Epub 2008/02/28. doi: 10.1097/PAS.0b013e31815a04db.

44. Ollier B. Shock Revelations About Hla-Dr4 – a Shortcut to Rheumatoid Arthritis? *Nature medicine* (1996) 2(3):279-80. Epub 1996/03/01. doi: 10.1038/nm0396-279.

45. Ali AA, Khalid KE, Mohammed SE, Akhtar MS, Saeed OK. Association of Human Leukocyte Antigen (Hla) Class Ii (Drb1 and Dqb1) Alleles and Haplotypes with Rheumatoid Arthritis in Sudanese Patients. *Frontiers in immunology* (2023) 14:1178546. Epub 2023/07/10. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2023.1178546.

46. Atouf O, Benbouazza K, Brick C, Bzami F, Bennani N, Amine B, et al. Hla Polymorphism and Early Rheumatoid Arthritis in the Moroccan Population. *Joint bone spine* (2008) 75(5):554-8. Epub 2008/09/20. doi: 10.1016/j.jbspin.2008.01.027.

47. Fries JF, Wolfe F, Apple R, Erlich H, Bugawan T, Holmes T, et al. Hla-Drb1 Genotype Associations in 793 White Patients from a Rheumatoid Arthritis Inception Cohort: Frequency, Severity, and Treatment Bias. *Arthritis and rheumatism* (2002) 46(9):2320-9. Epub 2002/10/02. doi: 10.1002/art.10485.

48. Yang M, Kuang X, Li J, Pan Y, Tan M, Lu B, et al. Meta-Analysis of the Association of Hla-Drb1 with Rheumatoid Arthritis in Chinese Populations. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders* (2013) 14:307. Epub 2013/10/29. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-14-307.

49. Benham H, Nel HJ, Law SC, Mehdi AM, Street S, Ramnoruth N, et al. Citrullinated Peptide Dendritic Cell Immunotherapy in Hla Risk Genotype-Positive Rheumatoid Arthritis Patients. *Science translational medicine* (2015) 7(290):290ra87. Epub 2015/06/05. doi: 10.1126/scitranslmed.aaa9301.



Exposure	Methods	Beta		OR (95%CI)
IBD & AA				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects	-0.06	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.94(0.83,1.06)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	-0.06	F	0.94(0.83,1.06)
	MR-Egger regression	0.01	+	→ 1.01(0.80,1.29)
	Weight median	-0.06	·	0.95(0.81,1.10)
	Penalised weighted median	-0.06	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.95(0.81,1.11)
	Simple mode	-0.09		0.91(0.72,1.17)
	Weighted mode	-0.04	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.96(0.80,1.16)
	Maximum likelihood	-0.06	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.94(0.83,1.06)
CD & AA				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects	-0.03	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.97(0.88,1.07)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	-0.03	⊢	0.97(0.88,1.07)
	MR-Egger regression	-0.02	·	0.98(0.81,1.18)
	Weight median	-0.03	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.97(0.86,1.09)
	Penalised weighted median	-0.03	⊢−−−−	0.97(0.85,1.09)
	Simple mode	-0.08	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.93(0.78,1.10)
	Weighted mode	-0.04	⊧ ∎	0.96(0.83,1.11)
	Maximum likelihood	-0.03	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.97(0.88,1.07)
UC & AA				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects	-0.06	······	0.95(0.84,1.07)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	-0.06	F	0.95(0.84,1.07)
	MR-Egger regression	-0.07	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.93(0.72,1.20)
	Weight median	-0.05	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.95(0.82,1.12)
	Penalised weighted median	-0.05	·	0.95(0.82,1.11)
	Simple mode	-0.01	F	0.99(0.79,1.24)
	Weighted mode	-0.03	·	0.97(0.80,1.17)
	Maximum likelihood	-0.06		0.95(0.84,1.07)
		0.	7 0.86 1 1.15 Odds Ratio	1.3

Exposure	Methods	Beta		OR (95%CI)
RA & AA				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects	-0.03	▶ ─₽ <u></u> <u></u> <u></u> <u></u> <u></u>	0.97(0.92,1.02)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	-0.03	▶ ─₽ <u></u> <u></u> ¹ 4	0.97(0.92,1.02)
	MR-Egger regression	-0.07	⊢ − − † 1	0.94(0.86,1.02)
	Weight median	-0.06	⊢ − − † 1	0.94(0.87,1.02)
	Penalised weighted median	-0.06	⊢ − − † 1	0.94(0.87,1.02)
	Simple mode	0.09	· · · · ·	1.10(0.92,1.30)
	Weighted mode	-0.05	⊢	0.95(0.88,1.03)
	Maximum likelihood	-0.03	⊢ ∎∔4	0.97(0.92,1.02)
SLE & AA				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects	-0.01	⊢ ∎ <mark> </mark> -1	0.99(0.96,1.02)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	-0.01	⊢ ∎ <mark> </mark> -1	0.99(0.96,1.02)
	MR-Egger regression	-0.06	⊢	0.94(0.87,1.02)
	Weight median	-0.02	⊢ ∎ <u></u>	0.98(0.94,1.04)
	Penalised weighted median	-0.01	⊢ _	0.99(0.94,1.04)
	Simple mode	0	▶ ──∲ ───┥	1.00(0.92,1.09)
	Weighted mode	-0.02	▶ <u></u>	0.98(0.92,1.05)
	Maximum likelihood	-0.01	⊢ ∎ <mark> </mark> -1	0.99(0.96,1.02)
PSO & AA				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects	-0.04	▶ ■	0.96(0.91,1.03)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	-0.04		0.96(0.91,1.03)
	MR-Egger regression	-0.03	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.97(0.87,1.07)
	Weight median	-0.04		0.96(0.88,1.04)
	Penalised weighted median	-0.04	F	0.96(0.87,1.05)
	Simple mode	-0.09	► -	0.92(0.79,1.07)
	Weighted mode	-0.03	· • • • • · · · ·	0.97(0.87,1.08)
	Maximum likelihood	-0.04		0.96(0.91,1.03)
		0.7	0.85 1 1.15 Odds Ratio	1.3

r-reviewed. Data may be preliminar.
r-reviewed. Data may be prelimin
r-reviewed. Data may be prelin
r-reviewed. Data may be pre
r-reviewed. Data may be I
r-reviewed. Data may b
T-reviewed. Data may
r-reviewed. Data m
r-reviewed. Data
r-reviewed. Da
r-reviewed. I
r-reviewed
r-review
T-revie
T-TC
÷.
٥
Å.
Я
90
÷
n
22
Ĩ,
g
aı
nt
1.I.
fel
d.
3
.18
hit
Εi
÷
2
6.7
48
36
8
00
10,
30
õ.
Ξ.
au
77
52
8
5
80
9
S
E.
E.
d.
<u>ē</u>
is:
B
Derm
t perm
out perm
thout perm
without perm
se without perm
suse without perm
reuse without perm
No reuse without perm
. No reuse without perm
ed. No reuse without perm
srved. No reuse without perm
eserved. No reuse without perm
s reserved. No reuse without perm
hts reserved. No reuse without perm
ights reserved. No reuse without perm
Il rights reserved. No reuse without perm
All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
r. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
der. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
under. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
or/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
thor/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
ne author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
er is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
older is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
ht holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
ight holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
whight holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
opyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
e copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
- The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
24 — The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
024 - The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
1.2024 - The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
Ian $2024 - $ The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
0 Jan $2024 - $ The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
30 Jan $2024 - $ The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
on 30 Jan $2024 -$ The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm
ed on 30 Jan $2024 -$ The copyright holder is the author/funder. All rights reserved. No reuse without perm

Exposure	Methods	Beta		OR (95%CI)
AA & IBD				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects)	0.04	⊢↓ • • • •	1.04(0.98,1.10)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	0.04	⊢ − − − − − − − − − − − − − − − − − −	1.04(0.98,1.10)
	MR-Egger regression	-0.01	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.99(0.87,1.12)
	Weight median	0.03	⊢	1.03(0.95,1.11)
	Penalised weighted median	0.03	⊢	1.03(0.95,1.11)
	Simple mode	0.02	·	1.02(0.87,1.20)
	Weighted mode	0.02	⊢−−−− −	1.02(0.88,1.18)
	Maximum likelihood	0.04	⊢ − − − − − − − − − − − − − − − − − −	1.04(0.98,1.10)
AA & CD				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects)	0.06		1.06(0.96,1.17)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	0.06	F	1.06(0.96,1.17)
	MR-Egger regression	-0.03	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.97(0.80,1.19)
	Weight median	0.03	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.03(0.90,1.18)
	Penalised weighted median	0.03	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.03(0.90,1.18)
	Simple mode	0.02	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.02(0.80,1.32)
	Weighted mode	0.03		
	Maximum likelihood	0.06		1.06(0.96,1.17)
AA & UC				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects)	0.02	F	1.02(0.95,1.09)
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	0.02	⊢	1.02(0.95,1.09)
	MR-Egger regression	-0.02	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.98(0.85,1.13)
	Weight median	0.02	F	1.02(0.92,1.12)
	Penalised weighted median	0.02	F	1.02(0.92,1.12)
	Simple mode	0	F	1.00(0.84,1.19)
	Weighted mode	0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.00(0.84,1.20)
	Maximum likelihood	0.02		1.02(0.95,1.09)
			0.8 0.95 1.05 1.2 Odds Ratio	1.35

Exposure	Methods	Beta		OR (95%C
AA & RA				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects)	0.06	-	1.06(1.01,1.1
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	0.06	-	1.06(1.01,1.1
	MR-Egger regression	0.09	·	1.10(0.97,1.2
	Weight median	0.06	· ↓	1.06(0.98,1.
	Penalised weighted median	0.06	· ↓	1.06(0.99,1.
	Simple mode	0.07	·	1.07(0.98,1.
	Weighted mode	0.07	↓	1.07(0.99,1.
	Maximum likelihood	0.06	-	1.06(1.01,1.
AA & SLE				
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects)	-0.05	·	0.95(0.84,1.
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	-0.05	·	0.95(0.84,1.
	MR-Egger regression	-0.15		0.86(0.64,1.
	Weight median	-0.12	·	0.89(0.76,1
	Penalised weighted median	-0.12	·	0.89(0.76,1.
	Simple mode	-0.14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.87(0.66,1
	Weighted mode	-0.14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.87(0.69,1
	Maximum likelihood	-0.05	·	0.95(0.84,1
AA & PSO	•			
	Inverse variance weighted (random effects)	0.01	⊢_ ∎(1.01(0.95,1
	Inverse variance weighted (fixed effects)	0.01	⊢	1.01(0.95,1
	MR-Egger regression	0	·	1.00(0.87,1
	Weight median	-0.04	·	0.96(0.87,1
	Penalised weighted median	-0.04	⊢ − ∎ <u></u>	0.96(0.87,1
	Simple mode	-0.06	·	0.94(0.79,1
	Weighted mode	-0.06	·	0.95(0.81,1
	Maximum likelihood	0.01	⊢_	1.01(0.95,1