Pharmacogenetic meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies of LDL cholesterol response to statins.
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Our findings advance the understanding of the pharmacogenetic architecture of statin response. Here we perform a pharmacogenetic meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies (GWAS) in studies addressing the LDL cholesterol response to statins, including up to 18,596 statin-treated subjects. We validate the most promising signals in a further 22,318 statin recipients and identity two loci, SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1 and SLC10A4, not previously identified in GWAS. Moreover, we confirm the previously described associations with APOE, LPA and SORT1.
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The 3-hydroxymethyl-3-methylglutaryl coenzyme A (HMG-CoA) reductase inhibitors, also known as statins, are widely prescribed and are highly effective in the management and prevention of cardiovascular disease. Statin therapy results in a lowering of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) levels by up to 55% and a 20–30% reduction of cardiovascular events. Despite the clinical efficacy of statins in a wide range of patients, interindividual variability exists with regard to LDL-C-lowering response as well as efficacy in reducing major cardiovascular events. The suggestion that some of this variability may be due, in part, to common pharmacogenetic variation is supported by previous studies that have identified genetic variants associated with differential LDL-C response to statin therapy.

A small number of genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have previously identified loci associated with statin response on a genome-wide level. A GWAS in the JUPITER trial identified three genetic loci, ABCG2 (rs2199936), LPA (rs10455872) and APOE (rs7412), that were associated with percentage LDL-C lowering effect compared with non-carriers. The second strongest association was with a SNP at LPA on chromosome 5 (rs13166647, MAF = 0.230, $\beta = -0.025$, s.e. = 0.046, $P = 4.50 \times 10^{-8}$), although genotypes for this SNP were only available in two studies within the first stage ($n = 2,144$).

**Second-stage meta-analysis.** We selected 246 SNPs with $P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$ from 158 loci for further investigation in three additional studies comprising up to 22,318 statin-treated subjects (see Methods; Supplementary Tables 1 and 5; Supplementary Note 3). This second stage confirmed the genome-wide significant associations between variations within the APOE and LPA loci and LDL-C response, as observed in the first stage (Table 1; Supplementary Fig. 2; Supplementary Table 5). In addition, SNPs at two new loci with $P$ values between $6.70 \times 10^{-7}$ and $2.26 \times 10^{-6}$ in the first phase were shown to be significantly associated with statin-induced LDL-C lowering after statin treatment in the total combined meta-analysis at a genome-wide level: SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1 (rs646776, $\beta = -0.013$, s.e. = 0.002, $P = 1.05 \times 10^{-9}$ and rs12740374, $\beta = -0.013$, s.e. = 0.002, $P = 1.05 \times 10^{-9}$; Fig 2c) and SLCO1B1 (rs2900478, $\beta = 0.016$, s.e. = 0.003, $P = 1.22 \times 10^{-9}$; Fig 2d), indicating an additional 1.5% increase per allele in LDL-C lowering effect for carriers of the SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1 SNP and a 1.6% smaller LDL-C lowering per minor allele for carriers of the SLCO1B1 SNP.

The six next-ranked SNPs with $P$ values just below $5 \times 10^{-8}$ in the combined meta-analysis, including the two SNPs at RICTOR (rs13166647 and rs13172966), were selected for additional genotyping in the Scandinavian ASCOT participants (see Methods). None of these six SNPs reached genome-wide significance after this additional genotyping (Supplementary Table 6). Therefore, our overall genome-wide significant findings were the SNPs at APOE, LPA, SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1 and SLCO1B1.

**Subfraction analyses.** To extend our results for the novel GWAS finding SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1, we performed additional association analyses, using measurements of cholesterol levels in four LDL subfractions (large, medium, small and very small) from two of the trials in GIST, CAP and PRINCE (Table 2; see Methods). The minor allele of SORT1 rs646776 was associated with greater statin-induced reductions in levels of all LDL subfractions, and there was a nonsignificant trend for larger effect sizes and greater statistical significance for lowering of small and very small LDL (Table 2). In contrast, the APOE SNP associated with greater carriers of the SNP compared with non-carriers. Associations at both loci have previously been described. A third genome-wide significant association was found with a SNP at RICTOR on chromosome 5 (rs13166647, MAF = 0.230, $\beta = -0.025$, s.e. = 0.046, $P = 4.50 \times 10^{-8}$), although genotypes for this SNP were only available in two studies within the first stage ($n = 2,144$).

---

**Figure 1** | **Results of the GWAS meta-analysis.** Manhattan plot presenting the $-\log_{10} P$ values from the combined meta-analysis ($n = 40,914$) on LDL-C response after statin treatment. $P$ values were generated using linear regression analysis.
**Table 1 | Genome-wide significant associations in stage 1, stage 2 and combined meta-analysis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chr</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Lead SNP</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Coding allele</th>
<th>Non-coding allele</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency-coding allele</th>
<th>Beta*</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
<th>% Extra reduction</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>109620053</td>
<td>rs646776</td>
<td>SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>16,697</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.70 × 10⁻⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>21,902</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.43 × 10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>38,599</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.05 × 10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>160930108</td>
<td>rs10455872</td>
<td>LPA</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>12,981</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.95 × 10⁻¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>18,075</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.14 × 10⁻⁵⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>31,056</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.41 × 10⁻⁴⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21260064</td>
<td>rs2900478</td>
<td>SLCO1B1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>16,749</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>2.26 × 10⁻⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>7,504</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>3.54 × 10⁻³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>24,253</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>1.22 × 10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>50107480</td>
<td>rs445925</td>
<td>APOE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>13,909</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.58 × 10⁻¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>3,613</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.41 × 10⁻¹⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>17,522</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.52 × 10⁻²⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chr, chromosome; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism.

*Beta for difference between the natural log-transformed on- and off-treatment low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) levels adjusted for natural log-transformed off-treatment LDL-C, age-, sex- and study-specific covariates. The beta reflects the fraction of differential LDL-C lowering in carriers versus non-carriers of the SNP; a negative beta indicates a better statin response (stronger LDL-C reduction), a positive beta a worse statin response. Betas and P values were generated using linear regression analysis.

†This percentage reflects the % extra LDL-C lowering in carriers versus non-carriers of the SNP.

LDL-C response to statins (rs445925) showed a small and non-significant association with change in very small LDL (Table 2). For the minor allele of rs2900478 (SLCO1B1), the borderline significant association with smaller magnitude of LDL-C reduction showed a trend for preferential association with larger versus smaller LDL subfractions. The lack of association of rs10455872 (LPA) with changes in LDL subfractions is consistent with evidence discussed below that this locus affects levels of lipoprotein(a) (Lp(a)) and not LDL particles. Using generalized estimating equations, we tested the association of log change in each of the LDL subfractions with interactions of the four SNPs. For very small LDL, the association with the rs646776 minor allele was significantly different from that of the other minor alleles (P = 0.03 after adjustment for multiple testing).

**Effects of off-treatment LDL-C.** To demonstrate that our findings for LDL-C response to statin treatment are unlikely to be explained through associations with baseline LDL-C levels, we performed a number of additional analyses (see Methods). First, Supplementary Table 7 shows regression coefficients for baseline-adjusted and measurement noise-corrected estimates of the direct effect of genotype on on-treatment LDL-C at the strongest SNPs in the GIST meta-analysis (P < 1 × 10⁻⁸), which were available in the CARDS data set. Correcting our effect size estimate further and modelling measurement noise at baseline reduced the apparent effect only slightly for all the markers, suggesting that there is little effect of measurement noise. Next, within the JUPITER trial, additional analyses were performed to determine whether there was an interaction between LDL-C change and statin or placebo allocation. Supplementary Table 8 shows significant P values for interaction (all < 5 × 10⁻²) for SNPs at the four genome-wide significant loci in the GIST meta-analysis, also suggesting that genetic effects on baseline LDL-C as manifested in the placebo group contribute at most only in part to genetic effects on LDL-C response in the statin group.

**Genome-Wide Conditional Analysis.** To investigate whether there were multiple SNPs within any gene and multiple loci associated with differential LDL-C lowering to statin therapy, we performed a conditional analysis across the genome using the summary statistics of the combined meta-analysis. The results of the Genome-Wide Conditional Analysis (GWCA; see Methods; Supplementary Table 9) showed 14 SNPs independently associated with statin response and these explained ~5% of the variation in LDL-C response to statin treatment. Of the 14 independent SNPs, 6 were genome-wide significant in the combined GWAS meta-analysis (Supplementary Table 5).

**Previous findings.** In Supplementary Table 10, we performed a look-up in our GWAS meta-analysis for SNPs previously described in the literature (NHGRI Catalogue of Published GWAS and Candidate gene studies) to be associated with statin response, besides the loci associated at a genome-wide level in the current study. None of these SNPs was associated with statin response in our GWAS after correcting for multiple testing.

**Functional analyses.** Functional characterization of the 246 SNPs selected for the second stage was performed using a range of bioinformatics tools (see Methods). A total of 420 expression quantitative trait loci (eQTL) associations were identified across a wide range of tissues (Supplementary Data 1), which comprised 67 independent gene eQTL associations. Eleven genes, including APOE, SORT1, CELSR2 and PSRC1, showed eQTLs in liver, which considering its primary role in mediating statin-induced LDL reduction may be particularly relevant to statin response. Putative gene eQTLs were combined with genes annotated to variants in linkage disequilibrium (LD) with LDL-C response-associated variants, resulting in a list of 185 candidate gene loci, defined by 2,681 SNPs (Supplementary Data 2 and 3). To identify statin responsive genes among the candidate loci, gene expression data measured in response to statin treatment in a range of cell lines was retrieved from the Connectivity Map resource (see Methods). Five genes (APOE, BRCA1, GPR57, ADRB2 and ETV1) showed convincing evidence of statin responsiveness on the basis of greater than twofold differential expression in response to statin treatment. Eight genes showed suggestive evidence (1.5- to 2-fold change; TOMM40, SREBP1, PSRC1, BCL3, BCAM, ANK3, SIVA1 and RANBP9; Supplementary Data 3).

Finally, involvement in statin response was investigated at a pathway level using GeneGo Metacore (Thomson Reuters). Briefly, 87 literature-reported genes linked to statin response were combined with the 185 candidate gene loci reported here.
A conservative network of direct interactions was constructed between query genes (Supplementary Data 4). The network included 24 genes located in the LDL-C-associated loci (Supplementary Fig. 4). Collectively, our functional and pathway analysis confirms a strong biological and functional role in statin response for several strongly associated gene loci, including APOE/TOMM40/PVRL2 and SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC2.

Discussion

We have performed a meta-analysis of GWAS including more than 40,000 subjects, investigating genetic variants associated with variation in LDL-C lowering on statin treatment independent from associations with baseline LDL-C. We identified four loci at genome-wide significance, including the previously identified APOE and LPA, and the novel GWAS loci SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1 and SLC01B1.

Nine SNPs in the APOE gene region reached genome-wide significance for LDL-C response. The minor allele of the lead SNP rs445925, which is a proxy for the apoE e2 protein variant defining SNP rs7412 (ref. 14), was associated with a larger LDL-C-lowering response to statins compared with carriers of the major allele. The magnitude and direction of the effect size was similar to previously reported findings for the rs445925 variant in

Table 2 | Associations of the minor alleles of rs646776, rs445925, rs2900478 and rs10455872 with changes in LDL-C and LDL subfractions in response to statin in the combined CAP and PRINCE studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change*</th>
<th>SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1</th>
<th>APOE</th>
<th>SLCO1B1</th>
<th>LPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDL-C total</td>
<td>rs646776 (MAF 0.2)</td>
<td>rs445925 (MAF 0.086)</td>
<td>rs2900478 (MAF 0.16)</td>
<td>rs10455872 (MAF 0.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>s.e.</td>
<td>P value</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>s.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL-C total</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large LDL-C</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium LDL-C</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small LDL-C</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very small LDL-C</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.00006</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; MAF, minor allele frequency.

*Change: ln (on treatment) – ln (baseline) models adjusted for log (baseline variable), age, sex, body mass index, smoking (y/n) and study (CAP versus PRINCE). Betas and P values were assessed using a generalized estimating equation method.
the GWAS study performed in CARDS and ASCOT8 and of the SNP rs7412 in JUPITER2. Since the apoE e2 protein results in increased hepatic cholesterol synthesis, it may also predispose to stronger inhibition of cholesterol synthesis by statin treatment8,10.

Three independent SNPs at LPA were significantly associated with LDL-C response to statins. The minor G allele of the lead SNP rs10455872 was associated with smaller LDL-C reduction than the major allele. This result was similar to the previous GWAS findings for this SNP in the JUPITER trial and the combined ASCOT and CARDS study2,8. The rs10455872 SNP was strongly associated with the KIV-2 copy number variant in Lp(a), which encodes variability in apo(a) size and is responsible for \( \sim 30\% \) of variance in Lp(a) levels8,11,13. Furthermore, rs10455872 was shown to be strongly associated with plasma Lp(a) levels16. Standard assays of LDL-C, as well as the Friedewald formula, include cholesterol that resides in Lp(a)6,8.

In the HPS trial, which used simvastatin, this candidate gene SNP was associated with a 1% lower LDL-C reduction per allele5. Single-dose studies have shown that the observed area under the curve of plasma level of active simvastatin after a dose of 40 mg was 221% higher in rs4149056 CC homozygotes compared with rs4149056 TT homozygotes, as compared with atorvastatin 20 mg (144% higher for CC versus TT) and rosuvastatin 40 mg (117% higher for CC versus TT)24. This finding results from the slower hepatic uptake of statins caused by the genetic variant, which would also be expected to result in a reduction in the cholesterol-lowering effect5. In a GWAS of the genetic risk factors for simvastatin-induced myopathy, SLCO1B1 showed the strongest association25. Haploinsufficient carriers of the SLCO1B1 variant had a 16.9 times higher risk for myopathy compared with non-carriers. This might have led to a decrease in study medicaiton adherence, and consequently a decreased effect on LDL-C in carriers of this SNP. In addition, previous analysis in the GoDARTS study showed that the effect of the SLCO1B1 gene on statin efficacy was abolished after removal of individuals who showed signs of intolerance26.

GWCA identified three independent loci in the APOE gene region and two loci in the LPA gene region (Supplementary Table 9). GWCA also showed several other loci with \( P < 5 \times 10^{-8} \) that were not GWAS significant on single-SNP analysis (HGD, RNF175, ISCA1-HTR1A, GLIS3-SLC1A1, LOCI00128657, NKK2-3-SLC25A28 and PE122). These findings will require replication in independent, larger data sets. The significant SNPs in the GWCA analysis explained \( \sim 5\% \) of the variation in LDL-C response to statin treatment. Whether this 5% is clinically relevant should be investigated by other studies. For example, it would be of interest to investigate whether this differential LDL-C lowering is also associated with differential event reduction by statin treatment.

In the current study, we combined the results of 6 randomized clinical trials and 10 observational studies in the first stage. This approach resulted also in combining several types of statins, since different statins were studied in the trials and within the observational studies (Supplementary Table 2). This, and the variation in statin dosage during follow-up for an individual, is a limitation of the current study, since, for example, the impact of the SLCO1B1 variant on statin pharmacogenetics is known to be highly dependent on statin type and dose24,27. To overcome this limitation, the individual study analyses were adjusted for statin dose. Dividing the actual statin dose given by the statin-specific dose equivalent (Supplementary Table 3) gives the statin-adjusted LDL-C reduction. Using this table, we made the different statin dosages and types comparable within the studies. To correct for between-study variance, we used a fixed effect meta-analysis with inverse variance weighting. Since we observed that the SLCO1B1 gene was genome-wide significantly associated with LDL lowering, this highlights the thoroughness of our analytical approach, in which the analyses were correctly adjusted for the type and dose of statins used (Supplementary Table 3). Moreover, a comparison of the estimates of the SNPs between the RCTs (where there are no intra-individual differences in dosages) with the estimates of the SNPs in the observational studies showed large homogeneity between the estimates in the various study designs (Supplementary Fig. 2), indicating that our adjustment for dosage seems to be sufficient within this study.
Another possible limitation of the current study is the influence of the identified genetic variants on baseline LDL-C levels. In pharmacogenetic studies investigating the LDL-C-lowering response to statins, it is important to eliminate the effect of association between the genetic variant and baseline LDL-C levels, since those findings may confound the response to treatment associations. Previous large GWAS studies have shown strong associations between baseline LDL-C levels and genetic variants in SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1, APOE and LPA. To eliminate those possible confounding effects, our response to treatment analyses were adjusted for baseline LDL-C levels. In addition, additional analysis in CARDS and JUPITER suggests no or little influence of genetic associations with baseline LDL-C on the genetic effects on LDL-C-lowering response.

In conclusion, this study is the largest meta-analysis of GWAS for LDL-C response to statin therapy conducted to date. Our results demonstrate that apart from the previously identified APOE and LPA loci, two new loci, SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1 and SLC01B1, also have a modest but genome-wide significant effect on LDL-C response. The minor alleles of the APOE rs445925 and SORT1/CELSR2/PSRC1 rs46776 SNPs were associated with a larger statin response, whereas the minor alleles of the LPA rs10455872 and SLC01B1 rs2990478 SNPs were associated with a smaller statin response. Our findings advance the understanding of the pharmacogenetic architecture of statin response.

Methods
Study populations. The meta-analysis was conducted in the GIST consortium, which includes data from 8 randomized controlled statin trials (RCTs) and 11 prospective, population-based studies. The initial analysis (first stage) was performed in 8,421 statin-treated subjects from 6 RCTs (ASCOT, CARDS, CAP, PRINCE, PROSPER and TNT) and 10,175 statin-treated subjects from 10 observational studies (AGES, ARIC, BioVU, CHS, FHS, GoDARTS I, GodDARTS II, Health ABC, HVH and MESA). Further investigation (second stage) was performed in 21,975 statin-treated subjects from two randomized trials (HPS and JUPITER) and one observational study (Rotterdam Study). Six SNPs were additionally genotyped in the Scandinavian participants of the ASCOT study. The details of the first- and second-stage studies can be found in the Supplementary Tables 1 and 2 and Supplementary Notes 1 and 2.

Subjects. Response to statin treatment was studied in statin-treated subjects only and not in those treated with placebo. Subjects included in the observational studies’ analysis should be treated with statins and have LDL-C measurements before and after start of statin treatment. Subjects of reported or suspected non-European ancestry were excluded. All participants gave written informed consent and the study was approved by all institutional ethics committees.

Outcome measurements. The response to statin treatment was defined as the difference between the natural log-transformed on- and off-treatment LDL-C levels. Control for possible associations with off-treatment LDL-C levels, analyses were adjusted for the natural log-transformed off-treatment LDL-C level. An additive model was assumed and tested using a linear model. All imputed SNPs, regression analysis was performed on expected allele dosage. Analyses were additionally adjusted for age-, sex- and study-specific covariates (for example, ancestry principal components or country). Analyses in the observational studies were, if available, additionally adjusted for the statin dose by the natural logarithm of the dose equivalent as defined in Supplementary Table 3. This table shows the dose equivalent per statin type; dividing the statin dosage of an individual by the dose equivalent shown in Supplementary Table 3 will give the adjusted statin dosage.

Quality control and meta-analysis. Centrally, within each study, SNPs with MAF < 1% or imputation quality < 0.3 were excluded from the analysis. QQ-plots were also assessed by each study to identify significant outliers (Supplementary Fig. 1). The software package METAL was used for performing the meta-analysis (http://www.sph.umich.edu/csg/abecasis/Metal/index.html). A fixed effects, inverse variance weighted approach was used. Using an inverse variance weighted meta-analysis will give smaller weights to studies with large s.e., To correct for possible population stratification, genomic control was performed by adjusting the within-study findings and the meta-analysis results for the genomic inflation factor.

Second stage. SNPs with P values < 5 × 10⁻⁶ in the first-stage meta-analysis were selected for further investigation in a second stage. A maximum of two SNPs per locus were selected, based on statistical significance, except for the APOE locus, for which all genome-wide significant associated SNPs were selected for validation. A total of 246 SNPs, within 158 independent loci, were included in the second stage, which was performed in the JUPITER trial, HPS study and the Rotterdam Study, which all had GWAS data and response to statin treatment available. For 2 of the 246 SNPs, a proxy was used in the JUPITER trial, and 31 SNPs were not available, nor was a proxy SNP. HPS. HPS provided data on 151 directly genotyped SNPs from GWAS and IPLEX experiments, including 48 of the second stage and 103 proxy SNPs (r² > 0.8). Analysis in HPS was not adjusted for within baseline LDL-C levels. In addition, the number of subjects with data varied from SNP-to-SNP and ranges from ~ 4,000 for variants with GWAS data to ~ 18,000 for some candidate genes. Results of the first and second stage were combined using fixed effects, inverse variance weighted meta-analysis and analysed by METAL. As a third stage, six SNPs with P values 5 × 10⁻⁸ < P < 5 × 10⁻⁷ in the combined meta-analysis were selected for additional genotyping in the Scandinavian participants of the ASCOT study. Kaspar assays were designed for four of the SNPs using the KBioscience Primerricker software, and oligos were provided by Integrated DNA technologies (http://eu.idtdna.com/site). Full Kaspar methodology is available from LGC SNP genotyping (http://www.lgcgenomics.com/genotyping/kasp-genotyping-reagents/). Two SNPs (rs981844 and rs13166647) were genotyped using Taqman assays supplied by Life Technologies (http://www.lifetechnologies.com/id/en/home.html) using the standard Taqman protocol. Results of the additional genotyping were combined with results from the first and second stages using a fixed effects, inverse variance weighted meta-analysis and analysed by METAL.

Determination of changes in LDL subfractions. LDL subclasses were classified as described previously using non-denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis of fasting plasma samples taken at baseline and after 6 weeks of simvastatin 40 mg per day (CAP study, n = 579) or 12 weeks of pravastatin 40 mg per day (PRINCE study, n = 2,084). Aliquots of 10 µl of whole plasma were mixed 1:1 with a buffering solution of 20% sucrose and 0.25% bromophenol blue. Electrophoresis of samples and size calibration standards was performed using 2–14% polyacrylamide gradients at 150 V for 3 h following a 15-min pre-run at 75 V. Gels were stained with 0.07% Sudan black for 1 h and stored in a 0.81% acetic acid, 4% methanol solution until they were scanned by computer-assisted densitometry for determination of areas of LDL IVb (22.0–23.2 nm), LDL IVA (23.3–24.1 nm), LDL IIB (24.2–24.6 nm), LDL IIa (24.7–25.5 nm), LDL III (25.6–26.4 nm), LDL IVa (26.5–27.1 nm) and LDL IVb (27.2–28.5 nm). The cholesterol concentrations of the subfractions (mg dL⁻¹ plasma) were determined by multiplying percent of the total stained LDL area for each subfraction by the LDL-C for that sample. For genetic association analyses, subfractions were grouped into large LDL (LDL I + IIa), medium LDL (LDL IIb), small LDL (LDL III + IVa) and very small LDL (LDL IVb) as described previously. A generalized estimating equation method was used to test the association of log change with the interaction of the four SNPs by LDL subfraction.

Effect of off-treatment LDL-C. Effects of genetic variation on treatment response as measured by on-treatment LDL-C could be mediated through effects on the off-treatment LDL-C. To evaluate whether genetic on-treatment LDL-C likely reflects residual effect on off-treatment LDL-C, it is necessary to adjust for the off-treatment LDL-C levels and to correct the maximum likelihood estimate of the adjusted effect of genotype on on-treatment value for the noise in off-treatment values (the noise is both random measurement error and intra-individual variation in usual LDL-C). This analysis was only carried out in CARDOS where baseline measurements were available. From the rules of path analysis, we calculated the direct effect of genotype on on-treatment trait value as β = α(1 − p)/p, where

GWAS analysis. Each study independently performed the GWAS on the difference between natural log-transformed on- and off-treatment LDL-C levels. To
β is the coefficient of regression for on-treatment trait value on genotype adjusted for measured off-treatment value, s is the coefficient of regression of baseline LDL on genotype, r is the base correlation between residuals following measurements of off-treatment traits and δ is the coefficient of regression for on-treatment value on observed off-treatment value. For these calculations, we used ρ = 0.8 as a plausible value for the intraclass correlation based on the within-person correlation in LDL-C values taken over two off-treatment visits in CARDS. The interaction of candidate SNPs with statin versus placebo allocation was assessed in the JUPITER trial, since this study was not involved in the first-stage meta-analysis. Regression models were applied to the combined population of statin- and placebo-treated subjects by including extra terms encoding placebo allocation and the product of placebo allocation with SNP minor allele dose.

GWCA using Genome-Complex Trait Analysis. There may be multiple causal variants in a gene and the total variation that could be explained at a locus may be underestimated if only the most significant SNP in the region is selected. To identify independent SNPs, we ideally can perform a conditional analysis, starting with the top associated SNP, across the whole genome followed by a stepwise procedure of selecting additional SNPs, one by one, according to their conditional P values. Such a strategy would allow the discovery of more than two associated SNPs at a locus. To identify independent SNPs across the genome-wide data, we used an approximate conditional and joint analysis approach implemented in Genome-Complex Trait Analysis (GCTA) software (http://www.complextraitgenomics.com/software/gcta/). We used summary-level statistics from the first- and second-stage genome-wide meta-analysis between correlations between SNPs estimated from CARDS GWAS data. SNPs on different chromosomes or more than 10 Mb distant are assumed to be in linkage equilibrium. The model selection process in GCTA starts with the most significant SNP in the single-SNP meta-analysis across the whole genome with P value < 5 x 10^-8. In the next step, it calculates the P values of all the remaining SNPs conditional on the top SNP that have already been selected in the model. To avoid problems due to collinearity, if the squared multiple correlations between a SNP to be tested and the selected SNPs(s) is larger than a cut-off value, such as 0.9, the conditional P value for that SNP will be set to 1. Select the SNPs with minimum conditional P value that is lower than the cut-off P value. Fit all the selected SNPs jointly in a model and drop the SNPs with the P value that is greater than the cut-off P value. This process is repeated until no SNPs can be added or removed from the model.

Pathway analysis and construction of a statin response network. Genes showing evidence of association (based on direct association or LD (HapMap CEU r² > 0.8)) were reviewed for evidence of involvement in statin response at a pathway level using GeneGo MetaCore (Thomson Reuters (portal.genego.com)). A statin response network was constructed in two stages. First, all genes with a literature-reported involvement in statin response (based on Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)) were identified using GeneGo MetaCore (Supplementary Data 3). Second, these genes were combined with all genes in associated loci (including genes in LD) and a network was constructed based on direct interactions only. By using direct interactions only, we created a conservative network of direct gene interactions that have been consistently linked to statin response in the literature.

eQTL analysis. LDL-C-associated index SNPs (246 SNPs) were used to identify 1,443 LD proxies displaying complete LD (r² = 1) across four HapMap builds in European ancestry samples (CEU) using the SNP tool (http://www.broadinstitute.org/mpg/snap/). The primary index SNPs and LD proxies were selected against a collected database of expression-based eSNP (eSNPs) results, including the following sources: fresh lymphocytes, frozen lymphocytes, leukocyte samples in individuals with Celiac disease, whole-blood samples, lymphoblastoid cell lines (LCL) derived from asthmatic children, HapMap LCL from three populations, a separate study on HapMap CEU LCL, additional LCL populations, primary phytohaemagglutinin-stimulated T cells, CD14 + T cells, peripheral blood monocytes, CD11 + dendritic cells before and after Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection, ovarian, and subcutaneous adipose, stomach, endometrium, ascites, liver, ER+ and ER− breast cancer tumour cells, brain cortex (frontal, parietal, temporal, occipital), subcutaneous, visceral, and umbilical fat, heart, liver, skin, skeletal muscle, bone, cerebellum, three additional large studies of brain regions including prefrontal cortex, visual cortex and cerebellum, respectively, liver, ileum, osteoblast, ileum, lung, skin, and primary fibroblasts. Micro-RNA QTLs were also queried for LCL and skeletal muscle adipose. The collected eSNP results met the criteria for gene expression levels as defined in the original papers. In each case where a LDL-C-associated SNP or proxy was associated with a transcript, we further examined the strongest eSNP for that transcript within the data set (best eSNP), and the LD between the best eSNP and GIST-selected eSNPs to estimate the concordance of the LDL-C and expression signals.

Statin response connectivity map analysis. The Connectivity Map (Cmap) data set is available at the Broad Institute (www.broadinstitute.org/cmap) and contains more than 7,000 expression profiles representing 1,309 compounds used on five different cultured human cancer cell lines (MCF7, shMCF7, HL60, PC3 and SKMELS). We selected (prostate tumour-derived) PC3 cells as they showed the most responsiveness to statins at a genome-wide level. Four statins were included in our analyses: including pravastatin, atorvastatin, simvastatin and rosvastatin. PC3 Instance reference files for each statin treatment were extracted (as defined by Lamb et al.12), that is, a treatment associated to its control pair. Transcripts were considered to show evidence of differential expression with a fold change > 2. A fold change > 1.5 was considered to be suggestive of differential expression only.

Exploration of functional impact among directly and indirectly associated variants. Genes and variants across all LDL-C-associated loci were investigated for evidence of functional perturbation using a range of bioinformatics tools and databases. Variants showing LD (CEU r² > 0.8) with associated variants were explored for impact on coding gene function using AnnoVAR16 and regulatory function using a combination of HaploReg32 and Regulomedb32, which both draw on comprehensive data from the Encyclopedia of DNA Elements (ENCODE)32 and the NIH Roadmap Epigenomics consortium32. Building on the functional annotation, we also identified variants that were shown to mediate eQTLs. Genes in associated loci were also used to query the NIH connectivity map for evidence of differential expression in PC3 cells treated with pravastatin, simvastatin and rosvastatin. By combining a wide range of functional data and pathway support, we were able to build up a view of genes with the highest level of support in statin response.
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