

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/94676/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Tideman, J. Willem L., Fan, Qiao, Polling, Jan Roelof, Guo, Xiaobo, Yazar, Seyhan, Khawaja, Anthony, Höhn, René, Lu, Yi, Jaddoe, Vincent W.V., Yamashiro, Kenji, Yoshikawa, Munemitsu, Gerhold-Ay, Aslihan, Nickels, Stefan, Zeller, Tanja, He, Mingguang, Boutin, Thibaud, Bencic, Goran, Vitart, Veronique, Mackey, David A., Foster, Paul J., MacGregor, Stuart, Williams, Cathy, Saw, Seang Mei, Guggenheim, Jeremy Andrew and Klaver, Caroline C. W. 2016. When do myopia genes have their effect? Comparison of genetic risks between children and adults. *Genetic Epidemiology* 40 (8) , 756 -766. 10.1002/gepi.21999 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/gepi.21999> <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/gepi.21999>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



When do myopia genes have their effect? Comparison of genetic risks between children and adults

Journal:	<i>Genetic Epidemiology</i>
Manuscript ID	GenEpi-16-0002.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Jul-2016
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Tideman, Willem; Erasmus MC, Ophthalmology; Erasmus MC, Epidemiology Fan, Qiao; Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore Eye Research Institute Polling, Jan Roelof; Erasmus MC, Ophthalmology Guo, Xiaobo; Sun Yat-Sen University, Department of Statistical Science, School of Mathematics & Computational Science; SYSU-CMU Shunde International Joint Research Institute; Sun Yat-Sen University, Southern China Research Center of Statistical Science Yazar, Seyhan; Lions Eye Institute, University of Western Australia Khawaja, Anthony; University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Department of Public Health and Primary Care Höhn, René; University Medical Center Mainz, Department of Ophthalmology; Inselspital Universitätsspital Bern, Department of Ophthalmology Lu, Yi; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Statistical Genetics Jaddoe, Vincent; Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Epidemiology; Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Pediatrics Yamashiro, Kenji; Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine, Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences Yoshikawa, Munemitsu; University Graduate School of Medicine, Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences Gerhold-Ay, Aslihan; University Medical Center Mainz, Institute of Medical Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics Nickels, Stefan; University Medical Center Mainz, Department of Ophthalmology Zeller, Tanja; University Heart Center Hamburg, Clinic for General and Interventional Cardiology He, Mingguang; Sun Yat-Sen University Boutin, Thibaud; Institute of Genetics and Molecular Medicine, Medical Research Council Human Genetics Unit Bencic, Goran; Sisters of Mercy University Hospital, Department of Ophthalmology Vitart, Veronique; University of Edinburgh, MRC Human Genetics Unit MRC IGMM Mackey, David; University of Western Australia, Centre for Ophthalmology and Visual Science, Lions Eye Institute Foster, Paul; NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust and King's College; Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust MacGregor, Stuart; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Royal Brisbane Hospital, Statistical Genetics Williams, Cathy; University of Bristol School of Social and Community</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	Medicine Saw, Seang-Mei; National University of Singapore and National University Health System, Ophthalmology; Duke-National University of Singapore, Graduate Medical School; Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre; Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore and National University Health System Guggenheim, Jeremy; School of Optometry & Vision Sciences Klaver, Caroline; Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Epidemiology; Erasmus Medical Center, Ophthalmology
Key Words:	myopia, development, genetic risk, SNPs

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

When do myopia genes have their effect? Comparison of genetic risks between children and adults

J.W.L. Tideman^{1,2}, Q. Fan³, J.R. Polling^{1,4}, X. Guo^{5,6,7}, S. Yazar⁸, A. Khawaja⁹, R. Höhn^{10,11}, Yi Lu¹², V.W.V. Jaddoe², K. Yamashiro¹³, M. Yoshikawa¹³, A. Gerhold-Ay¹⁴, S. Nickels¹⁰, T. Zeller¹⁵, M. He^{16,17}, T. Boutin¹⁸, G. Bencic¹⁹, V. Vitart¹⁸, D.A. Mackey²⁰, P.J. Foster²¹, S. MacGregor¹², C. Williams²², S.M. Saw^{3,23}, J.A. Guggenheim^{24,25}, C.C.W. Klaver^{1,2,25} and the CREAM consortium

1 Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Ophthalmology 2 Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Epidemiology 3 Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore 4 School of Applied Science Utrecht, Department of Orthoptics 5 Sun Yat-Sen University, Department of Statistical Science, School of Mathematics & Computational Science 6 SYSU-CMU Shunde International Joint Research Institute 7 Southern China Research Center of Statistical Science, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, GD 510275, China 8 Lions Eye Institute, University of Western Australia, Centre for Ophthalmology and Visual Science 9 Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Institute of Public Health, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Cambridge, United Kingdom. 10 University Medical Center, Department of Ophthalmology, Mainz, Germany 11 Department of Ophthalmology, Inselspital, Bern, Switzerland 12 Statistical Genetics, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, Australia 13 Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto, Japan 14 University Medical Center Mainz, Institute of Medical Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, Mainz, Germany 15 University Heart Center Hamburg, Clinic for General and Interventional Cardiology, Hamburg, Germany 16 Centre for Eye Research Australia, University of Melbourne, Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, Melbourne, Australia 17 State Key Laboratory of Ophthalmology, Zhongshan Ophthalmic Center, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China 18 Medical Research Council Human Genetics Unit, Institute of Genetics and Molecular Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH4 2XU, UK 19 Department of Ophthalmology, Sisters of Mercy University Hospital, Zagreb, Croatia 20 Centre for Ophthalmology and Visual Science, Lions Eye Institute, University of Western Australia 21 9 NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust & UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, London, United Kingdom 22 School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, England 23 National university of Singapore Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore 24 School of Optometry & Vision Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales 25 These authors jointly led this work

Conflict of Interest: The authors have indicated they have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose

Correspondence:

Prof. Dr. Caroline C.W. Klaver, MD, PhD, Erasmus Medical Centre - Sophia Children's Hospital, AL2808; PO Box 2060, 3000 CB Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

E-mail: c.c.w.klaver@erasmusmc.nl

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Previous studies have identified many genetic loci for refractive error and myopia. We aimed to investigate the effect of these loci on ocular biometry as a function of age in children, adolescents and adults.

Methods: The study population consisted of three age-groups identified from the international CREAM consortium: 5,490 individuals aged <10 years; 5,000 aged 10-25 years; and 16,274 aged >25 years. All participants had undergone standard ophthalmic examination including measurements of axial length (AL) and corneal radius (CR). We examined the lead SNP at all 39 currently known genetic loci for refractive error identified from genome-wide association studies (GWAS), as well as a combined genetic risk score (GRS). The beta coefficient for association between SNP genotype or GRS versus AL/CR was compared across the 3 age groups, adjusting for age, sex, and principal components. Analyses were Bonferroni-corrected.

Results: In the age-group <10 years, 3 loci (*GJD2*, *CHRNA3*, *ZIC2*) were associated with AL/CR. In the age-group 10-25 years, 4 loci (*BMP2*, *KCNQ5*, *A2BP1*, *CACNA1D*) were associated; and in adults 20 loci were associated. Association with GRS increased with age; $\beta = 0.0016$ per risk allele ($P = 2E-08$) in <10 years, 0.0033 ($P = 5E-15$) in 10-25 year-olds, and 0.0048 ($P = 1E-72$) in adults. Genes with strongest effects (*LAMA2*, *GJD2*) had an early effect that increased with age.

Conclusion: Our results provide insights on the age span during which myopia genes exert their effect. These insights form the basis for understanding the mechanisms underlying high and pathological myopia.

Key words: myopia, genetic risk, development, SNPs

INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of myopia (nearsightedness) has increased dramatically in developed countries in recent decades [Bar Dayan, et al. 2005; Vitale, et al. 2009]. Myopia is a complex, multifactorial disease with increasing public health burden due to a strong rise worldwide. In particular high myopia is associated with blinding complications such as myopic macular degeneration, glaucoma and retinal detachment [Curtin and Karlin 1971; McBrien and Gentle 2003; Saw 2006]. High myopia mostly has its onset in early childhood before age 10 years [Fledelius 2000].

The eye's dimensions alter markedly during the peak development phase between birth and the late teenage years, ultimately exerting very strong effects on final refractive error (RE) in later adult life. A complex process called emmetropisation aims to coordinate ocular development, bringing light into clear focus on the retina. Early life myopia is characteristically associated with excessive axial length (AL) increase. This results in a mismatch of the optical effects of the various refractive components of the eye, resulting in a focal point in front of the retina. Such a mismatch can be described by the ratio of AL to corneal radius (CR), AL/CR ratio, which has a high correlation with RE [Hashemi, et al. 2013; Ip, et al. 2007] and is independent of cycloplegia which may vary between studies.

Various studies have examined the heritability of myopia showing increased risk for first-degree relatives of affected individuals [Farbrother, et al. 2004; Guggenheim, et al. 2000] and twins [Sanfilippo, et al. 2010; Young, et al. 2007]. Numerous genetic loci that cause familial high myopia (*MYP1-18*) have been discovered using linkage analysis [Baird, et al. 2010]. More recently, genome wide association studies (GWAS) in large cohorts have been performed to identify further determinants for REs in the general population. The first single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) identified were near *GJD2* [Solouki, et al. 2010] and *RASGRF1* [Solouki, et al. 2010]. Later many more loci were found in studies of large populations (CREAM; 23andMe)[Kiefer, et al. 2013; Verhoeven, et al. 2013] [Wojciechowski and Hysi 2013].

1
2
3 All previously published refractive error GWAS studies were performed in cohorts
4 enrolling participants aged 25 years and older. We aimed to study the effect size of the 39
5 GWAS-identified genetic regions associated with refractive error to date, as a function of age.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **METHODS**

12 **Study specific analysis**

13
14 We included 18 cohorts from 8 different countries in Europe, Asia and Oceania, with a total of
15 5,490 children <10 years, 5,000 individuals of 10-25 years, and 16,274 adults, all with
16 phenotypic and genome-wide genotypic data available. Details on subject recruitment
17 procedures can be found in the supplemental materials. Each study participant was genotyped
18 with either an Affymetrix or Illumina SNP array (supplemental table I). All studies were
19 conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki. The studies were approved by the local
20 review boards. Written, informed consent for the collection and analysis of measurements of all
21 study participants was obtained.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **SNPs**

34
35 A total of 39 SNPs were included in this analysis. The SNPs were selected based on their
36 known association with RE and myopia in the GWAS carried out by CREAM [Verhoeven, et al.
37 2013] and 23andMe [Kiefer, et al. 2013](supplementary table II). An unweighted genetic risk
38 score (GRS) was calculated for each participant by summing the dosage of risk alleles (scale 0-
39 2) for all 39 SNPs. The risk score was normally distributed.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Ocular biometry**

47
48 The ocular biometry measurements included AL and CR, and the AL/CR ratio was calculated.
49 Multiple measurements of AL and CR were taken of the right eye and left eye, were averaged to
50 calculate a mean AL and CR for each eye. The average AL of both eyes was divided by the
51 average CR of both eyes to calculate the AL/CR ratio. Details of the phenotypic assessment
52 protocols/instruments used in each study can be found in the supplemental material.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Meta-analysis

All studies performed linear regression models with each SNP or the GRS as determinants, and the AL/CR ratio as outcome. Analyses were adjusted for the potentially confounding effects of age and gender, and additionally – to account for ancestry differences within the sample – for principal components where applicable. A meta-analysis was performed to estimate the beta effects using an inversed variance weighted fixed effect model with METAL [Willer, et al. 2010]. Meta-analyses were performed in each age stratum separately, and in combined strata of all participants <25 years. Several children measured in TEST (Twins Eye Study Tasmania) and GTES (Guangzhou Twin Eye Study) had follow up measurements at an older age; therefore, only data from the oldest age were used in the combined analysis. In the Asian studies the following SNPs were excluded due to low minor allele frequency (MAF) <0.05 in the Chinese population: rs17428076, rs1656404, rs14165, rs13091182, rs12205363, rs11145465, rs10882165, and rs17183295.

Pathway analysis

Loci with significant effects ($P < 0.05$) were further explored to identify differences in effect of early-onset genes (significant loci identified in groups <10 years, 10-25 years or the combined analysis) and late-onset genes (adult subjects). Data were analysed through the use of QIAGEN's Ingenuity®

Pathway Analysis (IPA®, QIAGEN Redwood City, www.qiagen.com/ingenuity) and the online software tool Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (DAVID) [Huang da, et al. 2009a; Huang da, et al. 2009b].

RESULTS

Our study sample of children <10 years comprised 5,490 participants derived from 5 studies; one of European ancestry (TEST), three of Asian ancestry (SCORM, STARS, and Guangzhou Twins), and one of mixed European, African, and Asian ancestry (Generation R). Our sample of individuals aged 10-25 years included 5,000 participants derived from 6 studies; 4 of European ancestry (TEST, ALSPAC, BATS and RAINE), and 2 of Asian (STARS, Guangzhou Twins) ancestry. Our sample of adults >25 years comprised 16,274 participants derived from 10 studies; 9 of European ancestry (Croatia Split, -Kurcula and – Vis study, Gothenburg Health Study, EPIC-Norfolk and the Rotterdam Study I-III), and one Asian study (Nagahama). General characteristics per study are shown in Table I.

Genetic risk score

The genetic risk score was associated with a higher AL/CR ratio even in children aged <10 years (table II), and this association increased in magnitude with older age. Specifically, AL/CR increased with each age category from β 0.0019 (SD 0.0003) per risk allele in children <10 years, to 0.0033 (SD 0.0004) in participants aged 10-25 years, to 0.0051 (SD 0.0003) in adults (figure I). Only the adult group showed evidence for heterogeneity (heterogeneity *P*-value 0.0005) between studies, therefore, meta-analyses for this age category were also performed using the random effect model (β 0.0048; SD 0.0007; supplementary table IV). The variance explained by the genetic risk score increased from 0.7% in the children aged 6 from the Generation R study, to 3.7% for the adult participants in the RS I-III (Fig II).

Genetic loci

In children <10 years, 9/39 loci were significant at $P < 0.05$, and 3/39 were significant after correction for multiple-testing for 39 SNPs ($P < 0.00128$). The 3 loci significant after Bonferroni correction were in the vicinity of the genes *GJD2*, *ZIC2* and *CHRNA2*. The 2 nominally-significant

1
2
3 loci with the greatest effect size (beta) were close to the *CHRNA2* and *PRSS56* genes. The other
4
5 5 loci were near *KCNQ5*, *SHISA6*, *KCNMA1*, *BMP2* and *BICC1*. Interestingly, the SNP at the
6
7 *BMP2* locus had a reversed effect from that observed in adult samples, i.e., the risk allele was
8
9 associated with a lower AL/CR ratio. In individuals aged 10 - 25 years, 10/39 loci showed
10
11 nominally significant association with AL/CR ratio, of which 5 survived Bonferroni correction
12
13 (*BMP2*, *TOX*, *KCNQ5*, *A2BP1* and *CACNA1D*). Five of the 10 SNPs above were already
14
15 nominal significantly associated with AL/CR ratio in children <10 years (*GJD2*, *BICC1*, *ZIC2*,
16
17 *BMP2* and *PRSS56*); of the remaining nominally-significant loci, the variant with the greatest
18
19 effect in 10-25 year-olds was the SNP at the *LAMA2* locus. One variant differed significantly in
20
21 effect between children <10 years and those aged 10-25 years. This was the SNP at the *BMP2*
22
23 locus which, as mentioned above, showed an opposite effect to that expected in children aged
24
25 <10 years (Figure III). One of the loci (*TOX*) showed evidence for heterogeneity (supplementary
26
27 table III) in effect between study cohorts in the age category 10-25 years (Heterogeneity $P =$
28
29 0.001). With random effect model the effect of this SNP decreased to β 0.0062 (SE 0.0073; P
30
31 0.40)(supplementary table IV). In the combined analysis of all studies <25 years, *BICC1* and
32
33 *PRSS56* reached Bonferroni adjusted significance; one additional locus (*PDE11A*) showed a
34
35 nominally significant effect for AL/CR ratio. In adults, 31/39 loci showed a significant effect, of
36
37 which 19/39 were Bonferroni significant. All loci, except for *ZBTB38* (β -0.0004; SE 0.0019),
38
39 showed an association in the expected direction (i.e. risk allele associated with a higher AL/CR
40
41 ratio). As in 10-25 years, one locus significant in adults showed evidence for heterogeneity
42
43 (*LOC100506035*); with random effect model this locus lost statistical significance
44
45 (supplementary table III and IV). Figure IV displays all estimated effect sizes per age group.

51 Pathway analysis

52
53 Pathway analyses were performed to gain insight into the mechanisms for early versus late-
54
55 onset eye growth and myopia development. We hypothesized that loci with at least a moderate
56
57 effect in children and adolescents most likely had an early onset. Hence, a locus was defined as
58
59

1
2
3 early onset when nominally significant ($P < 0.05$) in the groups <25 years and no evidence for
4 heterogeneity (Figure IV; loci above green line). Loci nominally significant in the adult population
5 without a significant effect <25 years were grouped as late onset genes (Figure IV; loci below
6 green line).
7
8
9
10

11 **Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA)**

12 Genes with an early onset in the age group <25 years were enriched in pathways of auditory
13 disease, organismal injury and abnormalities, and gastrointestinal disease (at FDR <5%). The
14 genes that were significantly associated in adults predisposed to connective tissue disorders,
15 developmental disorder (e.g. microphthalmia; *BMP4* and *SIX6*), and also gastrointestinal
16 disease (supplementary table V).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (DAVID)**

26 Using the categories defined above, early-onset genes were annotated to ion channels and ion
27 transport (*CACNA1D*, *CHRNA1*, *GJD2*, *KCNMA1* and *KCNQ5*). Late onset genes appeared to
28 be more related to neuron differentiation and visual perception (*RORB*, *SIX6*, *RASGRF1*,
29 *CHD7*, *RGR*, *RDH5* and *GRIA4*.) (supplementary table VI).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **DISCUSSION:**

39 This study identifies the age span during which the known GWAS-identified loci for refractive
40 error have their greatest effect. The current meta-analysis suggests that specific loci had their
41 greatest effect in young children (*CHRNA1*, *ZIC2*, *KCNMA1*), while others reached the greatest
42 effect during early teenage years (*BMP2*, *CACNA1D*, *A2BP1*). However, most appeared to have
43 a gradual effect during the entire age span of myopia development (*LAMA2*, *LRRC4C*, *DLX1*,
44 *RDH5*, *GRIA4*, *RGR*, *SIX6*).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Strengths of this study were the large sample size, the comparison across 3 distinct age
54 categories, and the precision in measurements of ocular biometry. A drawback was the lack of
55 complete cycloplegic refraction in children in several studies, which jeopardized valid
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measurements of RE in this age category. Thus, we used AL/CR ratio as an indicator of RE to
4
5 avoid heterogeneity in the outcome. This ratio has a high correlation with RE [Hashemi, et al.
6
7 2013; Ip, et al. 2007] and was available from all studies in the consortium. Another limitation
8
9 was the lack of power to detect statistically significant differences between the age groups for
10
11 most genes. A pooled analysis would have increased statistical power, but raw data from
12
13 individual participants were not available. Ideally, a study using longitudinal data of the same
14
15 children over different age periods would have the best study design for the current analysis.
16
17

18
19 Little has been reported on the development and progression of myopia as a function of
20
21 age; however, a number of studies investigated the relationship between development of ocular
22
23 biometry related to age. Until the age of 25 years, corneal curvature, the crystalline lens, and
24
25 axial length all evolve with age, and thereby influence refractive error. The cornea increases in
26
27 radius until preschool age leading to flattening of the corneal curvature and decrease in
28
29 refractive power [Augusteyn, et al. 2012]; the crystalline lens grows until 10 years of age, also
30
31 reducing refractive power [Mutti, et al. 2012; Mutti, et al. 1998]. This decrease in refractive
32
33 power is compensated by axial elongation which increases from 17 mm in newborns [Lim, et al.
34
35 2015] to 23.3 mm in 12-13 year olds [French, et al. 2012]. The average AL in emmetropic adults
36
37 is 23.5 mm [Fotedar, et al. 2010; Gordon and Donzis 1985]. The highest growth rate of AL
38
39 occurs in the first years of life and relates to emmetropisation; the growth rate after early teens
40
41 is more gradual but mainly relates to myopisation [Gordon and Donzis 1985]. The exact age at
42
43 which eye growth stops is not known; generally this occurs before age 20 years, but increase in
44
45 AL has been described up to the age of 25 years in university students [Fledelius 2000;
46
47 Midelfart, et al. 1992].
48
49

50
51 One of the key detected GWAS-identified loci for refractive error is on chromosome 15
52
53 near the *GJD2* gene, that encodes a gap junction protein known as CX36. This protein not only
54
55 processes cone-to-cone and cone-to-rod signals [Lee, et al. 2003] but also directs signaling
56
57 between other retinal cells [Feigenspan, et al. 2001; Hidaka, et al. 2004]. This cell-to-cell
58
59
60

1
2
3 communication appears to be under regulation of light exposure and dopamine [Bloomfield and
4 Volgyi 2009], two factors that have an established role in eye growth and myopia development.
5
6 Our data suggest that *GJD2* has an early-onset, indicating that altered retinal cell signaling,
7
8 perhaps via reduced light exposure and low dopamine levels, may be a first step in myopia
9
10 development. As expected, some early-onset genes also had a reported role in eye
11
12 development. Knockout of *LAMA2*, a gene encoding the large extracellular glycoprotein laminin-
13
14 $\alpha 2$; causes growth retardation including smaller eyes with compressed cellular layers [Gupta, et
15
16 al. 2012]. Mutations in the serine protease gene *PRSS56* cause a severe decrease of AL
17
18 leading to microphthalmia [Nair, et al. 2011]. Another developmental gene is *ZIC2*, an
19
20 enhancer-binding factor required for embryonic stem cell specification [Luo, et al. 2015]. This
21
22 gene may be important for development of retinal architecture, as it is known to be involved in
23
24 differentiation and proliferation of retinal progenitor cells [Watabe, et al. 2011], and development
25
26 of retinal ganglion cell trajectories [Herrera, et al. 2003]. Strikingly, several other genes involved
27
28 in eye development, such as *SIX6*, *CDH7*, and *DLX1*, did not show an early onset but were
29
30 more significant after the age of 10 years. Other early-onset genes were ion channels such as
31
32 *KCNQ5*, a potassium channel present in cone and rod photoreceptors [Zhang, et al. 2011], and
33
34 *CACNA1D*, a calcium channel present in photoreceptors [Xiao, et al. 2007]. *CHRNA3* has as yet
35
36 an unknown role in myopia development. It encodes the γ subunit of the embryonal
37
38 acetylcholine receptor, which is widely expressed in the retina [Hruska, et al. 1978; Hutchins
39
40 and Hollyfield 1985], and is associated with multiple pterygium syndrome [Vogt, et al. 2012].
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Several remarkable patterns of effect were notable. For instance, the lead SNPs at the
48
49 *BMP2*, *MYO1D*, *PTPRR*, and *BMP4* loci showed an opposite effect in children <10 years than
50
51 in those who were older. This is not uncommon in biology, as such a trajectory has also been
52
53 described for the *FTO* locus in relation to body mass index in children [Sovio, et al. 2011].
54
55 Interestingly, gene expression studies of *BMP2* in chickens showed that mRNA of this gene in
56
57 the retinal pigment epithelium is up- or down-regulated depending on the location of the image
58
59
60

1
2
3 plane [Zhang, et al. 2012]. When the image was focused behind the retina, mRNA was
4
5 downregulated and the vitreous chamber enlarged. This underscores a bidirectional role for
6
7 *BMP2* in modulation of eye growth.
8

9
10 Most genes had a late onset. *BMP4* has a similar function to *BMP2* as it is also responds
11
12 to optical defocus with bidirectional regulation of eye growth [Zhang, et al. 2013]. *SIX6* is a
13
14 DNA-binding homeobox and has a SIX domain, which binds downstream effector molecules. It
15
16 is known to influence eye size in zebrafish with knocked down *SIX6* expression [Iglesias, et al.
17
18 2014]. Other genes play a less obvious role in myopiagenesis. *MYO1D* is involved in membrane
19
20 trafficking in the recycling pathway and expressed in oligodendrites [Benesh, et al. 2012].
21
22 *RORB*, a gene encoding a nuclear receptor-directing photoreceptor differentiation, is known to
23
24 activate and generate S-opsin [Jia, et al. 2009; Srinivas, et al. 2006]. *DLX1* belongs to the DLX
25
26 family of homeobox transcription factors, and produces GABAergic interneurons during
27
28 embryonic development.
29
30

31
32 In conclusion, our study suggests that only a small proportion of the currently known
33
34 GWAS-identified loci for RE exert their full effect at a young age. Furthermore, some of the
35
36 pathways previously-identified by GWAS meta-analyses [Verhoeven, et al. 2013] can now be
37
38 separated into early- and late-onset pathways. For example, genes coding for ion channels
39
40 typically had an early onset, while genes related to connective tissue and visual feedback
41
42 mechanisms appeared to become more important at a later age. As the currently known genes
43
44 play only a minor role in early-onset myopia, we question whether this type of myopia is caused
45
46 by common variants in other genes, or whether rare variants with large effects determine early-
47
48 onset. Future research may shed more light on genes for early-onset myopia, and unravelling
49
50 these genes will open up strategies for prevention of high myopia.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I Participating studies and characteristics stratified per age group

Age <10 years				
Study	N	AL/CR (SD; range)	Age (SD)	Gender, % Female
STARS	207	2.99 (0.150; 2.76 – 3.46)	5.45 (2.11)	47.3
Generation R	3,874	2.87 (0.083; 2.38 – 3.90)	6.18 (0.51)	50.3
SCORM	898	3.02 (0.112; 2.63 – 3.45)	7.48 (0.87)	47.7
TEST	166	2.94 (0.101; 2.65 – 3.25)	7.53 (1.21)	52.4
GTES	345	2.97 (0.100; 2.62 – 3.45)	8.73 (0.79)	50.1
Total	5,490			
Age 10-25 years				
STARS	96	3.23 (0.127; 2.95 – 3.60)	12.23 (1.7)	58.3
GTES	699	3.13 (0.147; 2.58 – 3.82)	14.83 (1.2)	52.9
TEST	182	2.99 (0.108; 2.68 – 3.51)	15.16 (4.0)	60.4
ALSPAC	1,996	2.99 (0.099; 2.57 – 3.52)	15.46 (0.3)	53.6
BATS	983	3.03 (0.106; 2.67 – 3.82)	19.07 (3.2)	53.8
RAINE	1,044	3.05 (0.104; 2.63 – 3.54)	20.04 (0.4)	48.9
Total	5,000			
Age >25 years				
Nagahama	2,762	3.13 (0.153; 2.62 – 3.86)	52.05 (13.8)	49.0
Croatia-Split	730	3.02 (0.128; 2.38 – 3.90)	52.16 (13.0)	61.2
Croatia Korcula	832	2.99 (0.203; 2.26 – 5.73)	56.62 (13.3)	64.7
Croatia-Vis	573	2.99 (0.121; 2.50 – 3.83)	55.93 (13.8)	60.4
GHS 2	936	3.07 (0.160; 2.50 – 4.01)	59.26 (10.6)	50.0
GHS 1	1,919	3.06 (0.151; 2.30 – 3.88)	60.17 (10.7)	47.1
EPIC-Norfolk	6,051	3.05 (0.146; 2.42 – 3.95)	68.9 (8.0)	54.3
RS I-III	2,471	3.05 (0.143; 2.43 – 3.86)	70.02 (8.8)	53.6
Total	16,274			

*GTES= Guangzhou Twin Eye Study, RS I-III = Rotterdam Study I-III, GHS=Gutenberg Health Study

Table II Effect size of myopia related genes in age groups <10 years, 10-25 years, 25> years

Variant	Chr	Gene	RA	<10 years		10 - 25 years		Combined		>25 years	
				Beta (SE)	P	Beta (SE)	P	Beta (SE)	P	Beta (SE)	P
Allele Score	-	-	-	0.0019 (0.0003)	10⁻¹¹	0.0033 (0.0004)	10⁻¹⁵	0.0024 (0.0002)	10⁻²⁴	0.0051(0.0003)	10⁻⁷²
rs1652333	1	CD55	G	0.0033 (0.0017)	0.05	0.0006 (0.0024)	0.80	0.0026 (0.0014)	0.07	0.0084(0.0017)	10⁻⁶
rs4373767	1	ZC3H11B	T	0.0010 (0.0017)	0.55	0.0032 (0.0023)	0.16	0.0019 (0.0014)	0.16	0.0053(0.0017)	0.002
rs17412774	2	PABPCP2	A	0.0007 (0.0017)	0.69	0.0010 (0.0023)	0.67	0.0008 (0.0014)	0.57	0.0063(0.0017)	10⁻⁴
rs17428076	2	DLX1	C	0.0017 (0.0021)	0.43	0.0029 (0.0027)	0.28	0.0024 (0.0017)	0.16	0.0073(0.0021)	10⁻⁴
rs1898585	2	PDE11A	T	0.0022 (0.0019)	0.26	0.0050 (0.0029)	0.09	0.0034 (0.0017)	0.04	0.0057(0.0021)	0.007
rs1656404	2	PRSS56	A	0.0073 (0.0024)	0.002	0.0067 (0.0033)	0.04	0.0069 (0.0019)	10⁻⁴	0.0079(0.0024)	0.001
rs1881492	2	CHRNA1	T	0.0086 (0.0024)	10⁻⁴	0.0039 (0.0031)	0.21	0.0064 (0.0020)	0.001	0.0085(0.0022)	10⁻⁵
rs14165	3	CACNA1D	G	0.0035 (0.0020)	0.08	0.0082 (0.0026)	0.001	0.0055 (0.0016)	0.001	0.0055(0.0020)	0.005
rs13091182	3	ZBTB38	G	0.0008 (0.0020)	0.69	-0.0001 (0.0024)	0.98	0.0007 (0.0015)	0.66	-0.0004(0.0019)	0.83
rs9307551	4	LOC100506035	A	0.0007 (0.0019)	0.70	0.0037 (0.0026)	0.16	0.0020 (0.0016)	0.20	0.0051(0.0020)	0.008
rs5022942	4	BMP3	A	0.0014 (0.0018)	0.44	-0.0016 (0.0026)	0.54	0.0007 (0.0015)	0.63	0.0006(0.0020)	0.78
rs7744813	6	KCNQ5	A	0.0050 (0.0017)	0.004	0.0081 (0.0023)	10⁻⁴	0.0060 (0.0014)	10⁻⁵	0.0066(0.0018)	10⁻⁴
rs12205363	6	LAMA2	T	0.0041 (0.0041)	0.31	0.0138 (0.0046)	0.003	0.0094 (0.0031)	0.003	0.0229(0.0036)	10⁻¹⁰
rs7829127	8	ZMAT4	A	0.0025 (0.0020)	0.22	0.0019 (0.0028)	0.49	0.0025 (0.0017)	0.13	0.0072(0.0021)	0.001
rs7837791	8	TOX	G	0.0029 (0.0016)	0.06	0.0083 (0.0022)	10⁻⁴	0.0050 (0.0013)	10⁻⁴	0.0042(0.0017)	0.012
rs4237036	8	CHD7	T	0.0001 (0.0018)	0.96	0.0032 (0.0024)	0.18	0.0013 (0.0014)	0.37	0.0058(0.0018)	0.001
rs11145465	9	TJP2	A	0.0035 (0.0022)	0.11	0.0027 (0.0028)	0.33	0.0029 (0.0017)	0.09	0.0062(0.0021)	0.004
rs7042950	9	RORB	G	0.0028 (0.0019)	0.14	0.0031 (0.0026)	0.24	0.0027 (0.0016)	0.08	0.0071(0.0020)	10⁻⁴
rs7084402	10	BICC1	G	0.0035 (0.0016)	0.03	0.0066 (0.0023)	0.004	0.0050 (0.0013)	10⁻⁴	0.0074(0.0017)	10⁻⁶
rs6480859	10	KCNMA1	T	0.0040 (0.0018)	0.02	0.0037 (0.0023)	0.10	0.0040 (0.0014)	0.004	0.0015(0.0017)	0.38
rs745480	10	RGR	G	0.0007 (0.0016)	0.67	0.0021 (0.0022)	0.34	0.0011 (0.0013)	0.40	0.0055(0.0017)	0.001
rs10882165	10	CYP26A1	T	0.0012 (0.0018)	0.49	0.0002 (0.0024)	0.93	0.0007 (0.0014)	0.61	0.0011(0.0018)	0.54
rs1381566	11	LRRRC4C	G	0.0026 (0.0020)	0.21	0.0040 (0.0034)	0.23	0.0028 (0.0018)	0.12	0.0093(0.0022)	10⁻⁵
rs2155413	11	DLG2	A	0.0022 (0.0017)	0.18	0.0027 (0.0022)	0.23	0.0023 (0.0013)	0.09	0.0021(0.0017)	0.21
rs11601239	11	GRIA4	C	0.0011 (0.0016)	0.50	0.0027 (0.0022)	0.22	0.0014 (0.0013)	0.30	0.0055(0.0017)	0.001
rs3138144	12	RDH5	G	0.0020 (0.0021)	0.35	0.0039 (0.0027)	0.16	0.0028 (0.0017)	0.10	0.0045(0.0019)	0.02
rs12229663	12	PTPRR	A	-0.0023 (0.0019)	0.21	0.0046 (0.0026)	0.08	0.0000 (0.0016)	1.00	0.0069(0.0019)	10⁻⁴
rs8000973	13	ZIC2	C	0.0058 (0.0017)	10⁻⁴	0.0058 (0.0023)	0.01	0.0059 (0.0014)	10⁻⁵	0.0027(0.0017)	0.10
rs2184971	13	PCCA	A	0.0008 (0.0016)	0.61	0.0006 (0.0023)	0.80	0.0009 (0.0014)	0.48	0.0021(0.0017)	0.21
rs66913363	14	BMP4	G	-0.0025 (0.0017)	0.15	0.0040 (0.0024)	0.10	0.0006 (0.0014)	0.68	0.0047(0.0017)	0.006
rs1254319	14	SIX6	A	0.0007 (0.0017)	0.68	0.0044 (0.0024)	0.07	0.0017 (0.0014)	0.22	0.0054(0.0018)	0.002
rs524952	15	GJD2	A	0.0069 (0.0016)	10⁻⁵	0.0068 (0.0023)	0.003	0.0067 (0.0013)	10⁻⁷	0.0122(0.0016)	10⁻¹⁴
rs4778879	15	RASGRF1	G	0.0018 (0.0017)	0.29	0.0033 (0.0023)	0.15	0.0019 (0.0014)	0.17	0.0051(0.0017)	0.002
rs17648524	16	A2BP1	C	0.0018 (0.0018)	0.33	0.0079 (0.0024)	0.001	0.0039 (0.0015)	0.01	0.0077(0.0019)	10⁻⁵
rs2969180	17	SHISA6	A	0.0035 (0.0016)	0.03	0.0017 (0.0023)	0.46	0.0027 (0.0014)	0.05	0.0079(0.0017)	10⁻⁶
rs17183295	17	MYO1D	T	-0.0033 (0.0023)	0.16	0.0009 (0.0030)	0.76	-0.0018 (0.0018)	0.33	0.0089(0.0023)	10⁻⁴

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

rs4793501	17	KCNJ2	T	0.0029 (0.0016)	0.08	0.0001 (0.0022)	0.95	0.0019 (0.0013)	0.16	0.0041(0.0017)	0.015
rs12971120	18	CNDP2	A	0.0002 (0.0019)	0.93	0.0048 (0.0026)	0.07	0.0017 (0.0015)	0.27	0.0024(0.0019)	0.22
rs235770	20	BMP2	T	-0.0043 (0.0018)	0.02	0.0121 (0.0025)	10^-6	0.0008 (0.0015)	0.60	0.0043(0.0017)	0.013

Values are betas (SE) and *P*-values, from linear regression models adjusted for sex, age and principal components if applicable meta-analysed with inversed variance meta-analysis in METAL. Bold: *P* <0.05.

For Peer Review

1
2
3 **Figure I.** Association between genetic risk score and myopia in the three age groups
4

5 **Figure II.** Association between non-weighted genetic risk score and AL/CR ratio in children and adults.
6

7 **Figure III.** Increased effect on AL/CR ratio with age for *BMP2* gene.
8


9 **Figure IV.** Distribution of effects on AL/CR ratio per myopia-related gene in three age groups
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **REFERENCES**

- 21
22 Augusteyn RC, Nankivil D, Mohamed A, Maceo B, Pierre F, Parel JM. 2012. Human ocular biometry. *Exp*
23 *Eye Res* 102:70-5.
24
25 Baird PN, Schache M, Dirani M. 2010. The GENes in Myopia (GEM) study in understanding the aetiology
26 of refractive errors. *Prog Retin Eye Res* 29(6):520-42.
27
28 Bar Dayan Y, Levin A, Morad Y, Grotto I, Ben-David R, Goldberg A, Onn E, Avni I, Levi Y, Benyamini OG.
29 2005. The changing prevalence of myopia in young adults: a 13-year series of population-based
30 prevalence surveys. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 46(8):2760-5.
31
32 Benesh AE, Fleming JT, Chiang C, Carter BD, Tyska MJ. 2012. Expression and localization of myosin-1d in
33 the developing nervous system. *Brain Res* 1440:9-22.
34
35 Bloomfield SA, Volgyi B. 2009. The diverse functional roles and regulation of neuronal gap junctions in
36 the retina. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 10(7):495-506.
37
38 Curtin BJ, Karlin DB. 1971. Axial length measurements and fundus changes of the myopic eye. *Am J*
39 *Ophthalmol* 71(1 Pt 1):42-53.
40
41 Farbrother JE, Kirov G, Owen MJ, Guggenheim JA. 2004. Family aggregation of high myopia: estimation
42 of the sibling recurrence risk ratio. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 45(9):2873-8.
43
44 Feigenspan A, Teubner B, Willecke K, Weiler R. 2001. Expression of neuronal connexin36 in All amacrine
45 cells of the mammalian retina. *J Neurosci* 21(1):230-9.
46
47 Fledelius HC. 2000. Myopia profile in Copenhagen medical students 1996-98. Refractive stability over a
48 century is suggested. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand* 78(5):501-5.
49
50 Fotedar R, Wang JJ, Burlutsky G, Morgan IG, Rose K, Wong TY, Mitchell P. 2010. Distribution of axial
51 length and ocular biometry measured using partial coherence laser interferometry (IOL Master)
52 in an older white population. *Ophthalmology* 117(3):417-23.
53
54 French AN, O'Donoghue L, Morgan IG, Saunders KJ, Mitchell P, Rose KA. 2012. Comparison of refraction
55 and ocular biometry in European Caucasian children living in Northern Ireland and Sydney,
56 Australia. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 53(7):4021-31.
57
58 Gordon RA, Donzis PB. 1985. Refractive development of the human eye. *Arch Ophthalmol* 103(6):785-9.
59
60 Guggenheim JA, Kirov G, Hodson SA. 2000. The heritability of high myopia: a reanalysis of Goldschmidt's
data. *J Med Genet* 37(3):227-31.
Gupta VA, Kawahara G, Myers JA, Chen AT, Hall TE, Manzini MC, Currie PD, Zhou Y, Zon LI, Kunkel LM
and others. 2012. A splice site mutation in laminin-alpha2 results in a severe muscular dystrophy
and growth abnormalities in zebrafish. *PLoS One* 7(8):e43794.


- 1
2
3 Hashemi H, Khabazkhoob M, Mirafteb M, Emamian MH, Shariati M, Abdolahi-Nia T, Fotouhi A. 2013.
4 Axial length to corneal radius of curvature ratio and refractive errors. *J Ophthalmic Vis Res*
5 8(3):220-6.
6
7 Herrera E, Brown L, Aruga J, Rachel RA, Dolen G, Mikoshiba K, Brown S, Mason CA. 2003. Zic2 patterns
8 binocular vision by specifying the uncrossed retinal projection. *Cell* 114(5):545-57.
9 Hidaka S, Akahori Y, Kurosawa Y. 2004. Dendrodendritic electrical synapses between mammalian retinal
10 ganglion cells. *J Neurosci* 24(46):10553-67.
11 Hruska RE, White R, Azari J, Yamamura HI. 1978. Muscarinic cholinergic receptors in mammalian retina.
12 *Brain Res* 148(2):493-8.
13 Huang da W, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. 2009a. Bioinformatics enrichment tools: paths toward the
14 comprehensive functional analysis of large gene lists. *Nucleic Acids Res* 37(1):1-13.
15 Huang da W, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. 2009b. Systematic and integrative analysis of large gene lists
16 using DAVID bioinformatics resources. *Nat Protoc* 4(1):44-57.
17 Hutchins JB, Hollyfield JG. 1985. Acetylcholine receptors in the human retina. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*
18 26(11):1550-7.
19 Iglesias AI, Springelkamp H, van der Linde H, Severijnen LA, Amin N, Oostra B, Kockx CE, van den Hout
20 MC, van Ijcken WF, Hofman A and others. 2014. Exome sequencing and functional analyses
21 suggest that SIX6 is a gene involved in an altered proliferation-differentiation balance early in
22 life and optic nerve degeneration at old age. *Hum Mol Genet* 23(5):1320-32.
23 Ip JM, Huynh SC, Kifley A, Rose KA, Morgan IG, Varma R, Mitchell P. 2007. Variation of the contribution
24 from axial length and other ophthalmometric parameters to refraction by age and ethnicity. *Invest*
25 *Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 48(10):4846-53.
26 Jia L, Oh EC, Ng L, Srinivas M, Brooks M, Swaroop A, Forrest D. 2009. Retinoid-related orphan nuclear
27 receptor RORbeta is an early-acting factor in rod photoreceptor development. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
28 *U S A* 106(41):17534-9.
29 Kiefer AK, Tung JY, Do CB, Hinds DA, Mountain JL, Francke U, Eriksson N. 2013. Genome-wide analysis
30 points to roles for extracellular matrix remodeling, the visual cycle, and neuronal development
31 in myopia. *PLoS Genet* 9(2):e1003299.
32 Lee EJ, Han JW, Kim HJ, Kim IB, Lee MY, Oh SJ, Chung JW, Chun MH. 2003. The immunocytochemical
33 localization of connexin 36 at rod and cone gap junctions in the guinea pig retina. *Eur J Neurosci*
34 18(11):2925-34.
35 Lim LS, Chua S, Tan PT, Cai S, Chong YS, Kwek K, Gluckman PD, Fortier MV, Ngo C, Qiu A and others.
36 2015. Eye size and shape in newborn children and their relation to axial length and refraction at
37 3 years. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 35(4):414-23.
38 Luo Z, Gao X, Lin C, Smith ER, Marshall SA, Swanson SK, Florens L, Washburn MP, Shilatifard A. 2015. Zic2
39 is an enhancer-binding factor required for embryonic stem cell specification. *Mol Cell* 57(4):685-
40 94.
41 McBrien NA, Gentle A. 2003. Role of the sclera in the development and pathological complications of
42 myopia. *Prog Retin Eye Res* 22(3):307-38.
43 Midelfart A, Aamo B, Sjøhaug KA, Dysthe BE. 1992. Myopia among medical students in Norway. *Acta*
44 *Ophthalmol (Copenh)* 70(3):317-22.
45 Mutti DO, Mitchell GL, Sinnott LT, Jones-Jordan LA, Moeschberger ML, Cotter SA, Kleinstejn RN, Manny
46 RE, Twelker JD, Zadnik K and others. 2012. Corneal and crystalline lens dimensions before and
47 after myopia onset. *Optom Vis Sci* 89(3):251-62.
48 Mutti DO, Zadnik K, Fusaro RE, Friedman NE, Sholtz RI, Adams AJ. 1998. Optical and structural
49 development of the crystalline lens in childhood. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 39(1):120-33.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nair KS, Hmani-Aifa M, Ali Z, Kearney AL, Ben Salem S, Macalinao DG, Cosma IM, Bouassida W, Hakim B,
4 Benzina Z and others. 2011. Alteration of the serine protease PRSS56 causes angle-closure
5 glaucoma in mice and posterior microphthalmia in humans and mice. *Nat Genet* 43(6):579-84.
6 Sanfilippo PG, Hewitt AW, Hammond CJ, Mackey DA. 2010. The heritability of ocular traits. *Surv*
7 *Ophthalmol* 55(6):561-83.
8 Saw SM. 2006. How blinding is pathological myopia? *Br J Ophthalmol* 90(5):525-6.
9 Solouki AM, Verhoeven VJ, van Duijn CM, Verkerk AJ, Ikram MK, Hysi PG, Despriet DD, van Koolwijk LM,
10 Ho L, Ramdas WD and others. 2010. A genome-wide association study identifies a susceptibility
11 locus for refractive errors and myopia at 15q14. *Nat Genet* 42(10):897-901.
12 Sovio U, Mook-Kanamori DO, Warrington NM, Lawrence R, Briollais L, Palmer CN, Cecil J, Sandling JK,
13 Syvanen AC, Kaakinen M and others. 2011. Association between common variation at the FTO
14 locus and changes in body mass index from infancy to late childhood: the complex nature of
15 genetic association through growth and development. *PLoS Genet* 7(2):e1001307.
16 Srinivas M, Ng L, Liu H, Jia L, Forrest D. 2006. Activation of the blue opsin gene in cone photoreceptor
17 development by retinoid-related orphan receptor beta. *Mol Endocrinol* 20(8):1728-41.
18 Verhoeven VJ, Hysi PG, Wojciechowski R, Fan Q, Guggenheim JA, Hohn R, MacGregor S, Hewitt AW, Nag
19 A, Cheng CY and others. 2013. Genome-wide meta-analyses of multi-ancestry cohorts identify
20 multiple new susceptibility loci for refractive error and myopia. *Nat Genet* 45(3):314-8.
21 Vitale S, Sperduto RD, Ferris FL, 3rd. 2009. Increased prevalence of myopia in the United States between
22 1971-1972 and 1999-2004. *Arch Ophthalmol* 127(12):1632-9.
23 Vogt J, Morgan NV, Rehal P, Faivre L, Brueton LA, Becker K, Fryns JP, Holder S, Islam L, Kivuva E and
24 others. 2012. CHRNG genotype-phenotype correlations in the multiple pterygium syndromes. *J*
25 *Med Genet* 49(1):21-6.
26 Watabe Y, Baba Y, Nakauchi H, Mizota A, Watanabe S. 2011. The role of Zic family zinc finger
27 transcription factors in the proliferation and differentiation of retinal progenitor cells. *Biochem*
28 *Biophys Res Commun* 415(1):42-7.
29 Willer CJ, Li Y, Abecasis GR. 2010. METAL: fast and efficient meta-analysis of genomewide association
30 scans. *Bioinformatics* 26(17):2190-1.
31 Wojciechowski R, Hysi PG. 2013. Focusing in on the complex genetics of myopia. *PLoS Genet*
32 9(4):e1003442.
33 Xiao H, Chen X, Steele EC, Jr. 2007. Abundant L-type calcium channel Ca(v)1.3 (alpha1D) subunit mRNA is
34 detected in rod photoreceptors of the mouse retina via in situ hybridization. *Mol Vis* 13:764-71.
35 Young TL, Metlapally R, Shay AE. 2007. Complex trait genetics of refractive error. *Arch Ophthalmol*
36 125(1):38-48.
37 Zhang X, Yang D, Hughes BA. 2011. KCNQ5/K(v)7.5 potassium channel expression and subcellular
38 localization in primate retinal pigment epithelium and neural retina. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol*
39 301(5):C1017-26.
40 Zhang Y, Liu Y, Ho C, Wildsoet CF. 2013. Effects of imposed defocus of opposite sign on temporal gene
41 expression patterns of BMP4 and BMP7 in chick RPE. *Exp Eye Res* 109:98-106.
42 Zhang Y, Liu Y, Wildsoet CF. 2012. Bidirectional, optical sign-dependent regulation of BMP2 gene
43 expression in chick retinal pigment epithelium. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 53(10):6072-80.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




The y-axis represents the beta of the non-weighted genetic risk score. Black dots and grey lines depict the beta and the 95% CI. Estimate for > 25 years was based on a meta-analysis using a random effects model because relatively high heterogeneity; in the other two groups a fixed effects model could be used.

Figure I. Association between
258x136mm (300 x 300 DPI)




The grey dots and line represent children in Generation R (N = 3,874); the black dots and line represent adults from the Rotterdam Study I-III (N = 2,471).

Figure II. Association between
164x132mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Comparison of the association with AL/CR ratio (beta) of the topSNP near BMP2 between the age groups <10 years and 10-25 years ordered on average age for top to bottom.

Figure III. Increased effect o
169x201mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Effect was represented by betas of association with AL/CR ratio per top SNP. Above the orange line are genes that have a significant ($P < 0.05$) effect in children <10 years; between the orange and green line are genes that have a significant effect in individuals <25 years; below the green line are genes that have a significant effect in adults. * showed heterogeneity in 10-25 years and was not significant with random effect model.

Figure IV. Distribution of eff
171x166mm (300 x 300 DPI)

When do myopia genes have their effect? Comparison of genetic risks between children and adults

J.W.L. Tideman^{1,2}, Q. Fan³, J.R. Polling^{1,4}, X. Guo^{5,6,7}, S. Yazar⁸, A. Khawaja⁹, R. Höhn^{10,11}, Yi Lu¹², V.W.V. Jaddoe², K. Yamashiro¹³, M. Yoshikawa¹³, Aslihan Gerhold-Ay¹⁴, Stefan Nickels¹⁰, Tanja Zeller¹⁵, Mingguang He^{16,17}, Thibaud Boutin¹⁸, Goran Bencic¹⁹, V. Vitart¹⁸, D.A. Mackey²⁰, P.J. Foster²¹, S. MacGregor¹², C. Williams²², S.M. Saw^{3,23}, J.A. Guggenheim^{24,25}, C.C.W. Klaver^{1,2,25} and the CREAM consortium

1 Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Ophthalmology 2 Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Epidemiology 3 Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore 4 School of Applied Science Utrecht, Department of Orthoptics 5 Sun Yat-Sen University, Department of Statistical Science, School of Mathematics & Computational Science 6 SYSU-CMU Shunde International Joint Research Institute 7 Southern China Research Center of Statistical Science, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, GD 510275, China 8 Lions Eye Institute, University of Western Australia, Centre for Ophthalmology and Visual Science 9 Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Institute of Public Health, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Cambridge, United Kingdom. 10 University Medical Center, Department of Ophthalmology, Mainz, Germany 11 Department of Ophthalmology, Inselspital, Bern, Switzerland 12 Statistical Genetics, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, Australia 13 Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto, Japan 14 University Medical Center Mainz, Institute of Medical Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, Mainz, Germany 15 University Heart Center Hamburg, Clinic for General and Interventional Cardiology, Hamburg, Germany 16 Centre for Eye Research Australia, University of Melbourne, Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, Melbourne, Australia 17 State Key Laboratory of Ophthalmology, Zhongshan Ophthalmic Center, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China 18 Medical Research Council Human Genetics Unit, Institute of Genetics and Molecular Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH4 2XU, UK 19 Department of Ophthalmology, Sisters of Mercy University Hospital, Zagreb, Croatia 20 Centre for Ophthalmology and Visual Science, Lions Eye Institute, University of Western Australia 21 9 NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust & UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, London, United Kingdom 22 School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, England 23 National university of Singapore Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore 24 School of Optometry & Vision Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales 25 These authors jointly led this work

Correspondence:

Prof. Dr. Caroline C.W. Klaver, MD, PhD, Erasmus Medical Centre - Sophia Children's Hospital, AL2808; PO Box 2060, 3000 CB Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

E-mail: c.c.w.klaver@erasmusmc.nl

Supplements:

Table SI: Genotyping and imputation details

Table SII: SNPs previously associated with myopia and refractive error

Table SIII: Heterogeneity of the results

Table SIV: results of random effect meta-analysis in case of heterogeneity

Table SV: Results IPA pathway analysis

Table SVI: Results DAVID pathway analysis

Description of participating studies

Study specific acknowledgements

References of supplemental material

Supplementary Table I Genotyping and imputation details

Study	Genotyping platform	Imputation	Reference population (1000G)	QC
ALSPAC	Illumina HumanHap550	MACH/minimac	GIANT phase1 release v3	Cheng et al. 2013 ¹
BATS/TEST	Illumina HumanHap610/660-Quad	MACH	1000G Phase 1 release on Aug 4, 2010	Yazar et al. 2015 ²
RAINE	Illumina 660W-Quad	MACH/minimac	1000G Phase 1 release on Nov 23, 2010	Yazar et al. 2015 ²
TEST	Illumina HumanHap610/660-Quad	MACH	1000G Phase 1 release on Aug 4, 2010	Yazar et al. 2015 ²
Generation R	Illumina Infinium II HumanHap610 Quad Arrays	MACH	1000 Genomes GIANTv3 panel	Kruithof et al. 2014 ³
GTES	Affymetrix Gene Titan	IMPUTE2 v2.3.0	1000G Phase 1 release on Nov 23,2010	
SCORM	Illumina HumanHap550/550-Duo	MACH/minimac	1000G Phase 1 release March 2012	Cheng et al. 2013 ¹
STARS	Illumina HumanHap610-Quad	MACH/minimac	1000G Phase 1 release March 2012	Cheng et al. 2013 ¹
GHS 1/2	Affymetrix Genome-Wide Human SNP Array 6.0	MACH/minimac	1000G Phase 1 release on Nov 23, 2010	
Rotterdam Study	RS I: Illumina Infinium II HumanHap550 chip v3.0 array. RS II: HumanHap550 Duo Arrays + Human610 -	MACH	NCBI build 36, HapMap release #22	Solouki et al. 2010 ⁴

	Quad Arrays Illumina,		
	RS-III: Human 610 Quad		
	Arrays Illumina		
	Korcula: Illumina CNV370v1 and		1000G Phase 1 integrated v3
	CNV370-Quadv3		release March 2012 (Vis and
		IMPUTEv2	Korcula) release June 2014
Croatia	Vis: Illumina HumanHap 300v1	(phasing using	(Split)
	Split: Illumina CNV370-Quadv3	shapeit v2)	
	and Illumina OmniExpress		
	Exome-8v1_A		
	Human 610 Quad Arrays		NCBI build 36, HapMap release
Nagahama	Illumina /	MACH	#28
	Human Omni 2.5 Arrays Illumina		
	Affymetrix UK Biobank Axiom	IMPUTE version	1000G Phase 3 (October 2014)
EPIC-Norfolk	Array.	2.3.2.	

Abbreviations: 1000G, One thousand genomes project. QC, Quality control.

Supplementary Table II. All SNPs previously associated with myopia and refractive error.

SNP	Chr	Pos	Gene	Citation
rs1652333	1	207470460	<i>CD55</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs4373767	1	219759682	<i>ZC3H11B</i>	Cheng et al. 2013
rs17412774	2	146773948	<i>PABPCP2</i>	Kiefer et al. 2013
rs17428076	2	172851936	<i>DLX1</i>	Kiefer et al. 2013
rs1898585	2	178660450	<i>PDE11A</i>	Kiefer et al. 2013
rs1656404	2	233379941	<i>PRSS56</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs1881492	2	233406998	<i>CHRNA1</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs14165	3	53847408	<i>CACNA1D</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs13091182	3	141133960	<i>ZBTB38</i>	Kiefer et al. 2013
rs9307551	4	80530671	<i>LOC100506035</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs5022942	4	81959966	<i>BMP3</i>	Kiefer et al. 2013
rs7744813	6	73643289	<i>KCNQ5</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs12205363	6	129834628	<i>LAMA2</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs7829127	8	40726394	<i>ZMAT4</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs7837791	8	60179086	<i>TOX</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs4237036	8	61701057	<i>CHD7</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs11145465	9	70989531	<i>TJP2</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs7042950	9	77149837	<i>RORB</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs7084402	10	60265404	<i>BICC1</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs6480859	10	79081948	<i>KCNMA1</i>	Kiefer et al. 2013
rs745480	10	85986554	<i>RGR</i>	Kiefer et al. 2013
rs10882165	10	94924324	<i>CYP26A1</i>	Verhoeven et al. 2013
rs1381566	11	40149607	<i>LRRC4C</i>	Kiefer et al. 2013

1					
2					
3					
4	rs2155413	11	84634790	DLG2	Kiefer et al. 2013
5					
6	rs11601239	11	105556598	GRIA4	Verhoeven et al. 2013
7					
8	rs3138144	12	56114768	RDH5	Verhoeven et al. 2013
9					
10	rs12229663	12	71249996	PTPRR	Verhoeven et al. 2013
11					
12	rs8000973	13	100691367	ZIC2	Verhoeven et al. 2013
13					
14	rs2184971	13	100818092	PCCA	Verhoeven et al. 2013
15					
16	rs66913363	14	54413001	BMP4	Kiefer et al. 2013
17					
18	rs1254319	14	60903757	SIX6	Verhoeven et al. 2013
19					
20	rs524952	15	35005885	GJD2	Verhoeven et al. 2013
21					
22	rs4778879	15	79372875	RASGRF1	Verhoeven et al. 2013
23					
24	rs17648524	16	7459683	A2BP1	Verhoeven et al. 2013
25					
26	rs2969180	17	11407901	SHISA6	Verhoeven et al. 2013
27					
28	rs17183295	17	31078272	MYO1D	Verhoeven et al. 2013
29					
30	rs4793501	17	68718734	KCNJ2	Verhoeven et al. 2013
31					
32	rs12971120	18	72174023	CNDP2	Verhoeven et al. 2013
33					
34	rs235770	20	6761765	BMP2	Verhoeven et al. 2013
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					

Supplementary Table III. Heterogeneity per *P*-value per SNP for each age group.

				<10 years	10 - 25 years	Combined	>25 years
Variant	Ch	Gene	RA	Heterogeneity P	Heterogeneity P	Heterogeneity P	Heterogeneity P
Allele	-	-	-	0.07	0.08	0.0002	0.0005
rs1652333	1	CD55	G	0.40	0.25	0.23	0.18
rs4373767	1	ZC3H11B	T	0.18	0.69	0.29	0.38
rs1741277	2	PABPCP2	A	0.50	0.39	0.46	0.25
rs1742807	2	DLX1	C	0.26	0.02	0.05	0.70
rs1898585	2	PDE11A	T	0.40	0.86	0.76	0.77
rs1656404	2	PRSS56	A	0.45	0.15	0.25	0.53
rs1881492	2	CHRNA1	T	0.69	0.34	0.45	0.95
rs14165	3	CACNA1D	G	0.48	0.70	0.51	0.26
rs1309118	3	ZBTB38	G	0.13	0.89	0.94	0.16
rs9307551	4	LOC100506035	A	0.94	0.78	0.92	0.02
rs5022942	4	BMP3	A	0.82	0.91	0.94	0.98
rs7744813	6	KCNQ5	A	0.31	0.66	0.53	0.65
rs1220536	6	LAMA2	T	0.12	0.07	0.06	0.54
rs7829127	8	ZMAT4	A	0.24	0.75	0.54	0.92
rs7837791	8	TOX	G	0.82	0.001	0.002	0.12
rs4237036	8	CHD7	T	0.35	0.94	0.84	0.89
rs1114546	9	TJP2	A	0.17	0.24	0.38	0.13
rs7042950	9	RORB	G	0.83	0.41	0.70	0.12
rs7084402	10	BICC1	G	0.58	0.38	0.52	0.83
rs6480859	10	KCNMA1	T	0.27	0.63	0.62	0.81
rs745480	10	RGR	G	0.38	0.88	0.68	0.10
rs1088216	10	CYP26A1	T	0.51	0.31	0.45	0.03
rs1381566	11	LRRRC4C	G	0.40	0.60	0.49	0.78
rs2155413	11	DLG2	A	0.21	0.52	0.31	0.29
rs1160123	11	GRIA4	C	0.58	0.96	0.96	0.05
rs3138144	12	RDH5	G	0.67	0.72	0.83	0.43
rs1222966	12	PTPRR	A	0.41	0.18	0.06	0.97
rs8000973	13	ZIC2	C	0.44	0.61	0.65	0.01
rs2184971	13	PCCA	A	0.75	0.19	0.37	0.55
rs6691336	14	BMP4	G	0.62	0.22	0.10	0.57
rs1254319	14	SIX6	A	0.76	0.24	0.31	0.78
rs524952	15	GJD2	A	0.73	0.36	0.52	0.49
rs4778879	15	RASGRF1	G	0.15	0.99	0.79	0.30
rs1764852	16	A2BP1	C	0.14	0.52	0.07	0.72
rs2969180	17	SHISA6	A	0.59	0.24	0.30	0.23
rs1718329	17	MYO1D	T	0.47	0.99	0.83	0.37
rs4793501	17	KCNJ2	T	0.42	0.03	0.03	0.10
rs1297112	18	CNDP2	A	0.21	0.34	0.22	0.36
rs235770	20	BMP2	T	0.24	0.67	4*E-5	0.48

Supplementary Table IV Random effect analysis of SNPs with $P < 0.05$ and heterogeneity $P < 0.05$

				10 - 25 years		>25 years	
Variant	Chr	Gene	RA	Effect (SE)	P	Effect (SE)	P
GRS	-	-	-	-	-	0.0048 (0.0007)	<0.001
rs9307551	4	LOC100506035	A	-	-	0.0066 (0.0034)	0.06
rs7837791	8	TOX	G	0.0062 (0.0073)	0.40	-	-

GRS = Genetic risk score

For Peer Review

Supplementary table V

IPA Analysis of diseases and disorders associated with early and late onset genes for myopia with p-values and molecules

Diseases and Disorders of early onset genes		
Name	p-value range	Molecules
Auditory Disease	1.80E-02 – 1.13E-05	2
Organismal Injury and Abnormalities	4.62E-02 – 1.13E-05	11
Gastrointestinal Disease	4.71E-02 – 5.75E-05	8
Hematological Disease	1.22E-02 – 1.18E-04	3
Metabolic disease	4.71E-02 – 1.18E-04	3
Diseases and Disorders of late onset genes		
Name	p-value range	Molecules
Connective tissue disorders	4.60E-02 – 1.14E-04	4
Developmental disorders	4.60E-02 – 1.14E-04	7
Gastrointestinal Disease	4.66E-02 – 1.14E-04	16
Skeletal and Muscular disorders	4.60E-02 – 1.14E-04	4
Cancer	4.66E-02 – 8.24E-04	16

Supplementary table VI

DAVID pathway analysis of functional annotation with early and late onset genes for myopia with p-values and molecules

Functional annotation of early onset genes		
GO Term	p-value	Molecules
Channel activity	1.8E-4	5
Passive transmembrane transporter activity	1.8E-4	5
Ion channel complex	3.2E-4	4
Ionic channel	6.7E-4	4
Cation channel activity	1.0E-3	4
Functional annotation of late onset genes		
GO Term	p-value	Molecules
Neurological system process	5.0E-4	7
Visual perception	1.0E-3	4
Sensory perception of light stimulus	1.0E-3	4
Cognition	1.1E-3	6
Vision	5.8E-3	3

ALSPAC.

Pregnant women with an expected date of delivery between 1st April 1991 and 31st December 1992, resident in the former Avon health authority area in Southwest England, were eligible to participate in this population-based birth cohort study. 13,761 women were recruited. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees. Subject recruitment has been described previously⁵. Details of the phenotypes available and data access can be found at:

<http://www.bris.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/data-access/data-dictionary/>. In brief, data collection has been via various methods including self-completion questionnaires sent to the mother, to her partner and after age 5 to the child; direct assessments and interviews in a research clinic. Ocular biometry (IOLmaster) was carried out when participants attended a research clinic visit at the target age of 15 years-old. DNA samples were available for 11,343 ALSPAC Children, prepared from either blood samples or lymphoblastoid-transformed cell lines.

BATS

The Brisbane Adolescent Twin Study is an ongoing study of adolescent and young-adult monozygotic (MZ) and dizygotic (DZ) twin pairs (2720 individuals) and their siblings (1179)⁶. Twins were initially recruited to the study from primary and secondary schools in South East Queensland in 1992, with new twins added at various intervals. In addition, a small number of twins have been recruited through word of mouth, or through the Australian Twin Registry. The study was approved by the human research ethics committee at the QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute. Twins have undergone a variety of phenotypic assessments. A 40-ml blood sample is collected from participants and parents at the initial assessment. A subset of participants also completed an extensive eye examination as part of the Twins Eye Study in Tasmania. Axial length was measured using IOLmaster, and corneal curvature was measured

1
2
3 using a commercial automatic refractor/keratometer (Humphrey-598 Automatic
4 Refractor/Keratometer; Carl Zeiss Meditec, Inc., Miami, FL).

8 **GTES**

9
10
11 The Guangzhou Twin Eye Study was launched in 2006, and it has completed eight consecutive
12 annual follow-up examinations, with more than 1200 twin pairs participating. In brief, twins born
13 in Guangzhou aged 7 to 15 years received annual eye examinations, including cycloplegic
14 refraction, from 2006 onwards. Those with manifest strabismus, amblyopia, nystagmus, post-
15 refractive surgery, or any ocular disease causing best-corrected visual acuity less than 20/25
16 were excluded from the current analysis. The study was conducted in accordance with the
17 tenets of the World Medical Association's Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the
18 Ethics Review Board of the Zhongshan Ophthalmic Center of Sun Yat-Sen University. Written
19 informed consent was obtained from the parents or legal guardians of the participants. Axial
20 length was measured using the partial coherence interferometry (Zeiss IOLMaster, Jena,
21 Germany). Corneal radius was performed under cycloplegia using an auto-refractor (Topcon
22 KR8800, Tokyo, Japan).

37 **Generation R**

38
39
40
41 Generation R Study, a population-based prospective cohort study of pregnant women and their
42 children in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. A total of 9,778 pregnant women were included in the
43 study. All children were born between April 2002 and January 2006^{7,8}. The children were
44 invited at age 5 years with their mothers for examination on the research center by trained
45 nurses. Of the 9,778 included pregnant woman 6,690 participated with their children for physical
46 examination in the research centre at 5 years of age. The study protocol was approved by the
47 Medical Ethical Committee of the Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam (MEC 217.595/2002/20).
48 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Ocular biometry (AL, corneal
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 curvature (CC) was obtained with a Zeiss IOL-master. Data were collected from right and left
4 eyes. Five measurements of axial length were taken of OD and OS and averaged. OD and OS
5 measurements were combined to calculate a mean average axial length. Three measurement of
6 K1 and K2 were taken of OD and OS, and were averaged. AL/CC ratio was calculated by
7 dividing AL(mm) by CC (mm).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **RAINE**

17
18 The Western Australian Birth Cohort (Raine) Study is one of the largest ongoing prospective
19 cohort studies. It was established in 1989 by recruiting around 2900 pregnant women at 16-18
20 weeks of gestation in Perth. The original aim of the study was to investigate how events during
21 pregnancy and at birth influence the health and wellbeing of the newborns. This cohort has
22 gone on to be examined every 2 years by different research groups. At the 20 year follow-up of
23 the Raine Cohort were invited to participate in the Raine Eye Health Study (REHS) and
24 undertake a comprehensive eye examination. This study was approved by the Human
25 Research Ethics Committee at the University of Western Australia. During eye examination,
26 post-cycloplegic autorefractometry was performed in 1344 participant using the Nidek ARK-510A
27 (NIDEK Co.Ltd, Tokyo, Japan) autorefractor. Ocular biometric parameters including axial length
28 (AL) and corneal curvature were measured with IOLMaster V.5 (Carl Zeiss Meditec AG, Jena,
29 Germany). For AL, five consecutive measurements were taken until the following criteria were
30 satisfied: measurements within $\pm 0.02\text{mm}$ of each other, good waveform – no double peaks,
31 acceptable signal-to-noise ratio >2.0 . Any measurement outside the mentioned criteria deleted
32 and repeated. During keratometry, three measurements within 0.3D within each meridian with
33 careful alignment and focus were recorded.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **SCORM**

1
2
3 This study is a school-based population study performed in Singapore. A total of 1,979 children
4
5 in grades 1, 2, and 3 from three schools were recruited from 1999 to 2001 with detailed
6
7 information described elsewhere⁹. The children were examined on the school premises annually
8
9 by a team of eye care professionals. The GWAS was conducted in a subset of Chinese children
10
11 of 1,116 subjects¹⁰. The phenotype used in the cross-sectional study was based on the SE
12
13 measured on the 4th annual examination of the study (children at age 10 to 12 years). Complete
14
15 post-filtering data on measurements and SNP data were available in 994 SCORM children.
16
17

18 19 **STARS**

20
21
22 STARS is a population-based survey of Chinese families with children residing in the south-
23
24 western and western region of Singapore. Disproportionate random sampling by 6-month age
25
26 groups resulted in the recruitment and subsequent eye examination of 3,009 Chinese children
27
28 between May 2006 and November 2008. Details of the study design and methodology have
29
30 been previously described.¹¹ A total of 1,451 samples from 440 nuclear families underwent eye
31
32 examinations and were included for genome-wide genotyping. In all, 407 children with SE
33
34 measurement had complete post-filtered genotype data.
35
36

37 38 **TEST**

39
40
41 Commencing in the late 2000, 1372 participants were recruited to the Twins Eye Study
42
43 Tasmania through various methods including piggy-backing existing studies where twins had
44
45 been recruited, utilizing the national twin registry, word-of-mouth and local media publicity and
46
47 directly approaching schools¹². Ethical approval was obtained from the Royal Victorian Eye and
48
49 Ear Hospital, the University of Tasmania, the Australian Twin Registry (ATR). Axial length was
50
51 measured using IOLmaster, and corneal curvature was measured using a commercial
52
53 automatic refractor/keratometer (Humphrey-598 Automatic Refractor/Keratometer; Carl Zeiss
54
55 Meditec, Inc., Miami, FL). In children, buccal swabs or Oragene saliva samples were collected.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In adolescents, or when repeat examination was conducted several years later, a blood sample
4
5 was taken and those participants who were now adults signed their own consent.
6
7

8 9 **Rotterdam Study I-III**

10
11 The Rotterdam Study is a prospective population-based cohort study in the elderly living in
12
13 Ommoord, a suburb of Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Details of the study are described
14
15 elsewhere 30. In brief, the Rotterdam Study consists of 3 independent cohorts: RSI, RSII, and
16
17 RSIII. For the current analysis, 5,328 residents aged 55 years and older were included from
18
19 RS1, 2,009 participants aged 55 and older from RS II, and 1,970 aged 45 and older from RS III.
20
21 99% of subjects were of European ancestry. Participants underwent multiple physical
22
23 examinations with regular intervals from 1991 to present . In the fourth visit the examination
24
25 included AL measurement with Lensstar [LS 900]. AL was an average of five measurements of
26
27 OD and OS. CC was an average of three K1 and K2 measurement of OD and OS. The AL/CC
28
29 ratio was calculated by dividing the mean average AL by the mean average CC. Exclusion
30
31 criteria were bilateral cataract surgery, intra ocular procedures which influence corneal
32
33 curvature or corneal refractive procedures. All measurements in RS-I-III were conducted after
34
35 the Medical Ethics Committee of the Erasmus University had approved the study protocols and
36
37 all participants had given a written informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of
38
39 Helsinki. DNA was extracted from blood leucocytes according to standard procedures.
40
41 Genotyping of SNPs was performed using the Illumina Infinium II HumanHap550 chip v3.0 array
42
43 (RS-I); the HumanHap550 Duo Arrays and the Illumina Human610-Quad Arrays (RS-II), and the
44
45 Human 610 Quad Arrays Illumina (RS-III). Samples with low call rate (0.336), or with sex-
46
47 mismatch were excluded, as were outliers identified by the identity-by-state clustering analysis
48
49 (outliers were defined as being >3 s.d. from population mean or having identity-by-state
50
51 probabilities >97%). We used genomic control to obtain optimal and unbiased results and
52
53 applied the inverse variance method of each effect size estimated for both autosomal SNPs that
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were genotyped and imputed in both cohorts. A set of genotyped input SNPs with call rate
4 >98%, with minor allele frequency >0.01, and with Hardy-Weinberg P value >10⁻⁶ was used for
5 imputation. We used the Markov Chain Haplotyping (MACH) package version 1.0.15 software
6 (Rotterdam, The Netherlands; imputed to plus strand of NCBI build 36, HapMap release #22) for
7 the analyses. For each imputed SNP, a reliability of imputation was estimated as the ratio of the
8 empirically observed dosage variance to the expected binomial dosage variance (O/E ratio).
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
GWAS analyses were performed using GRIMP.

EPIC-Norfolk Eye Study

The European Prospective Investigation into Cancer (EPIC) study is a pan-European
prospective cohort study designed to investigate the aetiology of major chronic diseases.¹
EPIC-Norfolk, one of the UK arms of EPIC, recruited and examined 25,639 participants
between 1993 and 1997 for the baseline examination.² Recruitment was via general practices
in the city of Norwich and the surrounding small towns and rural areas, and methods have been
described in detail previously.³ Since virtually all residents in the UK are registered with a
general practitioner through the National Health Service, general practice lists serve as
population registers. Ophthalmic assessment formed part of the third health examination and
this has been termed the EPIC-Norfolk Eye Study.⁴ In total, 8,623 participants were seen for
the Eye Study, between 2004 and 2011. The EPIC-Norfolk Eye Study was carried out following
the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and the Research Governance Framework for
Health and Social Care. The study was approved by the Norfolk Local Research Ethics
Committee (05/Q0101/191) and East Norfolk & Waveney NHS Research Governance
Committee (2005EC07L). All participants gave written, informed consent.

Refractive error was measured using a Humphrey Auto-Refractor 500 (Humphrey Instruments,
San Leandro, California, USA). Biometry was conducted using non-contact partial coherence

1
2
3 interferometry (IOLMaster V.4, Carl Zeiss Meditech Ltd, Welwyn Garden City, UK). For each
4
5 eye, five measurements of axial length and three measurements of corneal curvature were
6
7 taken. Axial length measurements were repeated if flagged as more than 0.1mm different to the
8
9 others. AL/CR was calculated as described in the primary methods.

10
11
12 Genotyping was undertaken using the Affymetrix UK Biobank Axiom Array. SNP exclusion
13
14 criteria included: call rate < 95%, abnormal cluster pattern on visual inspection, plate batch
15
16 effect evident by significant variation in minor allele frequency, and/or Hardy-Weinberg
17
18 equilibrium $P < 10^{-7}$. Sample exclusion criteria included: DishQC < 0.82 (poor fluorescence
19
20 signal contrast), sex discordance, sample call rate < 97%, heterozygosity outliers (calculated
21
22 separately for SNPs with minor allele frequency >1% and <1%), rare allele count outlier, and
23
24 impossible identity-by-descent values. Following these exclusions, there were no ethnic
25
26 outliers. Data were pre-phased using SHAPEIT version 2 and imputed to the Phase 3 build of
27
28 the 1000 Genomes project (October 2014) using IMPUTE version 2.3.2.

29
30
31 In total, 6051 participants had complete data for both genotypes and phenotypes; their mean
32
33 age was 69 years and 54% were women.

34 35 36 37 38 **Gutenberg Health Study (GHS 1, GHS 2)**

39
40
41 The Gutenberg Health Study (GHS) is a population-based, prospective, observational cohort
42
43 study in the Rhine-Main Region in midwestern Germany with a total of 15,010 participants at
44
45 baseline and follow-up after five years. The study sample was recruited from subjects aged
46
47 between 35 and 74 years at baseline exam. Exclusion criteria were insufficient knowledge of the
48
49 German language to understand explanations and instructions, and physical or psychic inability
50
51 to participate in the examinations in the study center. The interdisciplinary study design
52
53 comprises an ophthalmological examination, general and especially cardiovascular
54
55 examinations, psychosomatic evaluation, laboratory tests, and biobanking for proteomic and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 genetic analyses. The study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of the University
4 Medical Center Mainz and by the local and federal data safety commissioners. According to the
5 tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki, written informed consent was obtained from all participants
6 prior to entering the study.
7
8
9

10
11
12 In the first follow-up, the examination included biometry measurement with the Lenstar[®] LS 900
13 (Haag Streit, Wedel, Germany). Axial length (AL) was an average of three measurements of OD
14 and OS. Corneal curvature (CC) was an average of three K1 and K2 measurement of OD and
15 OS. The AL/CC ratio was calculated by dividing the mean average AL by the mean average CC.
16
17
18

19
20 Within GHS, DNA was extracted from buffy-coats from EDTA blood samples. Genetic analysis
21 was conducted in the first 5,000 study participants. For these, 3,463 individuals were genotyped
22 in 2008 (GHS 1) and further 1,439 individuals in 2009 (GHS 2). Genotyping was performed for
23 GHS 1 and GHS 2 using the Affymetrix Genome-Wide Human SNP Array 6.0
24 (<http://www.affymetrix.com>), as described by the Affymetrix user manual. Genotypes were
25 called using the Affymetrix Birdseed-V2 calling algorithm. Individuals with low genotyping call
26 rate, a too high level of heterozygosity ($\text{hetFDR} > 0.01$), with sex-mismatches, and with Non-
27 European ancestry were excluded. After applying standard quality criteria (minor allele
28 frequency $> 1\%$, genotype call rate $> 98\%$ and P-value of deviation from Hardy-Weinberg
29 equilibrium of > 0.0001), 689,634 SNPs in 2996 individuals from GHS1 and 701,418 SNPs in
30 1,179 individuals from GHS2 remained for analysis (total 4175). Imputation of missing
31 genotypes was performed using the software MACH (v1.0.18.c) and minimac (release 2012-03-
32 14) with the reference panel 1000G Phase I Integrated Release Version 2 Haplotypes (2010-11-
33 23 data freeze, 2012-02-14 haplotypes) for each cohort separately. Linear regression analyses
34 were performed using ProbABEL (v0.4.1) with age and sex included in the model as covariates.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **CROATIA-Korcula and CROATIA-Vis island Studies**

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The CROATIA-Korčula and CROATIA-Vis studies performed on Croatian islands, are
4 population-based, cross-sectional studies in which adult subjects were recruited for genetic
5 studies of many medically-relevant traits including ocular biometrical traits (Vitart et al-IOVS
6 51,737-743). The studies received approval from relevant ethics committees in Scotland and
7 Croatia and followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. Keratometry (CC) was measured
8 on each eye using a NIDEK Ark30 hand-held autorefractometer/keratometer. Axial length (AL)
9 was measured together with other biometric measures using a NIDEK A-scan device (Echoscan
10 US-1800). Measures on eyes with a history of trauma, intra-ocular surgery, LASIK operations
11 were removed. Genotypes were determined using the Illumina BeadStudio software. Samples
12 with a call rate below 97 % , potentially mixed samples with excess autosomal heterozygosity or
13 gender discrepancy (based on the sex chromosomes genotypes), and ethnic outliers (based on
14 principal components analysis of genotypic data), were excluded from the analysis using the
15 quality control algorithm implemented in the R package GenABEL. After exclusion of SNP with
16 MAF < 0.01, call rate < 98% and HWE deviation $p < 10^{-6}$, samples were pre-phased using
17 shapeit v2(ref O. Delaneau, JF. Zagury, J. Marchini (2013). Improved whole chromosome
18 phasing for disease and population genetic studies. Nat Methods. 10(1):5-6. doi:
19 10.1038/nmeth.2307). Imputation was carried out using impute v2 (ref B. N. Howie, P. Donnelly,
20 and J. Marchini (2009) A flexible and accurate genotype imputation method for the next
21 generation of genome-wide association studies. PLoS Genetics 5(6): e1000529) and the 1,000
22 genomes All ancestries phase1 integrated v3 reference panel. The impute2mach GENABEL
23 function was used to convert the impute2 outputs to the MACH format that is used in the ABEL
24 suite (<http://www.genabel.org/packages>) and mixed model analyses were run using the
25 polygenic functions of the GenABEL package to account for relatedness between individuals
26 and fitting independent SNP doses or genetic score as fixed effect together with gender.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **CROATIA-Split Study**

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The CROATIA-Split study, Croatia, is a population-based, cross-sectional study in the
4 Dalmatian City of Split that includes 1000 examinees aged 18-95. The study received approval
5 from relevant ethics committees in Scotland and Croatia and followed the tenets of the
6 Declaration of Helsinki. Keratometry and A-scan were performed as described for the other
7 CROATIA studies.
8
9

10 Individuals were genotyped with either the 370CNV-Quadv3 (n=500) or the Illumina
11 OmniExpress Exome-8v1_A beadchips (n=500). Alleles were called in
12 BeadStudio/GenomeStudio using Illumina cluster files. Subjects were excluded if they fulfilled
13 any of the following criteria: genotypic call rate <97%, mismatch between reported and
14 genotypic sex, unexpectedly low genomic sharing with first degree relatives, excess autosomal
15 heterozygosity, or outliers identified by IBS clustering analysis. We excluded SNPs on the basis
16 of minor allele frequency (<0.01/monomorphism), HWE ($P < 10^{-6}$), call rate (<97%). The
17 samples genotyped with the denser array (Illumina OmniExpress Exome) were first prephased
18 and imputed as described for the CROATIA island studies; the phased data was also used as a
19 secondary reference panel to complement the 1,000 genomes All ancestries phase1 integrated
20 v3 reference panel for the imputation of the samples genotyped on the less dense array. Doses
21 derived from imputations for the two halves of the study were then combined for analysis in
22 mixed model analyses using the polygenic functions of the GenABEL package to account for
23 relatedness between individuals and fitting independent SNP doses or genetic score as fixed
24 effects together with gender.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Nagahama**

49
50
51 The Nagahama Prospective Genome Cohort for the Comprehensive Human Bioscience dataset
52 (The Nagahama Study, n=9,809) is a community-based prospective multiomics cohort study
53 recruited from the general population living in Nagahama City. The institutional review board and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ethics committee of Kyoto University Graduate School and the Faculty of Medicine Ethics
4
5 Committee, the Ad Hoc Review Board of the Nagahama Cohort Project, and the Nagahama
6
7 Municipal Review Board of Personal Information Protection approved the protocols of this study.
8
9 As part of the eye examination, all participants underwent automatic objective refractometry and
10
11 corneal curvature calculation (Autorefractor ARK-530; Nidek, Tokyo, Japan) and axial length
12
13 (AL) measurement (IOL Master; Carl Zeiss, Jena, Germany). The AL/CC ratio was calculated by
14
15 dividing the mean average AL by the mean average CC. DNA was extracted from blood
16
17 leucocytes and genotyping of SNPs was performed for 3,712 samples using at least one of the
18
19 three genotyping platforms, HumanHap610K Quad Arrays, HumanOmni2.5M Arrays, or
20
21 HumanExome Arrays (Illumina, Inc., San Diego, CA, USA).
22
23
24
25

26 **Acknowledgements**

27
28 **ALSPAC** We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives
29
30 for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers,
31
32 computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers,
33
34 managers, receptionists and nurses. The UK Medical Research Council and the Wellcome Trust
35
36 (Grant ref: 102215/2/13/2) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. This
37
38 publication is the work of the authors and JAG and CW will serve as guarantors for the contents
39
40 of this paper. This research was specifically funded by grant MC_UU_12013/3&4 from the UK
41
42 Medical Research Council and grant Z0GM from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. GWAS
43
44 data were generated by Sample Logistics and Genotyping Facilities at the Wellcome Trust
45
46 Sanger Institute and LabCorp (Laboratory Corporation of America) using support from
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
23andMe.

1
2
3 **BATS/TEST** The Brisbane Adolescent Twin Study (BATS) and Twin Eye Study in Tasmania
4
5 (TEST) authors are grateful to Dr Camilla Day and staff for their help in genotyping. The BATS
6
7 and TEST genotyping data were generated and processed by Nicholas G. Martin, Grant W.
8
9 Montgomery, Scott D. Gordon, Dale R. Nyholt, Sarah E. Medland, Brian P. McEvoy, Margaret J.
10
11 Wright, Anjali K. Henders, Megan J. Campbell. The BATS and TEST authors would additionally
12
13 like to thank Jane MacKinnon, Shayne Brown, Jonathan Ruddle, Paul Sanfilippo, Olivia Bigault,
14
15 Colleen Wilkinson, Johan Poulsen, Byoung Sung Chu Yaling Ma, and Julie Barbour for assisting
16
17 with clinical examinations. The Australian Twin Registry was supported by an Australian
18
19 National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Enabling Grant (2004–2009). We also
20
21 thank the following organisations for their financial support: Clifford Craig Medical Research
22
23 Trust, Ophthalmic Research Institute of Australia (ORIA), American Health Assistance
24
25 Foundation (AHAF), Peggy and Leslie Cranbourne Foundation, Foundation for Children,
26
27 NHMRC project grant 350415 (2005–2007), Jack Brockhoff Foundation, NEI Project Grant RO1
28
29 EY 018246-01 (2007–2010) (PI TLY). Genotyping for part of the BATS and TEST samples was
30
31 funded by an NHMRC Medical Genomics Grant. Genotyping for the remainder was performed
32
33 by CIDR as part of an NEI/NIH project grant. BATS and TEST sample imputation analyses were
34
35 carried out on the Genetic Cluster Computer which is financially supported by The Netherlands
36
37 Scientific Organization (NWO 480-05-003). CERA receives Operational Infrastructure Support
38
39 from the Victorian Government. DAM was a recipient of the Pfizer Australia Senior Research
40
41 Fellowship. SM is supported by an Australian Research Council Future Fellowship. YL is
42
43 supported by an Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Early Career
44
45 Fellowship.

46
47
48
49
50
51 **The CROATIA studies** were funded by grants from the Medical Research Council (UK) and
52
53 from the Republic of Croatia Ministry of Science, Education and Sports (10810803150302); and
54
55 the CROATIA-Korcula genotyping was funded by the European Union framework program 6
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 project EUROSPAN (LSHGCT2006018947). The CROATIA studies acknowledges Biljana
4
5 Andrijević Derk, Valentina Lacmanović Lončar, Krešimir Mandić, Antonija Mandić, Ivan Škegro,
6
7 Jasna Pavičić Astaloš, Ivana Merc, Miljenka Martinović, Petra Kralj, Tamara Knežević and Katja
8
9 Barać-Juretić as well as the recruitment team from the Croatian Centre for Global Health,
10
11 University of Split and the Institute of Anthropological Research in Zagreb for the
12
13 ophthalmological data collection; Peter Lichner and the Helmholtz Zentrum Munchen (Munich,
14
15 Germany), AROS Applied Biotechnology, Aarhus, Denmark and the Wellcome Trust Clinical
16
17 facility (Edinburgh, United Kingdom) for the SNP genotyping all studies.
18
19

20
21 **Generation R** The Generation R Study gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the children
22
23 and their parents, the general practitioners, the hospitals and the midwives and pharmacies in
24
25 Rotterdam. We thank M. Jhamai, M. Ganesh, P. Arp, M. Verkerk, L. Herrera and M. Peters for
26
27 their help in creating, managing and performing quality control for the genetic database. Also,
28
29 we thank K. Estrada and C. Medina-Gomez for their support in the creation and analysis of
30
31 imputed data. The Generation R Study is conducted by the Erasmus Medical Center in close
32
33 collaboration with the School of Law and the Faculty of Social Sciences of Erasmus University
34
35 Rotterdam, the Municipal Health Service, Rotterdam area, the Rotterdam Homecare Foundation
36
37 and the Stichting Trombosedienst & Artsenlaboratorium Rijnmond (STAR-MDC; Rotterdam).
38
39 The generation and management of genotype data for the Generation R Study were performed
40
41 at the Genetic Laboratory of the Department of Internal Medicine at Erasmus Medical Center.
42
43 The Generation R Study is made possible by financial support from the Erasmus Medical
44
45 Center (Rotterdam), the Erasmus University Rotterdam and the Netherlands Organization for
46
47 Health Research and Development (ZonMw; 21000074). The author was supported by the
48
49 following foundations: MaculaFonds, Novartis Fonds, ODAS, LSBS, Oogfonds and ANVVB that
50
51 contributed through UitZicht (grant 2013-24). The funding organizations had no role in the
52
53 design or conduct of this research. They provided unrestricted grants.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **GTES** The Guangzhou Twin Eye Studies (GTES) was supported by the NSFC (11401600), and
4
5 the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (15lgpy07).
6
7

8
9 **The Gutenberg Health Study** (GHS) is funded through the government of Rheinland-Pfalz
10 („Stiftung Rheinland-Pfalz für Innovation“, contract AZ 961-386261/733), the research programs
11 “Wissen schafft Zukunft” and “Center for Translational Vascular Biology (CTVB)” of the
12
13 Johannes Gutenberg-University of Mainz, and its contract with Boehringer Ingelheim, PHILIPS
14
15 Medical Systems and Novartis Pharma, including an unrestricted grant for the Gutenberg Health
16
17 Study. Funders were involved in the development of the study design as scientific consultants.
18
19 However, they played no role in data collection, analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of
20
21 the manuscript.
22
23
24

25
26 **RAINE** We are grateful to all the study participants. We also thank the Raine Study and Lions
27
28 Eye Institute (LEI) research staff for cohort coordination and data collection. The core
29
30 management of the Raine Study is funded by The University of Western Australia (UWA), The
31
32 Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, Raine Medical Research Foundation, UWA Faculty
33
34 of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences, Women’s and Infant’s Research Foundation and
35
36 Curtin University. Genotyping was funded by Australian National Health and Medical Research
37
38 Council (NHMRC) project grant 1021105. Support for the REHS was provided by LEI, the
39
40 Australian Foundation for the Prevention of Blindness and the Ophthalmic Research Institute of
41
42 Australia.
43
44

45
46 **Rotterdam Study** was supported by the Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research
47
48 (NWO) (Vidi 91796357); Erasmus Medical Center and Erasmus University, Rotterdam,
49
50 ThNetherlands; Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development (ZonMw);
51
52 Uitzicht; the Research Institute for Diseases in the Elderly; the Ministry of Education, Culture
53
54 and Science; the Ministry for Health, Welfare and Sports; the European Commission (DG XII);
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the Municipality of Rotterdam; the Netherlands Genomics Initiative/NWO; Center for Medical
4
5 Systems Biology of NCI; 73 Lijf en Leven; M.D. Fonds; Henkes Stichting; Stichting Nederlands
6
7 Oogheelkundig Onderzoek; Swart van Essen; Bevordering van Volkskracht; Blindenhulp;
8
9 Landelijke Stichting voor Blinden en Slechtzienden; Rotterdamse Vereniging voor
10
11 Blindenbelangen; OOG; Algemene Nederlandse Vereniging ter Voorkoming van Blindheid; the
12
13 Rotterdam Eye Hospital Research Foundation; Topcon Europe; Ada Hooghart, Corina Brussee,
14
15 Riet Bernaerts-Biskop, Patricia van Hilten, Pascal Arp, Jeanette Vergeer, Marijn Verkerk;
16
17 Sander Bervoets; Daan Loth and Maarten Kooijman.
18
19

20
21 **STARS and SCORM** The Strabismus, Amblyopia, and Refractive Error Study of Preschool
22
23 Children (STARS) was supported by a NMRC grant (1176/2008). The Singapore Cohort Of the
24
25 Risk factors for Myopia (SCORM) study was supported by the National Medical Research
26
27 Council, Singapore (NMRC/0795/2005). We acknowledge the Genome Institute of Singapore for
28
29 genotyping all the samples collected from the cohort studies in Singapore.
30
31

32 33 Reference

- 34
35 1. Cheng C-Y, Schache M, Ikram MK, et al. Nine loci for ocular axial length identified through
36
37 genome-wide association studies, including shared loci with refractive error. *American Journal of Human*
38
39 *Genetics* 2013;93(2):264-77.
- 40
41 2. Yazar S, Cuellar-Partida G, McKnight CM, et al. Genetic and Environmental Factors in
42
43 Conjunctival UV Autofluorescence. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 2015;(in press).
- 44
45 3. Kruithof CJ, Kooijman MN, van Duijn CM, et al. The Generation R Study: Biobank update 2015.
46
47 *Eur J Epidemiol* 2014;29(12):911-27.
- 48
49 4. Solouki AM, Verhoeven VJ, van Duijn CM, et al. A genome-wide association study identifies a
50
51 susceptibility locus for refractive errors and myopia at 15q14. *Nat Genet* 2010;42(10):897-901.
- 52
53 5. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, et al. Cohort Profile: The 'Children of the 90s'--the index offspring
54
55 of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *International Journal of Epidemiology*
56
57 2013;42(1):111-27.
- 58
59 6. Wright MJ, Martin NG. Brisbane Adolescent Twin Study: Outline of study methods and research
60
61 projects. *Australian Journal of Psychology* 2004;56(2):65-78.
- 62
63 7. Jaddoe VW, van Duijn CM, Franco OH, et al. The Generation R Study: design and cohort update
64
65 2012. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2012;27(9):739-56.
- 66
67 8. Jaddoe VW, Bakker R, van Duijn CM, et al. The Generation R Study Biobank: a resource for
68
69 epidemiological studies in children and their parents. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2007;22(12):917-23.
- 70
71 9. Saw SM, Shankar A, Tan SB, et al. A cohort study of incident myopia in Singaporean children.
72
73 *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2006;47(5):1839-44.

10. Li YJ, Goh L, Khor CC, et al. Genome-wide association studies reveal genetic variants in CTNND2 for high myopia in Singapore Chinese. *Ophthalmology* 2011;118(2):368-75.
11. Dirani M, Chan YH, Gazzard G, et al. Prevalence of refractive error in Singaporean Chinese children: the strabismus, amblyopia, and refractive error in young Singaporean Children (STARS) study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51(3):1348-55.
12. Mackey DA, MacKinnon JR, Brown SA, et al. Twins Eye Study in Tasmania (TEST): Rationale and methodology to recruit and examine twins. *Twin Research and Human Genetics* 2009;12(5):441-54.

For Peer Review

When do myopia genes have their effect? Comparison of genetic risks between children and adults

J.W.L. Tideman^{1,2}, Q. Fan³, J.R. Polling^{1,4}, X. Guo^{5,6,7}, S. Yazar⁸, A. Khawaja⁹, R. Höhn^{10,11}, Yi Lu¹², V.W.V. Jaddoe², K. Yamashiro¹³, M. Yoshikawa¹³, A. Gerhold-Ay¹⁴, S. Nickels¹⁰, T. Zeller¹⁵, M. He^{16,17}, T. Boutin¹⁸, G. Bencic¹⁹, V. Vitart¹⁸, D.A. Mackey²⁰, P.J. Foster²¹, S. MacGregor¹², C. Williams²², S.M. Saw^{3,23}, J.A. Guggenheim^{24,25}, C.C.W. Klaver^{1,2,25} and the CREAM consortium

1 Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Ophthalmology 2 Erasmus Medical Center, Department of Epidemiology 3 Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore 4 School of Applied Science Utrecht, Department of Orthoptics 5 Sun Yat-Sen University, Department of Statistical Science, School of Mathematics & Computational Science 6 SYSU-CMU Shunde International Joint Research Institute 7 Southern China Research Center of Statistical Science, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, GD 510275, China 8 Lions Eye Institute, University of Western Australia, Centre for Ophthalmology and Visual Science 9 Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Institute of Public Health, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Cambridge, United Kingdom. 10 University Medical Center, Department of Ophthalmology, Mainz, Germany 11 Department of Ophthalmology, Inselspital, Bern, Switzerland 12 Statistical Genetics, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, Australia 13 Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto, Japan 14 University Medical Center Mainz, Institute of Medical Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, Mainz, Germany 15 University Heart Center Hamburg, Clinic for General and Interventional Cardiology, Hamburg, Germany 16 Centre for Eye Research Australia, University of Melbourne, Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, Melbourne, Australia 17 State Key Laboratory of Ophthalmology, Zhongshan Ophthalmic Center, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China 18 Medical Research Council Human Genetics Unit, Institute of Genetics and Molecular Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH4 2XU, UK 19 Department of Ophthalmology, Sisters of Mercy University Hospital, Zagreb, Croatia 20 Centre for Ophthalmology and Visual Science, Lions Eye Institute, University of Western Australia 21 9 NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust & UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, London, United Kingdom 22 School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, England 23 National university of Singapore Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore 24 School of Optometry & Vision Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales 25 These authors jointly led this work

Conflict of Interest: The authors have indicated they have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose

Correspondence:

Prof. Dr. Caroline C.W. Klaver, MD, PhD, Erasmus Medical Centre - Sophia Children's Hospital, AL2808; PO Box 2060, 3000 CB Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

E-mail: c.c.w.klaver@erasmusmc.nl

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Previous studies have identified many genetic loci for refractive error and myopia. We aimed to investigate the effect of these loci on ocular biometry as a function of age in children, adolescents and adults.

Methods: The study population consisted of three age-groups identified from the international CREAM consortium: 5,490 individuals aged <10 years; 5,000 aged 10-25 years; and 16,274 aged >25 years. All participants had undergone standard ophthalmic examination including measurements of axial length (AL) and corneal radius (CR). We examined the lead SNP at all 39 currently known genetic loci for refractive error identified from genome-wide association studies (GWAS), as well as a combined genetic risk score (GRS). The beta coefficient for association between SNP genotype or GRS versus AL/CR was compared across the 3 age groups, adjusting for age, sex, and principal components. Analyses were Bonferroni-corrected.

Results: In the age-group <10 years, 3 loci (*GJD2*, *CHRNA3*, *ZIC2*) were associated with AL/CR. In the age-group 10-25 years, 4 loci (*BMP2*, *KCNQ5*, *A2BP1*, *CACNA1D*) were associated; and in adults 20 loci were associated. Association with GRS increased with age; $\beta = 0.0016$ per risk allele ($P = 2E-08$) in <10 years, 0.0033 ($P = 5E-15$) in 10-25 year-olds, and 0.0048 ($P = 1E-72$) in adults. Genes with strongest effects (*LAMA2*, *GJD2*) had an early effect that increased with age.

Conclusion: Our results provide insights on the age span during which myopia genes exert their effect. These insights form the basis for understanding the mechanisms underlying high and pathological myopia.

Key words: myopia, genetic risk, development, SNPs

INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of myopia (nearsightedness) has increased dramatically in developed countries in recent decades [Bar Dayan, et al. 2005; Vitale, et al. 2009]. Myopia is a complex, multifactorial disease with increasing public health burden due to a strong rise worldwide. In particular high myopia is associated with blinding complications such as myopic macular degeneration, glaucoma and retinal detachment [Curtin and Karlin 1971; McBrien and Gentle 2003; Saw 2006]. High myopia mostly has its onset in early childhood before age 10 years [Fledelius 2000].

The eye's dimensions alter markedly during the peak development phase between birth and the late teenage years, ultimately exerting very strong effects on final refractive error (RE) in later adult life. A complex process called emmetropisation aims to coordinate ocular development, bringing light into clear focus on the retina. Early life myopia is characteristically associated with excessive axial length (AL) increase. This results in a mismatch of the optical effects of the various refractive components of the eye, resulting in a focal point in front of the retina. Such a mismatch can be described by the ratio of AL to corneal radius (CR), AL/CR ratio, which has a high correlation with RE [Hashemi, et al. 2013; Ip, et al. 2007] and is independent of cycloplegia which may vary between studies.

Various studies have examined the heritability of myopia showing increased risk for first-degree relatives of affected individuals [Farbrother, et al. 2004; Guggenheim, et al. 2000] and twins [Sanfilippo, et al. 2010; Young, et al. 2007]. Numerous genetic loci that cause familial high myopia (*MYP1-18*) have been discovered using linkage analysis [Baird, et al. 2010]. More recently, genome wide association studies (GWAS) in large cohorts have been performed to identify further determinants for REs in the general population. The first single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) identified were near *GJD2* [Solouki, et al. 2010] and *RASGRF1* [Solouki, et al. 2010]. Later many more loci were found in studies of large populations (CREAM; 23andMe)[Kiefer, et al. 2013; Verhoeven, et al. 2013] [Wojciechowski and Hysi 2013].

1
2
3 All previously published refractive error GWAS studies were performed in cohorts
4 enrolling participants aged 25 years and older. We aimed to study the effect size of the 39
5 GWAS-identified genetic regions associated with refractive error to date, as a function of age.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **METHODS**

12 **Study specific analysis**

13
14 We included 18 cohorts from 8 different countries in Europe, Asia and Oceania, with a total of
15 5,490 children <10 years, 5,000 individuals of 10-25 years, and 16,274 adults, all with
16 phenotypic and genome-wide genotypic data available. Age cut off points were based on prior
17 knowledge regarding eye growth. The eye has the highest growth rate before the age of 10
18 years, and generally does not grow in axial length after age 25 years [Zadnik, et al. 2003].
19 Details on subject recruitment procedures can be found in the supplemental materials. Each
20 study participant was genotyped with either an Affymetrix or Illumina SNP array (supplemental
21 table I). All studies were conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki. The studies were
22 approved by the local review boards. Written, informed consent for the collection and analysis of
23 measurements of all study participants was obtained.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **SNPs**

39 A total of 39 SNPs were included in this analysis. The SNPs were selected based on their
40 known association with RE and myopia in the GWAS carried out by CREAM [Verhoeven, et al.
41 2013] and 23andMe [Kiefer, et al. 2013](supplementary table II). An unweighted genetic risk
42 score (GRS) was calculated for each participant by summing the dosage of risk alleles (scale 0-
43 2) for all 39 SNPs. The risk score was normally distributed.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Ocular biometry**

52 The ocular biometry measurements included AL and CR, and the AL/CR ratio was calculated.
53 Multiple measurements of AL and CR were taken of the right eye and left eye, were averaged to
54 calculate a mean AL and CR for each eye. The average AL of both eyes was divided by the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 average CR of both eyes to calculate the AL/CR ratio. Details of the phenotypic assessment
4 protocols/instruments used in each study can be found in the supplemental material.
5
6

7 **Meta-analysis**

8
9 All studies performed linear regression models with each SNP or the GRS as determinants, and
10 the AL/CR ratio as outcome. Analyses were adjusted for the potentially confounding effects of
11 age and gender, and additionally – to account for ancestry differences within the sample – for
12 principal components where applicable. A meta-analysis was performed to estimate the beta
13 effects using an inversed variance weighted fixed effect model with METAL [Willer, et al. 2010].
14
15 Meta-analyses were performed in each age stratum separately, and in combined strata of all
16 participants <25 years. Several children measured in TEST (Twins Eye Study Tasmania) and
17 GTES (Guangzhou Twin Eye Study) had follow up measurements at an older age; therefore,
18 only data from the oldest age were used in the combined analysis. In the Asian studies the
19 following SNPs were excluded due to low minor allele frequency (MAF) <0.05 in the Chinese
20 population: rs17428076, rs1656404, rs14165, rs13091182, rs12205363, rs11145465,
21
22 rs10882165, and rs17183295.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Pathway analysis**

37
38 Loci with significant effects ($P < 0.05$) were further explored to identify differences in effect of
39 early-onset genes (significant loci identified in groups <10 years, 10–25 years or the combined
40 analysis) and late-onset genes (adult subjects). Data were analysed through the use of
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Pathway Analysis (IPA®, QIAGEN Redwood City, www.qiagen.com/ingenuity) and the online
software tool Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (DAVID) [Huang
da, et al. 2009a; Huang da, et al. 2009b].

RESULTS

Our study sample of children <10 years comprised 5,490 participants derived from 5 studies; one of European ancestry (TEST), three of Asian ancestry (SCORM, STARS, and Guangzhou Twins), and one of mixed European, African, and Asian ancestry (Generation R). Our sample of individuals aged 10-25 years included 5,000 participants derived from 6 studies; 4 of European ancestry (TEST, ALSPAC, BATS and RAINE), and 2 of Asian (STARS, Guangzhou Twins) ancestry. Our sample of adults >25 years comprised 16,274 participants derived from 10 studies; 9 of European ancestry (Croatia Split, -Kurcula and – Vis study, Gothenburg Health Study, EPIC-Norfolk and the Rotterdam Study I-III), and one Asian study (Nagahama). General characteristics per study are shown in Table I.

Genetic risk score

The genetic risk score was associated with a higher AL/CR ratio even in children aged <10 years (table II), and this association increased in magnitude with older age. Specifically, AL/CR increased with each age category from β 0.0019 (SD 0.0003) per risk allele in children <10 years, to 0.0033 (SD 0.0004) in participants aged 10-25 years, to 0.0051 (SD 0.0003) in adults (figure I). Only the adult group showed evidence for heterogeneity (heterogeneity P -value 0.0005) between studies, therefore, meta-analyses for this age category were also performed using the random effect model (β 0.0048; SD 0.0007; supplementary table IV). The variance explained by the genetic risk score increased from 0.7% in the children aged 6 from the Generation R study, to 3.7% for the adult participants in the RS I-III (Fig II).

Genetic loci

In children <10 years, 9/39 loci were significant at $P < 0.05$, and 3/39 were significant after correction for multiple-testing for 39 SNPs ($P < 0.00128$). The 3 loci significant after Bonferroni correction were in the vicinity of the genes *GJD2*, *ZIC2* and *CHRNA2*. The 2 nominally-significant

1
2
3 loci with the greatest effect size (beta) were close to the *CHRNA2* and *PRSS56* genes. The other
4
5 5 loci were near *KCNQ5*, *SHISA6*, *KCNMA1*, *BMP2* and *BICC1*. Interestingly, the SNP at the
6
7 *BMP2* locus had a reversed effect from that observed in adult samples, i.e., the risk allele was
8
9 associated with a lower AL/CR ratio. In individuals aged 10 - 25 years, 10/39 loci showed
10
11 nominally significant association with AL/CR ratio, of which 5 survived Bonferroni correction
12
13 (*BMP2*, *TOX*, *KCNQ5*, *A2BP1* and *CACNA1D*). Five of the 10 SNPs above were already
14
15 nominal significantly associated with AL/CR ratio in children <10 years (*GJD2*, *BICC1*, *ZIC2*,
16
17 *BMP2* and *PRSS56*); of the remaining nominally-significant loci, the variant with the greatest
18
19 effect in 10-25 year-olds was the SNP at the *LAMA2* locus. One variant differed significantly in
20
21 effect between children <10 years and those aged 10-25 years. This was the SNP at the *BMP2*
22
23 locus which, as mentioned above, showed an opposite effect to that expected in children aged
24
25 <10 years (Figure III). One of the loci (*TOX*) showed evidence for heterogeneity (supplementary
26
27 table III) in effect between study cohorts in the age category 10-25 years (Heterogeneity $P =$
28
29 0.001). With random effect model the effect of this SNP decreased to β 0.0062 (SE 0.0073; P
30
31 0.40)(supplementary table IV). In the combined analysis of all studies <25 years, *BICC1* and
32
33 *PRSS56* reached Bonferroni adjusted significance; one additional locus (*PDE11A*) showed a
34
35 nominally significant effect for AL/CR ratio. In adults, 31/39 loci showed a significant effect, of
36
37 which 19/39 were Bonferroni significant. All loci, except for *ZBTB38* (β -0.0004; SE 0.0019),
38
39 showed an association in the expected direction (i.e. risk allele associated with a higher AL/CR
40
41 ratio). As in 10-25 years, one locus significant in adults showed evidence for heterogeneity
42
43 (LOC100506035); with random effect model this locus lost statistical significance
44
45 (supplementary table III and IV). Figure IV displays all estimated effect sizes per age group.

51 Pathway analysis

52
53 Pathway analyses were performed to gain insight into the mechanisms for early versus late-
54
55 onset eye growth and myopia development. We hypothesized that loci with at least a moderate
56
57 (nominally significant $P < 0.05$) effect in children and adolescents most likely had an early onset.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hence, a locus was defined as early onset when nominally significant ($P < 0.05$) in the group <10
4 years of age or the group 10-25 years and no evidence for heterogeneity (in Figure IV all loci
5 above the green line). Loci nominally significant in the adult population without a significant
6 effect in the group <10 years of age or the group 10-25 years were grouped as late onset genes
7 (in Figure IV all loci below the green line). We utilized two types of pathway analysis software.
8
9

14 **Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA)**

15
16 IPA is a web-based software to analyse and integrate the identified SNPs based on biological
17 functions. Analysis were performed in two separate analysis, one analysis with genes with an
18 early onset and one analysis with late onset genes. We used the program's diseases and
19 disorder table to identify associated diseases. Genes with an early onset in the age groups <25
20 years were enriched in pathways of auditory disease, organismal injury and abnormalities, and
21 gastrointestinal disease (at FDR <5%). The genes that were significantly associated in adults
22 predisposed to connective tissue disorders, developmental disorder (e.g. microphthalmia; with
23 the genes *BMP4* and *SIX6*), and also gastrointestinal disease (supplementary table V).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (DAVID)**

34
35 The software program DAVID is an online knowledge database to identify overlapping functions
36 of genes. We performed the analyses separately for early and late onset genes. Using the
37 categories defined above, early-onset genes were significantly more than expected annotated
38 to ion channels and ion transport. The genes annotated to these categories were *CACNA1D*,
39 *CHRNG*, *GJD2*, *KCNMA1* and *KCNQ5*. Late onset genes appeared to be significantly more
40 related to neuron differentiation and visual perception. The genes involved in these categories
41 were *RORB*, *SIX6*, *RASGRF1*, *CHD7*, *RGR*, *RDH5* and *GRIA4*. (supplementary table VI).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **DISCUSSION:**

54
55 This study identifies the age span during which the known GWAS-identified loci for refractive
56 error have their greatest effect. The current meta-analysis suggests that specific loci had their
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 greatest effect in young children (*CHRNA1, ZIC2, KCNMA1*), while others reached the greatest
4 effect during early teenage years (*BMP2, CACNA1D, A2BP1*). However, most appeared to have
5 a gradual effect during the entire age span of myopia development (*LAMA2, LRRC4C, DLX1,*
6
7
8
9
10
11 *RDH5, GRIA4, RGR, SIX6*).

12 Strengths of this study were the large sample size, the comparison across 3 distinct age
13 categories, and the precision in measurements of ocular biometry. A drawback was the lack of
14 complete cycloplegic refraction in children in several studies, which jeopardized valid
15 measurements of RE in this age category. Thus, we used AL/CR ratio as an indicator of RE to
16 avoid heterogeneity in the outcome. This ratio has a high correlation with RE [Hashemi, et al.
17 2013; Ip, et al. 2007] and was available from all studies in the consortium. Another limitation
18 was the lack of power to detect statistically significant differences between the age groups for
19 most genes. A pooled analysis would have increased statistical power, but raw data from
20 individual participants were not available. Ideally, a study using longitudinal data of the same
21 children over different age periods would have the best study design for the current analysis.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Little has been reported on the development and progression of myopia as a function of
34 age; however, a number of studies investigated the relationship between development of ocular
35 biometry related to age. Until the age of 25 years, corneal curvature, the crystalline lens, and
36 axial length all evolve with age, and thereby influence refractive error. The cornea increases in
37 radius until preschool age leading to flattening of the corneal curvature and decrease in
38 refractive power [Augusteyn, et al. 2012]; the crystalline lens grows until 10 years of age, also
39 reducing refractive power [Mutti, et al. 2012; Mutti, et al. 1998]. This decrease in refractive
40 power is compensated by axial elongation which increases from 17 mm in newborns [Lim, et al.
41 2015] to 23.3 mm in 12-13 year olds [French, et al. 2012]. The average AL in emmetropic adults
42 is 23.5 mm [Fotedar, et al. 2010; Gordon and Donzis 1985]. The highest growth rate of AL
43 occurs in the first years of life and relates to emmetropisation; the growth rate after early teens
44 is more gradual but mainly relates to myopisation [Gordon and Donzis 1985]. The exact age at
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which eye growth stops is not known; generally this occurs before age 20 years, but increase in
4
5 AL has been described up to the age of 25 years in university students [Fledelius 2000;
6
7 Midelfart, et al. 1992].
8
9

10 One of the key detected GWAS-identified loci for refractive error is on chromosome 15
11 near the *GJD2* gene, that encodes a gap junction protein known as CX36. This protein not only
12 processes cone-to-cone and cone-to-rod signals [Lee, et al. 2003] but also directs signaling
13 between other retinal cells [Feigenspan, et al. 2001; Hidaka, et al. 2004]. This cell-to-cell
14 communication appears to be under regulation of light exposure and dopamine [Bloomfield and
15 Volgyi 2009], two factors that have an established role in eye growth and myopia development.
16 Our data suggest that *GJD2* has an early-onset, indicating that altered retinal cell signaling,
17 perhaps via reduced light exposure and low dopamine levels, may be a first step in myopia
18 development. As expected, some early-onset genes also had a reported role in eye
19 development. Knockout of *LAMA2*, a gene encoding the large extracellular glycoprotein laminin-
20 $\alpha 2$; causes growth retardation including smaller eyes with compressed cellular layers [Gupta, et
21 al. 2012]. Mutations in the serine protease gene *PRSS56* cause a severe decrease of AL
22 leading to microphthalmia [Nair, et al. 2011]. Another developmental gene is *ZIC2*, an
23 enhancer-binding factor required for embryonic stem cell specification [Luo, et al. 2015]. This
24 gene may be important for development of retinal architecture, as it is known to be involved in
25 differentiation and proliferation of retinal progenitor cells [Watabe, et al. 2011], and development
26 of retinal ganglion cell trajectories [Herrera, et al. 2003]. Strikingly, several other genes involved
27 in eye development, such as *SIX6*, *CDH7*, and *DLX1*, did not show an early onset but were
28 more significant after the age of 10 years. Other early-onset genes were ion channels such as
29 *KCNQ5*, a potassium channel present in cone and rod photoreceptors [Zhang, et al. 2011], and
30 *CACNA1D*, a calcium channel present in photoreceptors [Xiao, et al. 2007]. *CHRNA1* has as yet
31 an unknown role in myopia development. It encodes the γ subunit of the embryonal
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 acetylcholine receptor, which is widely expressed in the retina [Hruska, et al. 1978; Hutchins
4 and Hollyfield 1985], and is associated with multiple pterygium syndrome [Vogt, et al. 2012].
5
6

7
8 Several remarkable patterns of effect were notable. For instance, the lead SNPs at the
9
10 *BMP2*, *MYO1D*, *PTPRR*, and *BMP4* loci showed an opposite effect in children <10 years than
11
12 in those who were older. This is not uncommon in biology, as such a trajectory has also been
13
14 described for the *FTO* locus in relation to body mass index in children [Sovio, et al. 2011].
15
16 Interestingly, gene expression studies of *BMP2* in chickens showed that mRNA of this gene in
17
18 the retinal pigment epithelium is up- or down-regulated depending on the location of the image
19
20 plane [Zhang, et al. 2012]. When the image was focused behind the retina, mRNA was
21
22 downregulated and the vitreous chamber enlarged. This underscores a bidirectional role for
23
24 *BMP2* in modulation of eye growth.
25
26

27
28 Most genes had a late onset. *BMP4* has a similar function to *BMP2* as it is also responds
29
30 to optical defocus with bidirectional regulation of eye growth [Zhang, et al. 2013]. *SIX6* is a
31
32 DNA-binding homeobox and has a SIX domain, which binds downstream effector molecules. It
33
34 is known to influence eye size in zebrafish with knocked down *SIX6* expression [Iglesias, et al.
35
36 2014]. Other genes play a less obvious role in myopiagenesis. *MYO1D* is involved in membrane
37
38 trafficking in the recycling pathway and expressed in oligodendrites [Benesh, et al. 2012].
39
40 *RORB*, a gene encoding a nuclear receptor-directing photoreceptor differentiation, is known to
41
42 activate and generate S-opsin [Jia, et al. 2009; Srinivas, et al. 2006]. *DLX1* belongs to the DLX
43
44 family of homeobox transcription factors, and produces GABAergic interneurons during
45
46 embryonic development.
47
48

49
50 In conclusion, our study suggests that only a small proportion of the currently known
51
52 GWAS-identified loci for RE exert their full effect at a young age. Furthermore, some of the
53
54 pathways previously-identified by GWAS meta-analyses [Verhoeven, et al. 2013] can now be
55
56 separated into early- and late-onset pathways. For example, genes coding for ion channels
57
58 typically had an early onset, while genes related to connective tissue and visual feedback
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

mechanisms appeared to become more important at a later age. As the currently known genes play only a minor role in early-onset myopia, we question whether this type of myopia is caused by common variants in other genes, or whether rare variants with large effects determine early-onset. Future research may shed more light on genes for early-onset myopia, and unravelling these genes will open up strategies for prevention of high myopia.

For Peer Review

Table I Participating studies and characteristics stratified per age group

Age <10 years				
Study	N	AL/CR (SD; range)	Age (SD)	Gender, % Female
STARS	207	2.99 (0.150; 2.76 – 3.46)	5.45 (2.11)	47.3
Generation R	3,874	2.87 (0.083; 2.38 – 3.90)	6.18 (0.51)	50.3
SCORM	898	3.02 (0.112; 2.63 – 3.45)	7.48 (0.87)	47.7
TEST	166	2.94 (0.101; 2.65 – 3.25)	7.53 (1.21)	52.4
GTES	345	2.97 (0.100; 2.62 – 3.45)	8.73 (0.79)	50.1
Total	5,490			
Age 10-25 years				
STARS	96	3.23 (0.127; 2.95 – 3.60)	12.23 (1.7)	58.3
GTES	699	3.13 (0.147; 2.58 – 3.82)	14.83 (1.2)	52.9
TEST	182	2.99 (0.108; 2.68 – 3.51)	15.16 (4.0)	60.4
ALSPAC	1,996	2.99 (0.099; 2.57 – 3.52)	15.46 (0.3)	53.6
BATS	983	3.03 (0.106; 2.67 – 3.82)	19.07 (3.2)	53.8
RAINE	1,044	3.05 (0.104; 2.63 – 3.54)	20.04 (0.4)	48.9
Total	5,000			
Age >25 years				
Nagahama	2,762	3.13 (0.153; 2.62 – 3.86)	52.05 (13.8)	49.0
Croatia-Split	730	3.02 (0.128; 2.38 – 3.90)	52.16 (13.0)	61.2
Croatia Korcula	832	2.99 (0.203; 2.26 – 5.73)	56.62 (13.3)	64.7
Croatia-Vis	573	2.99 (0.121; 2.50 – 3.83)	55.93 (13.8)	60.4
GHS 2	936	3.07 (0.160; 2.50 – 4.01)	59.26 (10.6)	50.0
GHS 1	1,919	3.06 (0.151; 2.30 – 3.88)	60.17 (10.7)	47.1
EPIC-Norfolk	6,051	3.05 (0.146; 2.42 – 3.95)	68.9 (8.0)	54.3
RS I-III	2,471	3.05 (0.143; 2.43 – 3.86)	70.02 (8.8)	53.6
Total	16,274			

*GTES= Guangzhou Twin Eye Study, RS I-III = Rotterdam Study I-III, GHS=Gutenberg Health Study

Table II Effect size of myopia related genes in age groups <10 years, 10-25 years, 25> years

Variant	Chr	Gene	RA	<10 years		10 - 25 years		Combined		>25 years	
				Beta (SE)	P	Beta (SE)	P	Beta (SE)	P	Beta (SE)	P
Allele Score	-	-	-	0.0019 (0.0003)	10⁻¹¹	0.0033 (0.0004)	10⁻¹⁵	0.0024 (0.0002)	10⁻²⁴	0.0051(0.0003)	10⁻⁷²
rs1652333	1	CD55	G	0.0033 (0.0017)	0.05	0.0006 (0.0024)	0.80	0.0026 (0.0014)	0.07	0.0084(0.0017)	10⁻⁶
rs4373767	1	ZC3H11B	T	0.0010 (0.0017)	0.55	0.0032 (0.0023)	0.16	0.0019 (0.0014)	0.16	0.0053(0.0017)	0.002
rs17412774	2	PABPCP2	A	0.0007 (0.0017)	0.69	0.0010 (0.0023)	0.67	0.0008 (0.0014)	0.57	0.0063(0.0017)	10⁻⁴
rs17428076	2	DLX1	C	0.0017 (0.0021)	0.43	0.0029 (0.0027)	0.28	0.0024 (0.0017)	0.16	0.0073(0.0021)	10⁻⁴
rs1898585	2	PDE11A	T	0.0022 (0.0019)	0.26	0.0050 (0.0029)	0.09	0.0034 (0.0017)	0.04	0.0057(0.0021)	0.007
rs1656404	2	PRSS56	A	0.0073 (0.0024)	0.002	0.0067 (0.0033)	0.04	0.0069 (0.0019)	10⁻⁴	0.0079(0.0024)	0.001
rs1881492	2	CHRNA1	T	0.0086 (0.0024)	10⁻⁴	0.0039 (0.0031)	0.21	0.0064 (0.0020)	0.001	0.0085(0.0022)	10⁻⁵
rs14165	3	CACNA1D	G	0.0035 (0.0020)	0.08	0.0082 (0.0026)	0.001	0.0055 (0.0016)	0.001	0.0055(0.0020)	0.005
rs13091182	3	ZBTB38	G	0.0008 (0.0020)	0.69	-0.0001 (0.0024)	0.98	0.0007 (0.0015)	0.66	-0.0004(0.0019)	0.83
rs9307551	4	LOC100506035	A	0.0007 (0.0019)	0.70	0.0037 (0.0026)	0.16	0.0020 (0.0016)	0.20	0.0051(0.0020)	0.008
rs5022942	4	BMP3	A	0.0014 (0.0018)	0.44	-0.0016 (0.0026)	0.54	0.0007 (0.0015)	0.63	0.0006(0.0020)	0.78
rs7744813	6	KCNQ5	A	0.0050 (0.0017)	0.004	0.0081 (0.0023)	10⁻⁴	0.0060 (0.0014)	10⁻⁵	0.0066(0.0018)	10⁻⁴
rs12205363	6	LAMA2	T	0.0041 (0.0041)	0.31	0.0138 (0.0046)	0.003	0.0094 (0.0031)	0.003	0.0229(0.0036)	10⁻¹⁰
rs7829127	8	ZMAT4	A	0.0025 (0.0020)	0.22	0.0019 (0.0028)	0.49	0.0025 (0.0017)	0.13	0.0072(0.0021)	0.001
rs7837791	8	TOX	G	0.0029 (0.0016)	0.06	0.0083 (0.0022)	10⁻⁴	0.0050 (0.0013)	10⁻⁴	0.0042(0.0017)	0.012
rs4237036	8	CHD7	T	0.0001 (0.0018)	0.96	0.0032 (0.0024)	0.18	0.0013 (0.0014)	0.37	0.0058(0.0018)	0.001
rs11145465	9	TJP2	A	0.0035 (0.0022)	0.11	0.0027 (0.0028)	0.33	0.0029 (0.0017)	0.09	0.0062(0.0021)	0.004
rs7042950	9	RORB	G	0.0028 (0.0019)	0.14	0.0031 (0.0026)	0.24	0.0027 (0.0016)	0.08	0.0071(0.0020)	10⁻⁴
rs7084402	10	BICC1	G	0.0035 (0.0016)	0.03	0.0066 (0.0023)	0.004	0.0050 (0.0013)	10⁻⁴	0.0074(0.0017)	10⁻⁶
rs6480859	10	KCNMA1	T	0.0040 (0.0018)	0.02	0.0037 (0.0023)	0.10	0.0040 (0.0014)	0.004	0.0015(0.0017)	0.38
rs745480	10	RGR	G	0.0007 (0.0016)	0.67	0.0021 (0.0022)	0.34	0.0011 (0.0013)	0.40	0.0055(0.0017)	0.001
rs10882165	10	CYP26A1	T	0.0012 (0.0018)	0.49	0.0002 (0.0024)	0.93	0.0007 (0.0014)	0.61	0.0011(0.0018)	0.54
rs1381566	11	LRRRC4C	G	0.0026 (0.0020)	0.21	0.0040 (0.0034)	0.23	0.0028 (0.0018)	0.12	0.0093(0.0022)	10⁻⁵
rs2155413	11	DLG2	A	0.0022 (0.0017)	0.18	0.0027 (0.0022)	0.23	0.0023 (0.0013)	0.09	0.0021(0.0017)	0.21
rs11601239	11	GRIA4	C	0.0011 (0.0016)	0.50	0.0027 (0.0022)	0.22	0.0014 (0.0013)	0.30	0.0055(0.0017)	0.001
rs3138144	12	RDH5	G	0.0020 (0.0021)	0.35	0.0039 (0.0027)	0.16	0.0028 (0.0017)	0.10	0.0045(0.0019)	0.02
rs12229663	12	PTPRR	A	-0.0023 (0.0019)	0.21	0.0046 (0.0026)	0.08	0.0000 (0.0016)	1.00	0.0069(0.0019)	10⁻⁴
rs8000973	13	ZIC2	C	0.0058 (0.0017)	10⁻⁴	0.0058 (0.0023)	0.01	0.0059 (0.0014)	10⁻⁵	0.0027(0.0017)	0.10
rs2184971	13	PCCA	A	0.0008 (0.0016)	0.61	0.0006 (0.0023)	0.80	0.0009 (0.0014)	0.48	0.0021(0.0017)	0.21
rs66913363	14	BMP4	G	-0.0025 (0.0017)	0.15	0.0040 (0.0024)	0.10	0.0006 (0.0014)	0.68	0.0047(0.0017)	0.006
rs1254319	14	SIX6	A	0.0007 (0.0017)	0.68	0.0044 (0.0024)	0.07	0.0017 (0.0014)	0.22	0.0054(0.0018)	0.002
rs524952	15	GJD2	A	0.0069 (0.0016)	10⁻⁵	0.0068 (0.0023)	0.003	0.0067 (0.0013)	10⁻⁷	0.0122(0.0016)	10⁻¹⁴
rs4778879	15	RASGRF1	G	0.0018 (0.0017)	0.29	0.0033 (0.0023)	0.15	0.0019 (0.0014)	0.17	0.0051(0.0017)	0.002
rs17648524	16	A2BP1	C	0.0018 (0.0018)	0.33	0.0079 (0.0024)	0.001	0.0039 (0.0015)	0.01	0.0077(0.0019)	10⁻⁵
rs2969180	17	SHISA6	A	0.0035 (0.0016)	0.03	0.0017 (0.0023)	0.46	0.0027 (0.0014)	0.05	0.0079(0.0017)	10⁻⁶
rs17183295	17	MYO1D	T	-0.0033 (0.0023)	0.16	0.0009 (0.0030)	0.76	-0.0018 (0.0018)	0.33	0.0089(0.0023)	10⁻⁴

rs4793501	17	KCNJ2	T	0.0029 (0.0016)	0.08	0.0001 (0.0022)	0.95	0.0019 (0.0013)	0.16	0.0041(0.0017)	0.015
rs12971120	18	CNDP2	A	0.0002 (0.0019)	0.93	0.0048 (0.0026)	0.07	0.0017 (0.0015)	0.27	0.0024(0.0019)	0.22
rs235770	20	BMP2	T	-0.0043 (0.0018)	0.02	0.0121 (0.0025)	10⁻⁶	0.0008 (0.0015)	0.60	0.0043(0.0017)	0.013

Values are betas (SE) and *P*-values, from linear regression models adjusted for sex, age and principal components if applicable meta-analysed with inversed variance meta-analysis in METAL. Bold: *P* < 0.05.

For Peer Review

1
2
3 **Figure I.** Association between genetic risk score and myopia in the three age groups

4
5 **Figure II.** Association between non-weighted genetic risk score and AL/CR ratio in children and adults.

6
7 **Figure III.** Increased effect on AL/CR ratio with age for *BMP2* gene.

8
9 **Figure IV.** Distribution of effects on AL/CR ratio per myopia-related gene in three age groups

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 **REFERENCES**

- 21
22 Augusteyn RC, Nankivil D, Mohamed A, Maceo B, Pierre F, Parel JM. 2012. Human ocular biometry. *Exp*
23 *Eye Res* 102:70-5.
- 24 Baird PN, Schache M, Dirani M. 2010. The GENes in Myopia (GEM) study in understanding the aetiology
25 of refractive errors. *Prog Retin Eye Res* 29(6):520-42.
- 26 Bar Dayan Y, Levin A, Morad Y, Grotto I, Ben-David R, Goldberg A, Onn E, Avni I, Levi Y, Benyamini OG.
27 2005. The changing prevalence of myopia in young adults: a 13-year series of population-based
28 prevalence surveys. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 46(8):2760-5.
- 29 Benesh AE, Fleming JT, Chiang C, Carter BD, Tyska MJ. 2012. Expression and localization of myosin-1d in
30 the developing nervous system. *Brain Res* 1440:9-22.
- 31 Bloomfield SA, Volgyi B. 2009. The diverse functional roles and regulation of neuronal gap junctions in
32 the retina. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 10(7):495-506.
- 33 Curtin BJ, Karlin DB. 1971. Axial length measurements and fundus changes of the myopic eye. *Am J*
34 *Ophthalmol* 71(1 Pt 1):42-53.
- 35 Farbrother JE, Kirov G, Owen MJ, Guggenheim JA. 2004. Family aggregation of high myopia: estimation
36 of the sibling recurrence risk ratio. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 45(9):2873-8.
- 37 Feigenspan A, Teubner B, Willecke K, Weiler R. 2001. Expression of neuronal connexin36 in All amacrine
38 cells of the mammalian retina. *J Neurosci* 21(1):230-9.
- 39 Fledelius HC. 2000. Myopia profile in Copenhagen medical students 1996-98. Refractive stability over a
40 century is suggested. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand* 78(5):501-5.
- 41 Fotedar R, Wang JJ, Burlutsky G, Morgan IG, Rose K, Wong TY, Mitchell P. 2010. Distribution of axial
42 length and ocular biometry measured using partial coherence laser interferometry (IOL Master)
43 in an older white population. *Ophthalmology* 117(3):417-23.
- 44 French AN, O'Donoghue L, Morgan IG, Saunders KJ, Mitchell P, Rose KA. 2012. Comparison of refraction
45 and ocular biometry in European Caucasian children living in Northern Ireland and Sydney,
46 Australia. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 53(7):4021-31.
- 47 Gordon RA, Donzis PB. 1985. Refractive development of the human eye. *Arch Ophthalmol* 103(6):785-9.
- 48 Guggenheim JA, Kirov G, Hodson SA. 2000. The heritability of high myopia: a reanalysis of Goldschmidt's
49 data. *J Med Genet* 37(3):227-31.
- 50 Gupta VA, Kawahara G, Myers JA, Chen AT, Hall TE, Manzini MC, Currie PD, Zhou Y, Zon LI, Kunkel LM
51 and others. 2012. A splice site mutation in laminin-alpha2 results in a severe muscular dystrophy
52 and growth abnormalities in zebrafish. *PLoS One* 7(8):e43794.

- 1
2
3 Hashemi H, Khabazkhoob M, Miraftab M, Emamian MH, Shariati M, Abdolahi-Nia T, Fotouhi A. 2013.
4 Axial length to corneal radius of curvature ratio and refractive errors. *J Ophthalmic Vis Res*
5 8(3):220-6.
6
7 Herrera E, Brown L, Aruga J, Rachel RA, Dolen G, Mikoshiba K, Brown S, Mason CA. 2003. Zic2 patterns
8 binocular vision by specifying the uncrossed retinal projection. *Cell* 114(5):545-57.
9
10 Hidaka S, Akahori Y, Kurosawa Y. 2004. Dendrodendritic electrical synapses between mammalian retinal
11 ganglion cells. *J Neurosci* 24(46):10553-67.
12
13 Hruska RE, White R, Azari J, Yamamura HI. 1978. Muscarinic cholinergic receptors in mammalian retina.
14 *Brain Res* 148(2):493-8.
15
16 Huang da W, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. 2009a. Bioinformatics enrichment tools: paths toward the
17 comprehensive functional analysis of large gene lists. *Nucleic Acids Res* 37(1):1-13.
18
19 Huang da W, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. 2009b. Systematic and integrative analysis of large gene lists
20 using DAVID bioinformatics resources. *Nat Protoc* 4(1):44-57.
21
22 Hutchins JB, Hollyfield JG. 1985. Acetylcholine receptors in the human retina. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*
23 26(11):1550-7.
24
25 Iglesias AI, Springelkamp H, van der Linde H, Severijnen LA, Amin N, Oostra B, Kockx CE, van den Hout
26 MC, van Ijcken WF, Hofman A and others. 2014. Exome sequencing and functional analyses
27 suggest that SIX6 is a gene involved in an altered proliferation-differentiation balance early in
28 life and optic nerve degeneration at old age. *Hum Mol Genet* 23(5):1320-32.
29
30 Ip JM, Huynh SC, Kifley A, Rose KA, Morgan IG, Varma R, Mitchell P. 2007. Variation of the contribution
31 from axial length and other oculometric parameters to refraction by age and ethnicity. *Invest*
32 *Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 48(10):4846-53.
33
34 Jia L, Oh EC, Ng L, Srinivas M, Brooks M, Swaroop A, Forrest D. 2009. Retinoid-related orphan nuclear
35 receptor RORbeta is an early-acting factor in rod photoreceptor development. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
36 *U S A* 106(41):17534-9.
37
38 Kiefer AK, Tung JY, Do CB, Hinds DA, Mountain JL, Francke U, Eriksson N. 2013. Genome-wide analysis
39 points to roles for extracellular matrix remodeling, the visual cycle, and neuronal development
40 in myopia. *PLoS Genet* 9(2):e1003299.
41
42 Lee EJ, Han JW, Kim HJ, Kim IB, Lee MY, Oh SJ, Chung JW, Chun MH. 2003. The immunocytochemical
43 localization of connexin 36 at rod and cone gap junctions in the guinea pig retina. *Eur J Neurosci*
44 18(11):2925-34.
45
46 Lim LS, Chua S, Tan PT, Cai S, Chong YS, Kwek K, Gluckman PD, Fortier MV, Ngo C, Qiu A and others.
47 2015. Eye size and shape in newborn children and their relation to axial length and refraction at
48 3 years. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 35(4):414-23.
49
50 Luo Z, Gao X, Lin C, Smith ER, Marshall SA, Swanson SK, Florens L, Washburn MP, Shilatifard A. 2015. Zic2
51 is an enhancer-binding factor required for embryonic stem cell specification. *Mol Cell* 57(4):685-
52 94.
53
54 McBrien NA, Gentle A. 2003. Role of the sclera in the development and pathological complications of
55 myopia. *Prog Retin Eye Res* 22(3):307-38.
56
57 Midelfart A, Aamo B, Sjøhaug KA, Dysthe BE. 1992. Myopia among medical students in Norway. *Acta*
58 *Ophthalmol (Copenh)* 70(3):317-22.
59
60 Mutti DO, Mitchell GL, Sinnott LT, Jones-Jordan LA, Moeschberger ML, Cotter SA, Kleinstein RN, Manny
RE, Twelker JD, Zadnik K and others. 2012. Corneal and crystalline lens dimensions before and
after myopia onset. *Optom Vis Sci* 89(3):251-62.
Mutti DO, Zadnik K, Fusaro RE, Friedman NE, Sholtz RI, Adams AJ. 1998. Optical and structural
development of the crystalline lens in childhood. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 39(1):120-33.

- 1
2
3 Nair KS, Hmani-Aifa M, Ali Z, Kearney AL, Ben Salem S, Macalinao DG, Cosma IM, Bouassida W, Hakim B,
4 Benzina Z and others. 2011. Alteration of the serine protease PRSS56 causes angle-closure
5 glaucoma in mice and posterior microphthalmia in humans and mice. *Nat Genet* 43(6):579-84.
6 Sanfilippo PG, Hewitt AW, Hammond CJ, Mackey DA. 2010. The heritability of ocular traits. *Surv*
7 *Ophthalmol* 55(6):561-83.
8 Saw SM. 2006. How blinding is pathological myopia? *Br J Ophthalmol* 90(5):525-6.
9 Solouki AM, Verhoeven VJ, van Duijn CM, Verkerk AJ, Ikram MK, Hysi PG, Despriet DD, van Koolwijk LM,
10 Ho L, Ramdas WD and others. 2010. A genome-wide association study identifies a susceptibility
11 locus for refractive errors and myopia at 15q14. *Nat Genet* 42(10):897-901.
12 Sovio U, Mook-Kanamori DO, Warrington NM, Lawrence R, Briollais L, Palmer CN, Cecil J, Sandling JK,
13 Syvanen AC, Kaakinen M and others. 2011. Association between common variation at the FTO
14 locus and changes in body mass index from infancy to late childhood: the complex nature of
15 genetic association through growth and development. *PLoS Genet* 7(2):e1001307.
16 Srinivas M, Ng L, Liu H, Jia L, Forrest D. 2006. Activation of the blue opsin gene in cone photoreceptor
17 development by retinoid-related orphan receptor beta. *Mol Endocrinol* 20(8):1728-41.
18 Verhoeven VJ, Hysi PG, Wojciechowski R, Fan Q, Guggenheim JA, Hohn R, MacGregor S, Hewitt AW, Nag
19 A, Cheng CY and others. 2013. Genome-wide meta-analyses of multi-ancestry cohorts identify
20 multiple new susceptibility loci for refractive error and myopia. *Nat Genet* 45(3):314-8.
21 Vitale S, Sperduto RD, Ferris FL, 3rd. 2009. Increased prevalence of myopia in the United States between
22 1971-1972 and 1999-2004. *Arch Ophthalmol* 127(12):1632-9.
23 Vogt J, Morgan NV, Rehal P, Faivre L, Brueton LA, Becker K, Fryns JP, Holder S, Islam L, Kivuva E and
24 others. 2012. CHRNA3 genotype-phenotype correlations in the multiple pterygium syndromes. *J*
25 *Med Genet* 49(1):21-6.
26 Watabe Y, Baba Y, Nakauchi H, Mizota A, Watanabe S. 2011. The role of Zic family zinc finger
27 transcription factors in the proliferation and differentiation of retinal progenitor cells. *Biochem*
28 *Biophys Res Commun* 415(1):42-7.
29 Willer CJ, Li Y, Abecasis GR. 2010. METAL: fast and efficient meta-analysis of genomewide association
30 scans. *Bioinformatics* 26(17):2190-1.
31 Wojciechowski R, Hysi PG. 2013. Focusing in on the complex genetics of myopia. *PLoS Genet*
32 9(4):e1003442.
33 Xiao H, Chen X, Steele EC, Jr. 2007. Abundant L-type calcium channel Ca(v)1.3 (alpha1D) subunit mRNA is
34 detected in rod photoreceptors of the mouse retina via in situ hybridization. *Mol Vis* 13:764-71.
35 Young TL, Metlapally R, Shay AE. 2007. Complex trait genetics of refractive error. *Arch Ophthalmol*
36 125(1):38-48.
37 Zadnik K, Manny RE, Yu JA, Mitchell GL, Cotter SA, Quiralte JC, Shipp M, Friedman NE, Kleinstejn R,
38 Walker TW and others. 2003. Ocular component data in schoolchildren as a function of age and
39 gender. *Optom Vis Sci* 80(3):226-36.
40 Zhang X, Yang D, Hughes BA. 2011. KCNQ5/K(v)7.5 potassium channel expression and subcellular
41 localization in primate retinal pigment epithelium and neural retina. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol*
42 301(5):C1017-26.
43 Zhang Y, Liu Y, Ho C, Wildsoet CF. 2013. Effects of imposed defocus of opposite sign on temporal gene
44 expression patterns of BMP4 and BMP7 in chick RPE. *Exp Eye Res* 109:98-106.
45 Zhang Y, Liu Y, Wildsoet CF. 2012. Bidirectional, optical sign-dependent regulation of BMP2 gene
46 expression in chick retinal pigment epithelium. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 53(10):6072-80.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Response to Reviewers' Comments

We thank the editor and reviewers for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript and the nice words. We provide a point-by-point response to the comments below. Underlined text represents changes according to the previous manuscript.

Comments to Author from reviewer:

Title: When do myopia genes have their effect? Comparison of genetic risks between children and adults

Authors: Tideman et al.

In this manuscript, authors investigated role of effects of GWAS identified SNPs on ocular biometry as a function of age. The investigators stratified the data into three groups: less than 10 years, 10-25 years, and over 25 years. The numbers of participants in each group were substantially large leading to good statistical power for associations studied in the paper. Overall, the paper is well-written. Specific comments:

1. It is not clear how the age group stratification decided? What is the rationale for the cut-offs of 10 and 25 years? Was this decided prior to analyses or post-hoc?

The group stratification was decided beforehand based on knowledge of myopia development and eye growth. Myopia can progress until 25 years; therefore, we chose this age cut off as the inclusion criteria for the adult GWAS study.[Verhoeven, et al. 2013] Mutti et al have shown that eye growth is larger in 6-9 years (0.69mm in 3 yrs) than in 10-13 years (0.27 mm in 3 years). Therefore, we chose 10 years as a cutoff in the children.[Zadnik, et al. 2003]

We added this to the methods: *“Age cut off points were based on prior knowledge regarding eye growth. The eye has the highest growth rate before the age of 10 years, and generally does not grow in axial length after age 25 years”*

2. Along the same lines, did you test for interaction between age and GRS (both as continuous variable)?

We indeed have tested for interaction between these variables, however, we did not obtain significant results (p-value 0.44). We think this is due to the narrow age range in the largest studies. The SD of age in Generation R is 0.5 years and in ALSPAC 0.3 years, which is too small to result in substantial differences in AL/CR ratio. The other studies are smaller and do not have enough power to obtain significant interaction terms.

3. Can you expand the results of the “Pathway analysis”, page 7 and 8. It is not clear what the results are based on what is written.

Thank you for pointing this out. We have expanded this part in the result section page 8 in lines 15 – 50.

Verhoeven VJ, Hysi PG, Wojciechowski R, Fan Q, Guggenheim JA, Hohn R, MacGregor S, Hewitt AW, Nag A, Cheng CY and others. 2013. Genome-wide meta-analyses of multiethnic cohorts identify multiple new susceptibility loci for refractive error and myopia. *Nat Genet* 45(3):314-8.

Zadnik K, Manny RE, Yu JA, Mitchell GL, Cotter SA, Quiralte JC, Shipp M, Friedman NE, Kleinstejn R, Walker TW and others. 2003. Ocular component data in schoolchildren as a function of age and gender. *Optom Vis Sci* 80(3):226-36.