



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/157992/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Dusingize, JC, Olsen, CM, An, J et al. (2020) Body mass index and height and risk of cutaneous melanoma: Mendelian randomization analyses. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 49 (4). pp. 1236-1245. ISSN: 0300-5771

<https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyaa009>

© The Author(s) 2020; all rights reserved. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the International Epidemiological Association. This is an author produced version of an article published in *International Journal of Epidemiology*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Body mass index and height and risk of cutaneous melanoma: Mendelian randomization analyses

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Epidemiology</i>
Manuscript ID	IJE-2019-05-0732.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	DUSINGIZE, JEAN; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Population Health ; University of Queensland School of Public Health Olsen, Catherine; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Cancer Control Group; University of Queensland School of Medicine An, Jiyuan; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute Pandeya , Nirmala; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Population Health ; University of Queensland School of Public Health Law, Matthew; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute Thompson, Bridie; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute Goldstein, Alisa; National Cancer Institute, Genetic Epidemiology Branch Iles, Mark; University of Leeds , Leeds Institute of Cancer and Pathology Webb, Penelope; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Population Health; University of Queensland School of Public Health Neale, Rachel; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Population Health Ong, Jue Sheng; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Statistical Genetics MacGregor, Stuart; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Statistical Genetics; University of Queensland School of Medicine Whiteman, David; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Population Health
Key Words:	body mass index, height, body size, skin cancer, melanoma, Mendelian randomization

1
2
3 **Body mass index and height and risk of cutaneous melanoma: Mendelian randomization**
4 **analyses**
5
6

7 Jean Claude Dusingize^{1,2}, Catherine M. Olsen^{1,4}, Jiyuan An³, Nirmala Pandeya^{1,2}, Matthew H.
8 Law³, Bridie S. Thompson¹, Alisa M. Goldstein⁵, Mark M. Iles⁶, Penelope M. Webb^{1,2}, Rachel E.
9 Neale^{1,2}, Jue-Sheng Ong^{3*}, Stuart MacGregor^{3,4*}, David C. Whiteman^{1,2*}
10
11
12

13
14 *These 3 authors contributed equally to the paper
15
16

17 ¹ Department of Population Health, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane,
18 Australia
19

20 ² School of Public Health, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
21

22 ³ Department of Genetics and Computational Biology, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute,
23 Brisbane, Australia
24

25 ⁴ School of Medicine, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
26

27 ⁵ Human Genetics Program, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer
28 Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, USA
29

30 ⁶ Section of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Leeds Institute of Cancer and Pathology, University of
31 Leeds, Leeds, UK
32
33
34
35

36 **Corresponding author:** Professor David Whiteman
37

38 Cancer Control Group,
39

40 QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute,
41

42 Locked Bag 2000, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, QLD 4029;
43

44 email: david.whiteman@qimrberghofer.edu.au
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background: Height and body mass index (BMI) have both been positively associated with melanoma risk, although findings for BMI have been less consistent than height. It remains unclear, however, whether these associations reflect causality or are due to residual confounding by environmental and lifestyle risk factors. We re-evaluated these associations using a two-sample Mendelian randomization (MR) approach.

Methods: We identified single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) for BMI and height from separate genome-wide association study (GWAS) meta-analyses. We obtained melanoma SNPs from the most recent melanoma GWAS meta-analysis comprising 12,874 cases and 23,203 controls. We used the inverse variance-weighted estimator to derive separate causal risk estimates across all SNP instruments for BMI and height.

Results: Based on the combined estimate derived from 730 SNPs for BMI, we found no evidence of an association between genetically predicted BMI and melanoma (OR per 1SD [4.6 kg/m²] increase in BMI 1.00, 95% CI: 0.91-1.11). In contrast, we observed a positive association between genetically-predicted height (derived from a pooled estimate of 3,290 SNPs) and melanoma risk (OR 1.08, 95% CI: 1.02-1.13, per 1SD [9.27 cm] increase in height). Sensitivity analyses using two alternative MR methods yielded similar results.

Conclusions: These findings provide no evidence for a causal association between higher BMI and melanoma, but support the notion that height is causally associated with melanoma risk.

Mechanisms through which height influences melanoma risk remain unclear, and it remains possible that the effect could be mediated through diverse pathways including growth factors and even socioeconomic status.

Key words: body mass index; height; body size; skin cancer; melanoma; causality; Mendelian randomization

Key Messages

- Observational studies examining the association between BMI and height and melanoma risk have yielded inconsistent findings.
- To resolve this inconsistency, we conducted Mendelian randomization analyses using large GWAS datasets.
- We found no evidence to suggest that the association between higher BMI and melanoma risk is causal but, height was found to be associated with melanoma.
- Mechanisms through which height influences melanoma risk remain unclear; numerous pathways have been proposed.

View Only

INTRODUCTION

Exposure to ultra-violet radiation and having a sun-sensitive phenotype are established risk factors for cutaneous melanoma (hereafter referred to as melanoma) among susceptible people^{1,2}. The associations with other factors are less clear, although some studies suggest a possible link between anthropometric factors and melanoma risk³⁻⁵. Previous observational studies have reported positive associations with body mass index (BMI) and height, but findings varied across studies. Positive associations between high BMI and melanoma have been reported in some^{4,6} but not all⁷⁻⁹ cohort studies. With regard to height, most previous observational studies of melanoma have reported an increased risk among taller people^{4,5,10-13}.

It remains unclear whether the reported associations represent true causal relationships or are explained by bias or confounding by other factors simultaneously associated with BMI, height and melanoma risk. For example, some studies have speculated that obesity and height might be causally associated with melanoma through increased body surface area and larger number of target cells at risk^{14,15} or, conversely, that melanoma risk might be decreased among obese people through limited outdoor recreational activities and difference in sun-seeking behaviours compared to their non-obese counterparts. Obesity may also be associated with other unknown or unmeasured lifestyle factors, and the possibility of residual confounding by such factors remains a limitation of all observational studies. Finally, information regarding childhood illness and nutrition status, which are potential modifiable factors of height, have not been assessed in previous studies.

One approach to circumvent some of the threats to validity and limitations found in conventional observational studies is to conduct instrumental variable analyses using genetic variants as proxy markers for risk factors, a technique known as Mendelian randomization (MR)¹⁶. MR uses genetic

1
2
3 variants associated with an exposure (or a biological intermediate) to estimate its effects on the
4
5 outcome ¹⁷. Because genetic variants associated with adult BMI and height are randomly assigned
6
7 from parents to their offspring at conception, MR studies are closer to the random assignment of
8
9 exposure in a randomized controlled trial, in which known and unknown genetic confounders are
10
11 randomly distributed across different treatment arms, assuming various MR assumptions are met.
12
13 We conducted MR analyses of BMI and height in relation to the risk of melanoma using the very
14
15 large international genome-wide association (GWAS) datasets from the Genetic Investigation of
16
17 ANthropometric Traits (GIANT) consortium ¹⁸ and consortium data from the melanoma GWAS
18
19 meta-analysis ¹⁹.

22 23 24 25 **METHODS**

26
27 We applied a two-sample Mendelian randomization approach to evaluate whether genetically
28
29 predicted BMI and height are risk factors for melanoma using publically available summary data
30
31 from the meta-analyses of genome-wide association studies (GWAS).
32
33

34 35 36 37 **Instrumental variables**

38
39 Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) were identified from the largest 2018 GWAS meta-
40
41 analysis of measured BMI and height in adulthood from the GIANT consortium ¹⁸. This meta-
42
43 analysis included data from a total of ~700,000 participants of European descent, comprising
44
45 ~250,000 participants from the earlier GWAS meta-analyses (conducted in 2014 and 2015) ^{20,21},
46
47 and new GWAS data from ~450,000 participants in the UK Biobank (UKBB). In total, 754 and
48
49 3290 independent SNPs known to be associated at $P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$ with BMI and height, respectively,
50
51 were used as instruments for these analyses. Detailed information regarding sample and SNP
52
53 selection, summary statistics, quality control and meta-analyses have been reported previously ¹⁸.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 We extracted data on major and minor alleles for each SNP together with the allele frequencies,
3 beta coefficient, standard error (SE) of the beta coefficient and p-value for the relevant association.
4
5 We tested the validity of the BMI and height instrumental variables in an independent dataset of
6
7 17,965 participants in the QSkin cohort. The QSkin Sun and Health Study is a population based
8
9 cohort consisting of 43,794 men and women aged between 40-69 years who were randomly
10
11 sampled from the Queensland population ²². The study was approved by the Human Research
12
13 Ethics Committee of the QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute and each participant provided
14
15 written informed consent. Genome-wide polygenic risk scores (PRS) for BMI and height were
16
17 calculated for eligible cohort participants who provided a DNA sample (n=17,222). We generated
18
19 the PRS using summary statistics from the same set of SNPs as used for MR analyses. PRS were
20
21 generated using the --score function of plink V1.90b6.6 ²³.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Association of BMI and height genetic variants with cutaneous melanoma**

31
32 We obtained GWAS summary statistics on melanoma from the largest meta-analysis of GWAS on
33
34 cutaneous melanoma to date which included 12,874 histologically confirmed cases and 23,203
35
36 controls from 11 independent GWAS in people of European ancestry in UK, Australia, USA,
37
38 Germany, France and Greece ¹⁹. Details regarding GWAS quality control and study samples have
39
40 been published previously ¹⁹. For each identified BMI or height SNP instrument, we extracted the
41
42 per allele log odds ratio (OR) for melanoma together with its SE and allele frequencies from the
43
44 melanoma GWAS meta-analysis. Since the two-sample MR involves combining data from two
45
46 independently-generated datasets, we harmonised the data by comparing allele frequencies between
47
48 the BMI, height and melanoma datasets, thereby ensuring that reference alleles for each locus were
49
50 concordant across the datasets. Palindromic strands with minor allele frequency threshold for
51
52 alignment above 0.3 are non-inferable and hence were excluded from the analyses.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Two-sample Mendelian randomization methods

In contrast to traditional 2-stage least squares MR, whereby individual level genotype and phenotype data are obtained from the same sample, we used a two-sample MR strategy in which the SNP exposure and SNP outcome associations are estimated using summary statistics from independent samples²⁴. The two-sample method typically offers greater statistical power than the one-sample method, because one can use large, independent datasets to firstly derive the instruments, and then to test the associations. The association between genetically predicted BMI or height and melanoma risk per SNP was evaluated using a Wald-type ratio estimator²⁵. The 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) were calculated from the SE of each Wald ratio. We combined individual Wald ratio estimates for all SNPs for each trait (i.e. BMI or height) using the inverse variance-weighted method (IVW) to obtain a weighted average of the effect estimates²⁵. We tested for heterogeneity in Wald ratios using Cochran's Q statistic²⁶.

Sensitivity analyses

The IVW method assumes that there is no horizontal pleiotropy for all SNPs (that is, that the effect of genetic variants on the outcome operates entirely via the exposure of interest), and that all SNPs are valid instruments. However, because testing the validity of these assumptions is difficult in practice, two additional MR analyses, namely MR-Egger regression²⁷ and weighted median estimator²⁸ were conducted to check for robustness of the estimates from IVW²⁷. MR-Egger regression is similar to IVW except that the intercept is not constrained to pass through the origin, with a non-zero intercept suggesting possibility of directional pleiotropy. The weighted median estimator method has the advantage that it is possible to estimate the effect as long as at least 50% of the variants in the analysis come from SNPs that satisfy the MR assumptions. While these

1
2
3 techniques address potential concern on the causal estimate due to weak violation of MR
4
5 assumptions, they require large sample sizes to detect effects.
6
7

8
9 Because deriving BMI and height instruments from datasets which include patients with melanoma
10
11 could conceivably induce bias in odds ratios, we performed an additional sensitivity analysis
12
13 restricted to 390,628 cancer-free white British participants in the UKBB only. For this analysis we
14
15 used 520 and 2059 independent SNPs that were associated with BMI or height respectively at
16
17 genome-wide significance as previously described^{29,30}. Cancer-free participants were defined as
18
19 any individual without cancer, or benign or in situ tumours, recorded in the cancer registry using the
20
21 International Classification of Disease, 10th edition (ICD10). Prevalent and incident cancer cases in
22
23 the UK Biobank were identified through linkage to the national cancer registries and hospital in-
24
25 patients data. To assess whether our estimates were sensitive to the choice of instrument, we also
26
27 conducted a separate analysis restricted to 97 BMI-associated SNPs and 697 height-associated
28
29 SNPs identified in earlier published studies in the GIANT consortium only^{20,21}. We used R
30
31 software (TwoSampleMR package) for Mendelian randomization analyses³¹.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **RESULTS**

40 **Mendelian randomization analyses of the association between BMI and melanoma risk**

41
42 The primary analyses included 754 independent genetic variants obtained from the UKBB and the
43
44 GIANT consortia as instruments for BMI. Five variants that were not available in the melanoma
45
46 GWAS dataset and 19 that were palindromic strands were excluded, leaving 730 variants for
47
48 analysis [Table 1]. These variants explained approximately 8% of the variance in BMI in the UKBB
49
50 and GIANT [Table 1]. In an independent cohort (QSkin), a PRS derived from these variants
51
52 explained ~5% of the variance in BMI (Supplementary Figures 1 and 2).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 We estimated the overall odds ratio of developing melanoma per one SD increase in BMI (1
6 SD=4.6 kg/m²). Based on the combined estimate derived from 730 genetic variants for BMI, we
7 found no evidence of an association between higher genetically predicted BMI and melanoma (OR
8 per 1SD increase in BMI 1.00, 95% CI: 0.91-1.11) [Table 2] [Figure 1].
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 We performed sensitivity analyses to check whether the null association might have arisen through
17 violations of the MR assumptions. We found no evidence that our risk estimates were influenced by
18 directional pleiotropy, as the average pleiotropic effect of the MR-Egger regression intercept was
19 close to null (MR-Egger intercept: 0.0001, p-value=0.9 [Table 3] . Graphical assessment of bias in
20 the MR funnel plot suggested that the dispersion of individual estimates was symmetrical
21 [Supplementary Figure 3], indicating that our estimates were not driven by individual outliers.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Taken together, the sensitivity analyses suggest that the null findings were very unlikely to be due
29 to violating the assumption imposed by the exclusion restriction criterion. Finally, we checked
30 whether our inferences were influenced by the choice of instruments by repeating the analyses using
31 79 of the 97 BMI-associated variants identified by the GIANT consortium. We also repeated the
32 same analysis using the 495 of the 520 BMI variants identified from the UKBB. The results were
33 essentially the same regardless of the source of instrument [Table 2].
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Mendelian randomization analyses of the association between height and melanoma risk**

47 We obtained data for a total of 3,290 height-related genetic variants from UKBB and the GIANT
48 consortium as potential instrumental variables. However, 117 of these 3,290 variants were not
49 available in the melanoma GWAS dataset and 10 variants were palindromic, so were excluded from
50 the analysis. The remaining 3163 variants explained ~19% of variance in height in UKBB and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 GIANT [Table 1]. A PRS derived from these height variants, explained ~12% of variance in height
4
5 in the QSkin cohort [Supplementary Figures 4 and 5]. Using the IVW method to pool estimates
6
7 from individual variants, genetically-predicted height was statistically significant associated with
8
9 increased melanoma risk (OR 1.08, 95% CI: 1.02-1.13, per 1SD (9.27 cm) increase in height)
10
11 [Table 2] [Figure 2].
12
13
14
15
16

17 After excluding non-inferable palindromic SNPs and SNPs that could not be obtained from the
18
19 melanoma GWAS dataset, we performed sensitivity analyses initially using 1810 height-associated
20
21 SNPs from the UKBB only, and secondly using a restricted list of 360 height-associated SNPs from
22
23 the earlier GIANT consortium analysis²¹. These analyses made little difference to the main
24
25 findings [Table 2]. Additional sensitivity analysis using MR-Egger regression to assess whether the
26
27 causal estimates could have been affected by directional pleiotropy showed no such evidence
28
29 (intercept=-0.001, p-value=0.6) (Table 3). Visual assessment of directional pleiotropy using a
30
31 funnel plot showed that variants were symmetrically distributed [Supplementary Figure 6].
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 We observed evidence of heterogeneity across SNP estimates ($Q=937$, $p<0.0001$ for BMI; $Q=2757$,
39
40 $p<0.0001$ for height (Supplementary Table 1)). SNPs that showed strong evidence of heterogeneity
41
42 ($Q>3.84$) were removed and the analyses were repeated. The adjusted MR estimates showed no
43
44 evidence of heterogeneity. However, the effect estimates were generally unchanged.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DISCUSSION

We conducted two-sample MR analyses using summary statistics from the largest GWAS meta-analyses of BMI, height and melanoma. Overall, we found no evidence that genetically predicted BMI was associated with increased risk of melanoma, but found evidence to suggest that genetically-predicted height conferred increased risk of melanoma.

Investigating a possible causal association between obesity and melanoma is relevant given the heterogeneity observed across previous observational studies, the substantial increase in obesity prevalence worldwide³², and the rapid increases in melanoma incidence observed in many populations³³. To our knowledge, this is the first analysis to use MR techniques. While observational studies can identify associations, they cannot always establish whether relationships are causal, notably in instances where confounding is believed to be present but not fully controlled. For example, many epidemiological studies rely on self-reported weight and height measurements^{8, 12, 34} which are subject to misclassification^{35, 36}. In addition, few studies adjusted for confounding effect of the sun exposure^{6, 37}, the major risk factor for melanoma.

Our null findings suggest that the increased risk of melanoma among overweight and obese people reported in previous epidemiological studies^{3, 4, 38, 39}, may be due to other, non-causal explanations such as ascertainment biases, misclassification or residual confounding inherent to observational studies. Earlier experimental studies had suggested that an association between BMI and melanoma might be plausible. For example, there were reports that obese mice exposed to UVB radiation had higher levels of proinflammatory cytokines in their skin than their non-obese counterparts⁴⁰. Those laboratory findings gave some credence to a possible link between obesity and skin cancer, on the basis that inflammatory responses in the skin might increase the risk of neoplasia^{41, 42}. Our data

1
2 indicate that even if obesity modifies cutaneous responses to sunlight in some animal models, the
3 effects do not necessarily translate into measurable changes in melanoma risk in humans.
4
5
6
7
8

9 In contrast to the lack of association between BMI and melanoma, the MR findings in relation to a
10 positive association between height and melanoma is broadly consistent with the observational
11 literature, albeit a smaller effect size estimate from MR. For instance, the UK Million Women
12 Study, with ~3,500 melanoma cases, reported a 30% increased melanoma risk per 10cm increase in
13 height ⁵. Subsequently, in a large population-based cohort in Norway, including more than 3,000
14 melanoma cases among ~300,000 men and women, a 50% increased melanoma risk was observed
15 for men and women in the fifth versus first quintile of height ⁴. Increased risk of melanoma with
16 greater height was also reported in a study conducted in a high ambient sunlight setting
17 (Queensland, Australia), although the estimates lack precision due to low sample size ⁹. Finally, the
18 evidence from a pooled analysis including 8 case-control studies provides additional support for an
19 association between height and melanoma in women ¹¹.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The MR findings described in this study in relation to the two-sample MR generally agree with
38 previously reported findings from one-sample MR analyses conducted in the UK Biobank. In those
39 analyses, no association between genetically determined higher BMI and melanoma was found
40 (OR: 0.98, 95% CI: 0.85-1.14)⁴³, but a 12% increase in melanoma risk was reported per 10 cm
41 increase in genetically predicted height (OR: 1.12, 95% CI: 1.001 - 1.26)²⁹. Height has also been
42 reported as a risk factor for other types of cancer in other MR studies, although the effect of height
43 on melanoma reported in our study was relatively lower for some cancer types, but similar for
44 others. For example, previous research has reported that for every 10 cm increase in genetically
45 predicted height, the risk ratio was 1.22 (95% CI: 1.13-1.32) for breast cancer ⁴⁴, 1.07 (95% CI:
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1.01-1.14) for colorectal cancer⁴⁵, 1.23 (95% CI 1.06-1.42) for endometrial cancer ²⁹ and 1.12 (95%
4
5 CI: 1.02-1.23) for ovarian cancer⁴⁶.
6
7
8

9
10 Adult height is determined by various growth mechanisms, childhood environment, and possibly by
11
12 epigenetic factors, any of which may influence melanoma risk. Previous investigators have
13
14 speculated that height is a proxy for the total number of cells (including stem cells) in the body, and
15
16 that this presumably increases the probability of mutations and hence malignancy ^{14, 15}. However,
17
18 this hypothesis does not accord with the higher rates of malignancy observed across species (for
19
20 example, between mice and humans which differ in volume by orders of magnitude) ⁴⁷. The lack of
21
22 relationship between body size and cancer risk across species, known as Peto's Paradox ⁴⁸, suggests
23
24 that larger organisms might have evolved cancer-suppressing mechanisms in order to live longer ⁴⁹.
25
26 For example, a recent study has shown that the genome of an elephant has 20 copies of the P53
27
28 tumour suppressor gene whereas humans have only one copy ⁵⁰. Thus, body size is an imperfect
29
30 predictor of cancer risk in an organism across species, but body size and cancer risk are positively
31
32 correlated within members of the same species [7-10]. While BMI is a reliable measure of body
33
34 size, mature adipocytes do not undergo mitoses as they are fully differentiated cell type and thus,
35
36 provide fewer targets for oncogenic mutations.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 An earlier study also reported a positive association between the number of naevi and height but not
45
46 weight ⁵¹. The study argued that both naevi count and melanoma are associated with longer
47
48 telomeres. Telomere length has been reported as a genetic marker of reduced senescence and
49
50 increased growth ⁵², and is believed to play important roles in carcinogenesis ⁵³. Various hormones
51
52 implicated in childhood growth, such as insulin-like growth factor (IGF)-I ⁵⁴, also regulate cell
53
54 turnover, apoptosis and tumour progression ⁵⁵, and thus could be implicated in cancer development.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 These mechanisms are presumably largely under genetic control, and the genetic associations
4
5 between height and melanoma might be mediated through these pathways.
6
7

8
9 While biological mechanisms to explain the association between height and melanoma have
10
11 intuitive appeal, it is also possible that height might mediate its effects on melanoma risk through
12
13 other pathways, at least in some populations. Recently, a Mendelian randomization study conducted
14
15 within the UK BioBank (using very similar instruments to those that we used) reported that
16
17 genetically-predicted height was significantly associated with four different measures of
18
19 socioeconomic status (SES), with strong positive associations observed for job class and annual
20
21 household income ⁵⁶. Previous observational studies, particularly those conducted in settings of low
22
23 ambient sunlight (such as northern Europe), have reported significantly higher melanoma incidence
24
25 among people in high SES categories compared to those in low SES categories. In those settings, it
26
27 has been postulated that greater affluence has given greater access to holidays in sunny locations
28
29 and sunburns, thereby conferring an increased risk of melanoma ⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹. Occupational studies from
30
31 the UK ⁶⁰ and Sweden ⁶¹ corroborate this hypothesis, showing that indoor workers have
32
33 significantly higher risks of melanoma than outdoor workers in those countries. Thus, at a
34
35 population-level, genetically determined height is possibly causally associated with melanoma
36
37 through a pathway of social class and sun exposure.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 A limitation common to all MR analyses relates to potential pleiotropy, whereby a genetic variant is
47
48 independently associated with the outcome, but not through the exposure of interest. We assessed
49
50 potential pleiotropy using the MR-Egger method and observed no evidence that the exclusion
51
52 restriction criteria assumption was violated. While it is also possible that some of the variants used
53
54 in the analysis might be associated with confounders of the height and melanoma association, such
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 an effect would likely be small because our genetic instrument was generated from more than 3000
4
5 variants explaining ~19% of variance in height, which further reduces the likelihood of bias from
6
7 violating MR assumptions⁶². Our analyses also intrinsically assume a linear relationship between
8
9 BMI/height and the log(OR) on melanoma. Here, the MR estimates capture a population averaged
10
11 effect across different strata of exposure, which might differ from the association of BMI/height on
12
13 melanoma for individuals at extreme ends of the distribution. We argue that this is unlikely a major
14
15 concern for our analyses given the overall null finding for BMI (except for extreme circumstances
16
17 where the opposing direction of effect across two ends of a stratum directly cancel out), however a
18
19 larger sample size will be required to comprehensively evaluate any non-linear relationships
20
21 between height and melanoma.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 In conclusion, these large-scale Mendelian randomization analyses found little evidence to suggest
29
30 that the association between higher BMI and melanoma risk is causal but, in accord with earlier
31
32 observational studies, height was found to be associated with melanoma. Mechanisms through
33
34 which greater height might lead to increased risk of melanoma remain unclear, and it is possible that
35
36 the effect is mediated through various pathways, ranging from direct hormonal effects through to
37
38 social class and sun exposure. While the most effective way to reduce cancer risks involves
39
40 elimination of the causal risk factor, it is not feasible to modify adult height. However, the specific
41
42 mechanisms (which might be modifiable) underlying this association may provide valuable insights
43
44 into carcinogenesis. It is also possible that height may contribute to future risk stratification
45
46 algorithms which could be used to target people for early detection activities.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FUNDING

This work was supported by a program grant from the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia (grant numbers APP1073898, APP1063061 and APP1123248).

This work was conducted using the UK Biobank Resource (application number 25331). The full acknowledgements for the melanoma meta-analysis can be found in the Supplementary Note of the 2015 melanoma GWAS meta-analysis¹⁹. DCW and REN are supported by NHMRC Research Fellowships. SM is supported by the Australian Research Council Future Fellowship. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis or decision to publish.

For Review Only

References

1. International Agency for Research on Cancer. IARC monograph on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans; ultraviolet radiation. Lyon; 1992.
2. Gandini S, Sera F, Cattaruzza MS, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma: III. Family history, actinic damage and phenotypic factors. *Eur J Cancer* 2005; **41**: 2040-59.
3. Sergentanis TN, Antoniadis AG, Gogas HJ, et al. Obesity and risk of malignant melanoma: a meta-analysis of cohort and case-control studies. *Eur J Cancer* 2013; **49**: 642-57.
4. Stenehjem JS, Veierod MB, Nilsen LT, et al. Anthropometric factors and cutaneous melanoma: Prospective data from the population-based Janus Cohort. *Int J Cancer* 2018; **142**: 681-90.
5. Green J, Cairns BJ, Casabonne D, Wright FL, Reeves G, Beral V. Height and cancer incidence in the Million Women Study: prospective cohort, and meta-analysis of prospective studies of height and total cancer risk. *Lancet Oncol* 2011; **12**: 785-94.
6. Lukanova A, Bjor O, Kaaks R, et al. Body mass index and cancer: results from the Northern Sweden Health and Disease Cohort. *Int J Cancer* 2006; **118**: 458-66.
7. Freedman DM, Sigurdson A, Doody MM, Rao RS, Linet MS. Risk of melanoma in relation to smoking, alcohol intake, and other factors in a large occupational cohort. *Cancer Causes Control* 2003; **14**: 847-57.
8. Pothiwala S, Qureshi AA, Li Y, Han J. Obesity and the incidence of skin cancer in US Caucasians. *Cancer Causes Control* 2012; **23**: 717-26.
9. Lahmann PH, Hughes MC, Williams GM, Green AC. A prospective study of measured body size and height and risk of keratinocyte cancers and melanoma. *Cancer Epidemiol* 2016; **40**: 119-25.
10. Shors AR, Solomon C, McTiernan A, White E. Melanoma risk in relation to height, weight, and exercise (United States). *Cancer Causes Control* 2001; **12**: 599-606.
11. Olsen CM, Green AC, Zens MS, et al. Anthropometric factors and risk of melanoma in women: a pooled analysis. *Int J Cancer* 2008; **122**: 1100-8.
12. Kvaskoff M, Bijon A, Mesrine S, Vilier A, Clavel-Chapelon F, Boutron-Ruault MC. Anthropometric features and cutaneous melanoma risk: a prospective cohort study in French women. *Cancer Epidemiol* 2014; **38**: 357-63.
13. Benyi E, Linder M, Adami J, Kieler H, Palme M, Säwendahl L. Adult height is associated with risk of cancer and mortality in 5.5 million Swedish women and men. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2019: jech-2018-211040.
14. Nunney L. Size matters: height, cell number and a person's risk of cancer. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 2018; **285**.
15. Albanes D, Winick M. Are cell number and cell proliferation risk factors for cancer? *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1988; **80**: 772-4.
16. Lawlor DA, Harbord RM, Sterne JA, Timpson N, Davey Smith G. Mendelian randomization: using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in epidemiology. *Stat Med* 2008; **27**: 1133-63.
17. Evans DM, Davey Smith G. Mendelian Randomization: New Applications in the Coming Age of Hypothesis-Free Causality. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet* 2015; **16**: 327-50.
18. Yengo L, Sidorenko J, Kemper KE, et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies for height and body mass index in approximately 700000 individuals of European ancestry. *Hum Mol Genet* 2018; **27**: 3641-9.

19. Law MH, Bishop DT, Lee JE, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis identifies five new susceptibility loci for cutaneous malignant melanoma. *Nat Genet* 2015; **47**: 987-95.
20. Locke AE, Kahali B, Berndt SI, et al. Genetic studies of body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. *Nature* 2015; **518**: 197-206.
21. Wood AR, Esko T, Yang J, et al. Defining the role of common variation in the genomic and biological architecture of adult human height. *Nat Genet* 2014; **46**: 1173-86.
22. Olsen CM, Green AC, Neale RE, et al. Cohort profile: the QSkin Sun and Health Study. *International journal of epidemiology* 2012; **41**: 929-i.
23. Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LC, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *Gigascience* 2015; **4**: 7.
24. Pierce BL, Burgess S. Efficient design for Mendelian randomization studies: subsample and 2-sample instrumental variable estimators. *Am J Epidemiol* 2013; **178**: 1177-84.
25. Burgess S, Butterworth A, Thompson SG. Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple genetic variants using summarized data. *Genet Epidemiol* 2013; **37**: 658-65.
26. Burgess S, Bowden J. Integrating summarized data from multiple genetic variants in Mendelian randomization: bias and coverage properties of inverse-variance weighted methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:151204486* 2015.
27. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J Epidemiol* 2015; **44**: 512-25.
28. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. *Genet Epidemiol* 2016; **40**: 304-14.
29. Ong J-S, An J, Law MH, et al. Height and overall cancer risk and mortality: evidence from a Mendelian randomisation study on 310,000 UK Biobank participants. *Br J Cancer* 2018; **118**: 1262-7.
30. Gharahkhani P, Ong JS, An J, et al. Effect of increased body mass index on risk of diagnosis or death from cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2019.
31. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, et al. The MR-Base platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. *Elife* 2018; **7**.
32. Ng M, Fleming T, Robinson M, et al. Global, regional, and national prevalence of overweight and obesity in children and adults during 1980-2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet* 2014; **384**: 766-81.
33. Whiteman DC, Green AC, Olsen CM. The Growing Burden of Invasive Melanoma: Projections of Incidence Rates and Numbers of New Cases in Six Susceptible Populations through 2031. *J Invest Dermatol* 2016; **136**: 1161-71.
34. Tang JY, Henderson MT, Hernandez-Boussard T, et al. Lower skin cancer risk in women with higher body mass index: the women's health initiative observational study. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2013; **22**: 2412-5.
35. Shields M, Connor Gorber S, Tremblay MS. Estimates of obesity based on self-report versus direct measures. *Health Rep* 2008; **19**: 61-76.
36. Connor Gorber S, Tremblay M, Moher D, Gorber B. A comparison of direct vs. self-report measures for assessing height, weight and body mass index: a systematic review. *Obes Rev* 2007; **8**: 307-26.
37. Bhaskaran K, Douglas I, Forbes H, dos-Santos-Silva I, Leon DA, Smeeth L. Body-mass index and risk of 22 specific cancers: a population-based cohort study of 5.24 million UK adults. *Lancet* 2014; **384**: 755-65.

- 1
2
3 38. Renehan AG, Tyson M, Egger M, Heller RF, Zwahlen M. Body-mass index and incidence
4 of cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective observational studies. *Lancet* 2008;
5 **371**: 569-78.
- 6 39. Dobbins M, Decorby K, Choi BC. The Association between Obesity and Cancer Risk: A
7 Meta-Analysis of Observational Studies from 1985 to 2011. *ISRN Prev Med* 2013; **2013**: 680536.
- 8 40. Sharma SD, Katiyar SK. Leptin deficiency-induced obesity exacerbates ultraviolet B
9 radiation-induced cyclooxygenase-2 expression and cell survival signals in ultraviolet B-irradiated
10 mouse skin. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol* 2010; **244**: 328-35.
- 11 41. Clement E, Lazar I, Muller C, Nieto L. Obesity and melanoma: could fat be fueling
12 malignancy? *Pigment Cell Melanoma Res* 2017; **30**: 294-306.
- 13 42. Brandon EL, Gu JW, Cantwell L, He Z, Wallace G, Hall JE. Obesity promotes melanoma
14 tumor growth: role of leptin. *Cancer Biol Ther* 2009; **8**: 1871-9.
- 15 43. Gharahkhani P, Ong J-S, An J, et al. Effect of increased body mass index on risk of
16 diagnosis or death from cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2019; **120**: 565-70.
- 17 44. Zhang B, Shu XO, Delahanty RJ, et al. Height and Breast Cancer Risk: Evidence From
18 Prospective Studies and Mendelian Randomization. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2015; **107**.
- 19 45. Thrift AP, Gong J, Peters U, et al. Mendelian randomization study of height and risk of
20 colorectal cancer. *Int J Epidemiol* 2015; **44**: 662-72.
- 21 46. Dixon-Suen SC, Nagle CM, Thrift AP, et al. Adult height is associated with increased risk
22 of ovarian cancer: a Mendelian randomisation study. *Br J Cancer* 2018; **118**: 1123-9.
- 23 47. Nagy JD, Victor EM, Cropper JH. Why don't all whales have cancer? A novel hypothesis
24 resolving Peto's paradox. *Integr Comp Biol* 2007; **47**: 317-28.
- 25 48. Peto R. Epidemiology, multistage models, and short-term mutagenicity tests 1. *Int J*
26 *Epidemiol* 2016; **45**: 621-37.
- 27 49. Caulin AF, Maley CC. Peto's Paradox: evolution's prescription for cancer prevention. *Trends*
28 *Ecol Evol* 2011; **26**: 175-82.
- 29 50. Abegglen LM, Caulin AF, Chan A, et al. Potential Mechanisms for Cancer Resistance in
30 Elephants and Comparative Cellular Response to DNA Damage in Humans. *JAMA* 2015; **314**:
31 1850-60.
- 32 51. Ribero S. Height and bone mineral density are associated with naevus count supporting the
33 importance of growth in melanoma susceptibility. *PLoS One* 2015; **10**: e0116863.
- 34 52. Bernadotte A, Mikhelson VM, Spivak IM. Markers of cellular senescence. Telomere
35 shortening as a marker of cellular senescence. *Aging (Albany NY)* 2016; **8**: 3-11.
- 36 53. Han J, Qureshi AA, Prescott J, et al. A prospective study of telomere length and the risk of
37 skin cancer. *J Invest Dermatol* 2009; **129**: 415-21.
- 38 54. Clayton PE, Banerjee I, Murray PG, Renehan AG. Growth hormone, the insulin-like growth
39 factor axis, insulin and cancer risk. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2011; **7**: 11-24.
- 40 55. Pollak M. Insulin and insulin-like growth factor signalling in neoplasia. *Nat Rev Cancer*
41 2008; **8**: 915-28.
- 42 56. Tyrrell J, Jones SE, Beaumont R, et al. Height, body mass index, and socioeconomic status:
43 mendelian randomisation study in UK Biobank. *BMJ* 2016; **352**.
- 44 57. Pérez-Gómez B, Aragonés N, Gustavsson P, Lope V, López-Abente G, Pollán M. Socio-
45 economic class, rurality and risk of cutaneous melanoma by site and gender in Sweden. *BMC Public*
46 *Health* 2008; **8**: 33.
- 47 58. Elwood JM, Whitehead SM, Davison J, Stewart M, Galt M. Malignant melanoma in
48 England: risks associated with naevi, freckles, social class, hair colour, and sunburn. *Int J Epidemiol*
49 1990; **19**: 801-10.
- 50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 59. Petersen B, Triguero-Mas M, Maier B, et al. Sun behaviour and personal UVR exposure
4 among Europeans on short term holidays. *J Photochem Photobiol B* 2015; **151**: 264-9.
5 60. Beral V, Robinson N. The relationship of malignant melanoma, basal and squamous skin
6 cancers to indoor and outdoor work. *Br J Cancer* 1981; **44**: 886-91.
7 61. Vagero D, Persson G. Occurrence of cancer in socioeconomic groups in Sweden. An
8 analysis based on the Swedish Cancer Environment Registry. *Scand J Soc Med* 1986; **14**: 151-60.
9 62. VanderWeele TJ, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Cornelis M, Kraft P. Methodological challenges in
10 mendelian randomization. *Epidemiology* 2014; **25**: 427-35.
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

For Review Only

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

Table 1. The characteristics and source of genetic instruments used in Mendelian randomisation (MR) analyses

Instruments from	Body mass index				Height			
	Sample size	Number of SNPs obtained	Number of SNPs used	Total variance Explained(r^2)*	Sample size	Number of SNPs obtained	Number of SNPs used	Total variance Explained (r^2)*
UK Biobank + GIANT	681,275	754	730	7.8%	693,529	3,290	3,163	19%
GIANT only	339,224	97	79	2.7%	253,288	697	360	13%
UK Biobank only	390,628	520	495	7%	310,793	2,059	1810	17%

SNP: single-nucleotide polymorphism; GIANT: Genetic Investigation of ANthropometric Traits

*Total variance explained by instrument is computed based on the genetic influence of the BMI or height SNPs instruments on measured BMI or height from the white-British participants from the UK Biobank cohort.




Table 2. Association between increased BMI and height and risk of melanoma using two-sample Mendelian randomisation (MR)¹

Instruments from	MR method	Body mass index			Height		
		Odds ratio	95% CI	P-Value	Odds ratio	95% CI	P-Value
UK Biobank + GIANT ²	IVW	1.00	0.91-1.11	0.99	1.08	1.02-1.13	0.004
	MR-Egger ⁵	0.99	0.74-1.33	0.97	1.05	0.96-1.14	0.14
	Weighted Median	1.01	0.86-1.17	0.92	1.11	1.02-1.20	0.02
	Simple Mode	0.85	0.51-1.43	0.55	1.07	0.80-1.45	0.61
	Weighed Mode	0.98	0.73-1.32	0.89	1.13	0.95-1.36	0.15
GIANT only ³	IVW	0.96	0.80-1.15	0.66	1.09	1.02-1.18	0.01
	MR-Egger ⁵	0.99	0.56-1.73	0.25	1.02	0.84-1.25	0.8
	Weighted Median	0.86	0.66-1.11	0.82	1.14	1.02-1.27	0.02
	Simple Mode	0.78	0.45-1.34	0.36	1.14	0.81-1.60	0.44
	Weighed Mode	0.99	0.72-1.38	0.98	1.14	0.87-1.49	0.34
UK Biobank only ⁴	IVW	1.01	0.98-1.03	0.76	1.07	1.01-1.13	0.01
	MR-Egger ⁵	1.03	0.96-1.11	0.31	1.04	0.87-1.25	0.25
	Weighted Median	1.00	0.97-1.04	0.81	1.07	0.99-1.16	0.08
	Simple Mode	0.95	0.86-1.07	0.45	1.03	0.97-1.07	0.33
	Weighed Mode	1.01	0.93-1.08	0.83	1.02	0.98-1.04	0.26

SNP: single-nucleotide polymorphism; CI: confidence interval; UKBB: UK Bio-bank; GIANT: Genetic Investigation of ANthropometric Traits; IVW: inverse variance weighted

¹The estimates are given per one SD increase in BMI (1 SD=4.6 kg/m²) and per one SD increase in height (1SD=9.27 cm)

²UKBB + GIANT: Genetic variants obtained from the 2018 BMI and height GWAS meta-analysis in the GIANT consortium

³GIANT only: Genetic variants obtained from the 2015 BMI GWAS meta-analysis and from 2014 height GWAS meta-analysis in the GIANT consortium

⁴UK Biobank only: BMI and height genetic variants obtained from the UKBB only.


⁵For MR-Egger analyses, the standard error (SE) for each exposure-outcome estimate was obtained by bootstrapping the distributions of the SNP effect estimates for both exposure and outcome 1000 times.


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

Table 3. Estimates of Egger intercept to evaluate evidence for directional pleiotropy in MR association

Instruments from	Body mass index			Height		
	Egger intercept	SE of Egger intercept	P-value	Egger intercept	SE of Egger intercept	P-value
UKBB + GIANT	0.0001	0.002	0.9	0.001	0.0008	0.6
UKBB only	-0.002	0.02	0.3	0.003	0.001	0.5
GIANT only	-0.005	0.005	0.4	0.004	0.003	0.2

Here, p-value refers to the p-value of the estimated Egger intercept being null. A significant p-value ($P < 0.05$) would present evidence that the MR causal estimates derived via the inverse-variance weighted model were biased by directional pleiotropy.






Association of individual SNPs with BMI and melanoma risk. Instrumental variable estimates were derived from 730 BMI SNP instruments identified in the BMI GWAS meta-analyses using samples from GIANT and the UKBB cohort. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The gradients of regression lines colors correspond to the instrumental variable estimates of the effect of BMI on melanoma risk with different MR methods compared.

177x177mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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



Association of individual SNPs with height and melanoma risk. Instrumental variable estimates were derived from 3290 height SNP instruments identified in the height GWAS meta-analysis using samples from GIANT and the UKBB cohort. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The gradients of regression lines colors correspond to the instrumental variable estimates of the effect of height on melanoma risk with different MR methods compared.

177x177mm (300 x 300 DPI)