A Multi-Cohort Study of Polymorphisms in the GH/IGF Axis and Physical Capability: The HALCyon Programme
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Abstract

Background: Low muscle mass and function have been associated with poorer indicators of physical capability in older people, which are in-turn associated with increased mortality rates. The growth hormone/insulin-like growth factor (GH/IGF) axis is involved in muscle function and genetic variants in genes in the axis may influence measures of physical capability.

Methods: As part of the Healthy Ageing across the Life Course (HALCyon) programme, men and women from seven UK cohorts aged between 52 and 90 years old were genotyped for six polymorphisms: rs35767 (IGF1), rs7127900 (IGF2), rs2854744 (IGFBP3), rs2943641 (IRS1), rs2665802 (GH1) and the exon-3 deletion of GHR. The polymorphisms have previously been robustly associated with age-related traits or are potentially functional. Meta-analysis was used to pool within-study genotypic effects of the associations between the polymorphisms and four measures of physical capability: grip strength, timed walk or get up and go, chair raises and standing balance.

Results: Few important associations were observed among the several tests. We found evidence that rs2665802 in GH1 was associated with inability to balance for 5 s (pooled odds ratio per minor allele = 0.90, 95% CI: 0.82–0.98, p-value = 0.01, n = 10,748), after adjusting for age and sex. We found no evidence for other associations between the polymorphisms and physical capability traits.

Conclusion: Our findings do not provide evidence for a substantial influence of these common polymorphisms in the GH/IGF axis on objectively measured physical capability levels in older adults.

Introduction

Muscle mass declines with age [1,2] and low muscle mass and function in older people have been associated with a range of adverse outcomes [3], including poorer mobility [4], increased disability [1,2] and higher mortality rates [5]. Low muscle mass and area are also independently associated with lower levels of subjective measures of physical capability, the capacity to undertake the physical tasks of daily living, including grip strength [6], ability to balance [7] and to complete five chair stands [7]. Therefore, understanding the contributors to the inter-individual variability of muscle properties is important and may be relevant to the
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Genotyping and Quality Control

Genotyping for SNPs rs53576 (~C1245T, \(IGF1\), rs7127900 (\(IGF2\)), rs2854744 (~A-202C, \(IGFBP3\)), rs2943641 (\(IRS1\)) and rs2665802 (~G1245C, \(GH1\)) have been associated with BMI and IGF-I levels [38]. The d3GHR (exon-3 deletion of \(GHR\)) polymorphism resulted from recombination between two near identical retroelements and may be associated with reduced breast and prostate cancer risk [47]. The Caerphilly Prospective Study (CaPS) recruited 2512 men aged between 45 and 59 years in 1979–83 from the town of Caerphilly, South Wales, and its surrounding villages. Blood samples were collected at baseline and at each of the four follow-ups (Phase II: 1984–88, Phase III: 1989–93, Phase IV: 1993–97 and Phase V: 2002–04.) Further details are available on the cohort’s website (www.epi.bris.ac.uk/caerphilly/caerphillyprospectivestudy.htm).

The Lothian Birth Cohort 1921 Study (LBC1921) participants were all born in 1921 and completed an IQ assessment at age 11. In 1999–2001 (Phase I) 530 79 year olds, living in and around Edinburgh, attended a clinic. Details of the recruitment into the study are available on its website (www.lothianbirthcohort.ed.ac.uk) and have been published previously [33].
Phenotypes

**Anthropometry.** Measurements were conducted either at clinics, during a clinical interview in the home, or from self-report. Body mass index (BMI kg/m²) was calculated as weight divided by height squared. Waist-hip ratio (WHR) was defined as waist circumference (cm) divided by hip circumference (cm) and was measured in NSHD, ELSA, HCS, HAS, Boyd Orr and CaPS.

**Physical Capability and Activity.** Grip strength was measured in NSHD, ELSA, HCS, HAS and LBC1921 using electronic or hydraulic dynamometers, with the best measure used in the analysis where more than one trial was conducted. Standing balance tests were conducted in the studies, with participants’ eyes open; flamingo [57], (stopped at 30 s) in NSHD, HCS, HAS, Boyd Orr and CaPS, and side-by-side, semi-tandem and full tandem [58] in ELSA. Poor standing balance was defined for this analysis as the inability to complete 5 s. The timed get up and go test [59] was carried out in HCS, HAS, Boyd Orr and CaPS and required participants to get up from a chair, walk 3 m, turn, walk back, turn and sit down. Timed walks over 2.44 m (8 feet) and 6 m were carried out in ELSA and LBC1921 respectively. Speeds were calculated for timed walks and get up and go, with the fastest speeds used in the analysis where more than one trial was conducted. Timed chair rises [60] involved asking participants to rise from a chair and sit back down 5 times in ELSA, HCS and HAS, and 10 times in NSHD; the reciprocal of time taken in seconds ×100 [61] was used in the analysis. Levels of physical activity were derived from self reported levels using questionnaires in NSHD, ELSA, Boyd Orr, CaPS and LBC1921. Individuals were categorised as ‘physically active’ in this analysis if they engaged, at least once a week, in vigorous sport or activities in ELSA.

**Summary of Sex, Age and Minor Allele Frequencies by Cohort.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>NSHD</th>
<th>ELSA</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>HAS</th>
<th>Boyd Orr</th>
<th>CaPS</th>
<th>LBC1921</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>2618</td>
<td>5515</td>
<td>2902</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>13364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, %</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age* in years, median (range)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65 (52–90+)</td>
<td>66 (59–73)</td>
<td>67 (63–73)</td>
<td>70 (64–82)</td>
<td>73 (65–83)</td>
<td>79 (77–80)</td>
<td>65 (52–90+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Allele Frequencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs35767 (IGF1)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs7127900 (IGF2)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2854744 (IGFBP3)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2934641 (IRIS1)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2665802 (GH1)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d3GHR</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers of participants represent those with available data for at least one anthropometric or physical capability phenotype and at least one genotype.

*Age at phase from which the majority of variables are taken, i.e. Boyd Orr: III; CaPS: V; ELSA: II; HAS: I; HCS: I; LBC1921: I; NSHD: 1999 Collection. CaPS: Caerphilly Prospective Study; ELSA: English Longitudinal Study of Ageing; HAS: Hertfordshire Ageing Study; HCS: Hertfordshire Cohort Study; NSHD: National Survey of Health and Development.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0029883.t001

**Statistical Methods**

Where information on ancestry was collected, non-European participants were excluded from the analyses in order to avoid confounding from population stratification [62]. Within studies, linear and logistic regression analyses were conducted on the continuous and dichotomous traits within the cohorts respectively, adjusting for sex in all studies except CaPS, and age in all studies except NSHD and LBC1921. Analyses of physical capability measures were repeated additionally adjusting for height and weight. Due to the low frequency of individuals homozygous for the T allele of rs35767 (n = 296, 2.3%), T allele of rs7127900 (n = 453, 3.5%) and the exon-3 deletion of GHR (n = 653, 6.5%), dominant models were used for these polymorphisms in order to avoid the presentation of tables containing cells with very low frequencies in particular cohorts. Additive models were used for rs2854744, rs2934641 and rs2665802 with genotypes coded as 0, 1 and 2 for the number of minor alleles. Likelihood ratio tests were used to compare the fit of the additive models compared with the full genotype model. For continuous traits, the normality of the standardised residuals was inspected with distributional diagnostic plots. Cook’s distances [63] were plotted against fitted values, using a cut-off of four divided by sample size, to identify influential outliers in the continuous phenotypes. For the harmonisation of continuous traits that were used to obtain pooled estimates of the genotypic effects, z-score units were calculated in each study by subtracting the study mean and dividing by its standard deviation. The overall mean for z-scores is 0 and standard deviation 1. Beta coefficients calculated on z-score units can be reverted to the original scale by multiplying by an appropriate standard deviation. Two-step [64] meta-analyses using a random-effects model were performed to obtain pooled genotypic effects. The I² measure was used to quantify heterogeneity [65]. Additionally, within-study analyses of the physical capability traits were stratified by physical activity, an indicator shown to modify genotypic effects on anthropometric measures [66] and the effects of rs2665802 on colorectal cancer risk [67]. Finally, the calculation of z-scores, for the continuous traits, and the main analyses were repeated in males and females separately. Quanto [68] was used for power calculations. Reporting of the analyses met the appropriate items of recommended checklists [69,70]. A
two-tailed significance level of \( p < 0.05 \) was used as evidence of statistical significance. Statistical analysis was performed in Stata 11.1 (StataCorp LP).

**Results**

**Cohort Summaries and Genotyping Quality**

Relevant genotypic and phenotypic data were available for a total of 13,364 adults aged between 52 and 90 years old (Table 1). The call rates were high, exceeding 95% across the studies for all polymorphisms. The HWE condition was met for rs35767, rs7127900, rs2854744, rs2943641 and rs2665802 in all studies (\( p \)-values > 0.05) except for rs7127900 in HAS (\( p \)-value = 0.001) and rs2665802 in LBC1921 (\( p \)-value = 0.02). Whilst the HWE condition was met for d3GHR in ELSA, HAS, Boyd Orr and CaPS (\( p \)-values > 0.05) it was not met in two of the larger studies, NSHD (\( p \)-value = 0.02) and HCS (\( p \)-value = 0.04), and was borderline in LBC1921 (\( p \)-value = 0.06), with the number of d3/ d3 individuals under-represented.

**Associations between Genotypes and Phenotypes**

In ELSA, the study with the widest age range, genotype frequencies in those under 70 years were compared with those over 70 years; the T allele of rs2943641 (\( IRS1 \)) was more common among those over 70 (chi-squared \( p \)-value = 0.0659). Associations with age group were not observed for the other polymorphisms (\( p \)-values > 0.1; data not shown).

Figure 1 and Tables S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6 show the associations between the polymorphisms and height, weight, BMI and WHR adjusting for age and sex. From the pooled analyses there was evidence for associations between d3GHR and weight (\( p \)-value = 0.046) and BMI (\( p \)-value = 0.005), with individuals with at least one exon-3 deletion allele having lower weight and BMI compared with individuals retaining both copies of the exon (Figure S1 and S2). There was also a trend among individuals carrying the exon-3 deletion to have a lower WHR (\( p \)-value = 0.07) and for rs2854744-A (\( IGFBP3 \)) to be associated with shorter height (\( p \)-value = 0.08). There was no evidence for other associations between the polymorphisms and anthropometric measures (\( p \)-values > 0.1).

**Figure 1.** Pooled Results of Associations between Genotypes and Measures of Anthropometry. Adjusted for age and sex. Models used: rs35767 (\( IGF1 \))- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs7127900 (\( IGF2 \))- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs2854744 (\( IGFBP3 \))- per minor (A) allele; rs2943641 (\( IRS1 \))- per minor (T) allele; rs2665802 (\( GH1 \))- per minor (T) allele; d3GHR- (fl/fl+d3/d3) vs. fl/fl. fl: full length; d3: exon-3 deletion.
Figure 2 and Tables S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6 show that there was no evidence for associations between any of the polymorphisms and grip strength, timed get up and go/walks and timed chair rises after adjusting for age and sex (p-values > 0.1). Similarly, there were no associations after additionally adjusting for height and weight (p-values > 0.1; data not shown).

The associations between the polymorphisms and poor balance, adjusting for age and sex, are presented in Figure 3 and Tables S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6. There was evidence for an association with SNP rs2665802 (GH1) (p-value = 0.01), with the minor allele associated with increased ability to balance (Figure S3). The association remained after additional adjustment for height and weight (p-value = 0.02; data not shown). There was no evidence for associations with the other polymorphisms after adjusting for age, sex (p-values > 0.5), height and weight (p-values > 0.4; data not shown).

In only a relatively small number of tests did the full genotype model represent a significantly better fit than the per allele model (indicated in Tables S3, S4, S5).

Within NSHD, ELSA, Boyd Orr, CaPS and LBC1921, there was little evidence that the genotypic effects for the physical capability traits differed between the physically active and inactive. Interactions were only observed in Boyd Orr for rs2854744 with balance (p-value = 0.04) and in ELSA for rs2943641 with grip strength (p-value = 0.03); however, the genotypic effects were not significant in either group in ELSA, whilst an association was observed with balance in the physically inactive group in Boyd Orr.

Investigations by Sex

Figures S4 and S5 present the pooled associations between the polymorphisms and the anthropometric traits adjusting for age in males and females, respectively. There was evidence for a sex difference between rs2943641 (IRS1) and height (p-value = 0.03 for heterogeneity between males and females) with the T allele being associated with greater height in females but not males (Figure S6). There was no evidence for any other sex differences between the polymorphisms and anthropometric traits (heterogeneity p-values > 0.1).

Pooled associations between the polymorphisms and the physical capability traits, adjusting for age, in males and females are presented in Figures S7 to S9. There was no evidence for sex differences (heterogeneity p-values > 0.1), except for rs35767 (IGF1).

Figure 2. Pooled Results of Associations between Genotypes and Grip Strength, TGUG and Chair Rises. Adjusted for age and sex. Timed chair rises on reciprocal of time taken in sec x100. Models used: rs35767 (IGF1)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs7127900 (IGF2)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs2054744 (IGFBP3)- per minor (A) allele; rs2943641 (IRS1)- per minor (T) allele; rs2665802 (GH1)- per minor (T) allele; d3GHR- (fl/d3+fl/d3) vs. fl/fl. fl: full length; d3: exon-3 deletion. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0029883.g002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Beta (95% CI)</th>
<th>P-value (Heterogeneity)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grip Strength, kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs35767 (IGF1)</td>
<td>0.03 (-0.01, 0.06)</td>
<td>P=0.127 (P=29.3%, P=0.226)</td>
<td>11757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs7127900 (IGF2)</td>
<td>0.02 (-0.01, 0.05)</td>
<td>P=0.270 (P=38.5%, P=0.164)</td>
<td>11614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2054744 (IGFBP3)</td>
<td>0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)</td>
<td>P=0.404 (P=0.0%, P=0.715)</td>
<td>11604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2943641 (IRS1)</td>
<td>0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)</td>
<td>P=0.467 (P=30.2%, P=0.220)</td>
<td>11745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2665802 (GH1)</td>
<td>0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)</td>
<td>P=0.823 (P=55.7%, P=0.060)</td>
<td>11585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d3GHR</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)</td>
<td>P=0.965 (P=0.0%, P=0.033)</td>
<td>11704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed Get Up &amp; Go/Walk, m/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs35767 (IGF1)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.05, 0.05)</td>
<td>P=0.973 (P=4.3%, P=0.389)</td>
<td>7467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs7127900 (IGF2)</td>
<td>0.01 (-0.03, 0.06)</td>
<td>P=0.630 (P=0.0%, P=0.517)</td>
<td>7520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2054744 (IGFBP3)</td>
<td>0.02 (-0.03, 0.06)</td>
<td>P=0.442 (P=36.5%, P=0.163)</td>
<td>7443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2943641 (IRS1)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.04, 0.03)</td>
<td>P=0.799 (P=0.0%, P=0.780)</td>
<td>7472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2665802 (GH1)</td>
<td>-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)</td>
<td>P=0.576 (P=0.0%, P=0.704)</td>
<td>7402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d3GHR</td>
<td>-0.03 (-0.08, 0.03)</td>
<td>P=0.393 (P=26.1%, P=0.238)</td>
<td>7491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed Chair Rises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs35767 (IGF1)</td>
<td>0.00 (-0.04, 0.05)</td>
<td>P=0.861 (P=0.0%, P=0.707)</td>
<td>8839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs7127900 (IGF2)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.05, 0.05)</td>
<td>P=0.968 (P=16.7%, P=0.308)</td>
<td>8846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2054744 (IGFBP3)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)</td>
<td>P=0.910 (P=49.7%, P=0.119)</td>
<td>8756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2943641 (IRS1)</td>
<td>0.02 (-0.03, 0.07)</td>
<td>P=0.460 (P=49.0%, P=0.118)</td>
<td>8804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2665802 (GH1)</td>
<td>-0.01 (-0.05, 0.04)</td>
<td>P=0.723 (P=43.8%, P=0.149)</td>
<td>8683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d3GHR</td>
<td>0.03 (-0.01, 0.07)</td>
<td>P=0.186 (P=0.0%, P=0.553)</td>
<td>8798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

We examined associations between six common polymorphisms in the GH/IGF axis and measures of anthropometric and physical capability phenotypes in seven UK cohorts comprising a total of 13,364 adults aged between 52 and 90 years. To our knowledge this is the largest investigation into polymorphisms in the axis and physical capability. The polymorphisms chosen are either functional or have been robustly associated with age-related phenotypes in GWAS. Among the 48 genotype association tests conducted in the main analysis there were few important associations observed. We found evidence for associations between d3GHR and anthropometry, with carriers of at least one exon-3 deletion having lower weight, BMI and a trend towards lower WHR. After adjusting for age and sex we found evidence for an association with physical capability for only one of the polymorphisms, with the minor allele of rs2665802 (GH1) being associated with increased ability to balance for at least 5 s. On the whole, the associations for physical capability were similar in males and females, between the physically active and inactive and after additionally adjusting for height and weight. These findings suggest that these polymorphisms are not important contributors to physical capability in older adults.

GWAS in Asian populations have found associations between SNPs around IGF1, including rs35767, and height [25,26]. However, to-date, little evidence has emerged from GWAS supporting highly significant associations between common polymorphisms in the six genes that we investigated in the GH/IGF axis and measures of anthropometry in Europeans [71,72]. Although, it is possible that SNPs in these six genes may significantly modify the effects on lean body mass of SNPs in other genes that are relevant to the GH/IGF axis [73]. We observed no association between rs35767 (IGF1) and measures of body size, consistent with other studies on European populations [27,74]. A previous investigation in elderly men and women found no consistent associations between rs35767 (IGF1) and measures of body composition and walk times, grip strength and timed chair stand [75]. We did not observe poorer measures of physical capability among carriers of the risk allele for prostate cancer for rs7127900 near IGF2 [39]. Other smaller studies had found no association between rs2854744 (IGFBP3) and measures of adult body size in women of European ancestry (n = 1702) [76], or muscle phenotypes in response to strength training in older adults (n = 128) [77]. Unlike a previous study (n = 454) [44], we did not observe associations between rs2665802 (GH1) and height in either sex, nor were associations reported with height or BMI elsewhere (sample sizes ranged between 293 and 1003) [43,78,79]. Our results suggested that the minor allele of rs2665802 (GH1) was associated with better ability to balance for at least 5 s. The allele has also been associated with lower colorectal cancer [43] and mortality risk in females [44], though the null findings observed for the other measures of physical capability would suggest that rs2665802 (GH1) does not substantially influence measures of physical capability. In
addition, a study of 169 athletes and 155 controls suggests that it is not associated with athletic status [80]. Our meta-analysis provided some evidence for lower weight and BMI among carriers of the exon-3 deletion of GHR. Although few specific investigations into the d3GHR polymorphism on population-based studies of adults have been conducted, smaller studies have found no associations with measures of body size (sample sizes ranged between 100 and 831) [46,81,92]; however, one study observed associations between its haplotypic block and BMI [46]. We therefore contacted the GIANT Consortium [83] to look up associations between tag SNPs of d3GHR and BMI. No associations were observed in per minor allele models for BMI for any of the five available SNPs, for example, for rs4590193 the data suggested a p-value of 0.96 in an analysis of 123,963 participants, suggesting our observed associations for d3GHR with weight and BMI were false positives. It is an important finding that this investigation does not provide evidence for a substantial role of these common polymorphisms in the GH/IGF axis and measures of physical capability given the statistical power of this multi-cohort study. Sample size calculations for the quantitative traits for 80% power at the 5% significance level estimated that around 7000 individuals would be required to detect a beta coefficient of 0.07 z-score units under a dominant model for a polymorphism with a MAF of 0.19 or for 0.05 z-score units under an additive model using a MAF of 0.35. For example, there was sufficient power to detect a difference in grip strength of around 0.8 kg under a dominant model for rs7127900 (IGF2), assuming a standard deviation of 11. This allows the inference that any associations between the polymorphisms and physical capability traits are very small.

Deviation from the HWE condition was detected for d3GHR in two of the larger studies, NSHD and HCS. However, the only suggested associations for d3GHR were with weight and BMI, which were found to be in opposite directions for these studies (Table S6, Figure S1 and S2), indicating that, although exclusion is not recommended [56], excluding these two studies would not substantially affect the overall pooled results. Furthermore, whilst we observed four deviations from HWE altogether, around two statistically significant tests would be expected given the 42 (6 polymorphisms×7 studies) HWE tests performed.

Whilst the choice of polymorphisms within our candidate genes were primarily based on robust associations observed with age-related traits [18,27,39,41], or functional evidence [42], additional polymorphisms in these genes may be useful for exploring further the influence of common polymorphisms in the GH/IGF axis on measures of physical capability.

Conclusion

The results of this large, multi-cohort investigation do not support the hypothesis that these common polymorphisms in the GH/IGF axis contribute substantially to objectively measured physical capability in older adults.

Supporting Information

Figure S1 Meta-analysis for the Associations between d3GHR Genotype and Weight. Adjusted for age and sex. Coefficients based on z-scores. fl: full length; d3: exon-3 deletion. (TIF)

Figure S2 Meta-analysis for the Associations between d3GHR Genotype and BMI. Adjusted for age and sex. Coefficients based on z-scores. fl: full length; d3: exon-3 deletion. (TIF)

Figure S3 Meta-analysis for the Associations between rs2665802 (GHI) Genotype and Poor Balance. Adjusted for age, sex. Poor balance defined as inability to complete the Flamingo test for 5 s in Boyd Orr, HAS, HCS, NSHD and CaPS, and 5 s of the tandem test in ELSA. (TIF)

Figure S4 Summary of Pooled Results of Associations between Genotypes and Measures of Anthropometry in Males. Adjusted for age. Models used: rs35767 (IGF1)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs7127900 (IGF2)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs2854744 (IGFBP3)- per minor (A) allele; rs2943641 (IRSI)- per minor (T) allele; rs2665802 (GHI)- per minor (T) allele; d3GHR- (fl/d3+d3/d3) vs. fl/fl: fl: full length; d3: exon-3 deletion. (TIF)

Figure S5 Summary of Pooled Results of Associations between Genotypes and Measures of Anthropometry in Females. Adjusted for age. Models used: rs35767 (IGF1)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs7127900 (IGF2)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs2854744 (IGFBP3)- per minor (A) allele; rs2943641 (IRSI)- per minor (T) allele; rs2665802 (GHI)- per minor (T) allele; d3GHR- (fl/d3+d3/d3) vs. fl/fl: fl: full length; d3: exon-3 deletion. (TIF)

Figure S6 Meta-analysis for the Associations between rs2943641 (IRSI) Genotype and Height by Sex. Adjusted for age. Coefficients based on z-scores. (TIF)

Figure S7 Summary of Pooled Results of Associations between Genotypes and Grip Strength, Timed Get Up & Go and Chair Rises in Males. Adjusted for age. Timed chair rises on reciprocal of time taken in sec ×100. Models used: rs35767 (IGF1)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs7127900 (IGF2)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs2854744 (IGFBP3)- per minor (A) allele; rs2943641 (IRSI)- per minor (T) allele; rs2665802 (GHI)- per minor (T) allele; d3GHR- (fl/d3+d3/d3) vs. fl/fl: fl: full length; d3: exon-3 deletion. (TIF)

Figure S8 Summary of Pooled Results of Associations between Genotypes and Grip Strength, Timed Get Up & Go and Chair Rises in Females. Adjusted for age. Timed chair rises on reciprocal of time taken in sec ×100. Models used: rs35767 (IGF1)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs7127900 (IGF2)- (C/T+T/T) vs. C/C; rs2854744 (IGFBP3)- per minor (A) allele; rs2943641 (IRSI)- per minor (T) allele; rs2665802 (GHI)- per minor (T) allele; d3GHR- (fl/d3+d3/d3) vs. fl/fl: fl: full length; d3: exon-3 deletion. (TIF)

Figure S9 Summary of Pooled Results of Associations between Genotypes and Poor Balance by Sex. Adjusted for age. Poor balance defined as inability to complete the Flamingo test for 5 s in Boyd Orr, HAS, HCS, NSHD and CaPS, and 5 s of the tandem test in ELSA. (TIF)

Figure S10 Meta-analysis for the Associations between rs35767 (IGF1) Genotype and Timed Chair Rises by Sex. Adjusted for age. Timed chair rises on reciprocal of time taken in sec ×100. Coefficients based on z-scores. (TIF)
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