

STROBE-MR checklist of recommended items to address in reports of Mendelian randomization studies^{1 2}

Item No.	Section	Checklist item	Page No.	Relevant text from manuscript
1	TITLE and ABSTRACT	Indicate Mendelian randomization (MR) as the study's design in the title and/or the abstract if that is a main purpose of the study	1	
INTRODUCTION				
2	Background	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the reported study. What is the exposure? Is a potential causal relationship between exposure and outcome plausible? Justify why MR is a helpful method to address the study question	3-4	
3	Objectives	State specific objectives clearly, including pre-specified causal hypotheses (if any). State that MR is a method that, under specific assumptions, intends to estimate causal effects	4	Here, we performed a meta-analysis of genome-wide genotype data from three large-scale studies, including the FinnGen study, the UK Biobank, and the GWAS on ICH from 2014, and used the derived dataset, comprising 7605 ICH cases and 711 818 non-cases, to identify the modifiable cardiometabolic and lifestyle factors for ICH through MR analysis.
METHODS				
4	Study design and data sources	Present key elements of the study design early in the article. Consider including a table listing sources of data for all phases of the study. For each data source contributing to the analysis, describe the following:		
	a)	Setting: Describe the study design and the underlying population, if possible. Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection, when available.	4 + Fig 1	
	b)	Participants: Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Report the sample size, and whether any power or sample size calculations were carried out prior to the main analysis	5-6	
	c)	Describe measurement, quality control and selection of genetic variants	8	
	d)	For each exposure, outcome, and other relevant variables, describe methods of assessment and diagnostic criteria for diseases	ST1	Supplemental Table 1
	e)	Provide details of ethics committee approval and participant informed consent, if	Not	

	relevant		relevant
5	Assumptions	Explicitly state the three core IV assumptions for the main analysis (relevance, independence and exclusion restriction) as well assumptions for any additional or sensitivity analysis	8-9
6	Statistical methods: main analysis	Describe statistical methods and statistics used	8-9
	a)	Describe how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses (i.e., scale, units, model)	ST5 Supplemental Table 5 and Figure 3
	b)	Describe how genetic variants were handled in the analyses and, if applicable, how their weights were selected	ST2, ST5
	c)	Describe the MR estimator (e.g. two-stage least squares, Wald ratio) and related statistics. Detail the included covariates and, in case of two-sample MR, whether the same covariate set was used for adjustment in the two samples	8
	d)	Explain how missing data were addressed	8
	e)	If applicable, indicate how multiple testing was addressed	9
7	Assessment of assumptions	Describe any methods or prior knowledge used to assess the assumptions or justify their validity	n/a
8	Sensitivity analyses and additional analyses	Describe any sensitivity analyses or additional analyses performed (e.g. comparison of effect estimates from different approaches, independent replication, bias analytic techniques, validation of instruments, simulations)	8-9
9	Software and pre-registration		
	a)	Name statistical software and package(s), including version and settings used	9
	b)	State whether the study protocol and details were pre-registered (as well as when and where)	n/a
RESULTS			
10	Descriptive data		
	a)	Report the numbers of individuals at each stage of included studies and reasons for exclusion. Consider use of a flow diagram	5-6
	b)	Report summary statistics for phenotypic exposure(s), outcome(s), and other	ST2

	relevant variables (e.g. means, SDs, proportions)		
	c) If the data sources include meta-analyses of previous studies, provide the assessments of heterogeneity across these studies	n/a	
	d) For two-sample MR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide justification of the similarity of the genetic variant-exposure associations between the exposure and outcome samples ii. Provide information on the number of individuals who overlap between the exposure and outcome studies 	n/a	
11	Main results		
	a) Report the associations between genetic variant and exposure, and between genetic variant and outcome, preferably on an interpretable scale	Fig 3	Fig 3 and ST5-ST10
	b) Report MR estimates of the relationship between exposure and outcome, and the measures of uncertainty from the MR analysis, on an interpretable scale, such as odds ratio or relative risk per SD difference	Fig 3	
	c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a	
	d) Consider plots to visualize results (e.g. forest plot, scatterplot of associations between genetic variants and outcome versus between genetic variants and exposure)	Fig 3	
12	Assessment of assumptions		
	a) Report the assessment of the validity of the assumptions	n/a	
	b) Report any additional statistics (e.g., assessments of heterogeneity across genetic variants, such as I^2 , Q statistic or E-value)		ST5-ST9
13	Sensitivity analyses and additional analyses		
	a) Report any sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of the main results to violations of the assumptions		ST5-ST9
	b) Report results from other sensitivity analyses or additional analyses		ST5-ST9
	c) Report any assessment of direction of causal relationship (e.g., bidirectional MR)	n/a	
	d) When relevant, report and compare with estimates from non-MR analyses	n/a	

	e)	Consider additional plots to visualize results (e.g., leave-one-out analyses)	n/a
DISCUSSION			
14	Key results	Summarize key results with reference to study objectives	11-12
15	Limitations	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account the validity of the IV assumptions, other sources of potential bias, and imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias and any efforts to address them	16
16	Interpretation		
	a)	Meaning: Give a cautious overall interpretation of results in the context of their limitations and in comparison with other studies	17
	b)	Mechanism: Discuss underlying biological mechanisms that could drive a potential causal relationship between the investigated exposure and the outcome, and whether the gene-environment equivalence assumption is reasonable. Use causal language carefully, clarifying that IV estimates may provide causal effects only under certain assumptions	13-15
	c)	Clinical relevance: Discuss whether the results have clinical or public policy relevance, and to what extent they inform effect sizes of possible interventions	17
17	Generalizability	Discuss the generalizability of the study results (a) to other populations, (b) across other exposure periods/timings, and (c) across other levels of exposure	16
OTHER INFORMATION			
18	Funding	Describe sources of funding and the role of funders in the present study and, if applicable, sources of funding for the databases and original study or studies on which the present study is based	17
19	Data and data sharing	Provide the data used to perform all analyses or report where and how the data can be accessed, and reference these sources in the article. Provide the statistical code needed to reproduce the results in the article, or report whether the code is publicly accessible and if so, where	18
20	Conflicts of Interest	All authors should declare all potential conflicts of interest	17

This checklist is copyrighted by the Equator Network under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported (CC BY 3.0) license.

1. Skrivankova VW, Richmond RC, Woolf BAR, Yarmolinsky J, Davies NM, Swanson SA, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology using Mendelian Randomization (STROBE-MR) Statement. JAMA. 2021;under review.

2. Skrivankova VW, Richmond RC, Woolf BAR, Davies NM, Swanson SA, VanderWeele TJ, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology using Mendelian Randomisation (STROBE-MR): Explanation and Elaboration. *BMJ*. 2021;375:n2233.