

Robust genetic nurture effects on education: evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis based on 38,654 families across eight cohorts

Biyao Wang, PhD¹, Jessie R. Baldwin, PhD^{1,2}, Tabea Schoeler, PhD¹, Rosa Cheesman, PhD^{2,3}, Wikus Barkhuizen, PhD¹, Frank Dudbridge, PhD⁴, David Bann, PhD⁵, Tim T. Morris, PhD^{6,7}, Jean-Baptiste Pingault, PhD^{1,2*}

¹ Division of Psychology and Language Sciences, University College London, London WC1H 0AP, United Kingdom

² Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, King's College, London SE5 8AF, United Kingdom

³ PROMENTA Research Center, Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, 0373 Oslo, Norway

⁴ Department of Health Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH, United Kingdom

⁵ Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Social Research Institute, University College London, London WC1H 0AL, United Kingdom

⁶ Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 2BN, United Kingdom

⁷ Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 2BN, United Kingdom

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jean-Baptiste Pingault, Department of Clinical, Educational, and Health Psychology, Division of Psychology and Language Sciences, University College London, 26 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AP, UK. Email: j.pingault@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

Similarities between parents and offspring arise from nature and nurture. Beyond this simple dichotomy, recent genomic studies have uncovered “genetic nurture” effects, whereby parental genotypes influence offspring outcomes via environmental pathways rather than genetic transmission. Such genetic nurture effects also need to be accounted for to accurately estimate “direct” genetic effects (i.e. genetic effects on a trait originating in the offspring). Empirical studies have indicated that genetic nurture effects are particularly relevant to the intergenerational transmission of risk for child educational outcomes, which are, in turn, associated with major psychological and health milestones throughout the life course. These findings have yet to be systematically appraised across contexts. We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to quantify genetic nurture effects on educational outcomes. Twelve studies comprising 38,654 distinct parent(s)-offspring pairs or trios from eight cohorts reported 22 estimates of genetic nurture effects. Genetic nurture effects on offspring’s educational outcomes ($\beta_{\text{genetic nurture}} = 0.08$, 95% CI [0.07, 0.09]) were smaller than direct genetic effects ($\beta_{\text{direct genetic}} = 0.17$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.20]). Findings were largely consistent across studies. Genetic nurture effects originating from mothers and fathers were of similar magnitude, highlighting the need for a greater inclusion of fathers in educational research. Genetic nurture effects were largely explained by observed parental education and socioeconomic status, pointing to their role in environmental pathways shaping child educational outcomes. Findings provide consistent evidence that environmentally mediated parental genetic influences contribute to the intergenerational transmission of educational outcomes, in addition to effects due to genetic transmission.

Educational attainment is defined as the highest education level a person attains. A related construct is educational achievement, which refers to one's school performance. These two constructs are prospectively associated with major psychological, social, economic and health milestones throughout the life course¹⁻³. Parents' educational levels are important early predictors of their offspring's own educational attainment and achievement⁴. It is crucial to understand the processes underlying this transmission of educational attainment and achievement, which can lead to cycles of disadvantage across generations.

Positive associations between parents' education and their offspring's education are found in nearly every society⁵. For example, correlations between parents' and offspring's educational outcomes were consistent across twelve Western countries with estimates ranging from $r = 0.30$ (Denmark) to 0.46 (U.S.)⁶. Parent-offspring resemblance in educational outcomes can be attributed to nature (genetic variants that offspring inherit from their parents) and nurture (the environment that parents provide for their offspring)⁷. These nature and nurture effects are complex and intertwined. For example, the environment created by parents can be partly shaped by genetic influences; parents with a higher genetic propensity for learning may have a greater interest in activities such as reading that, in turn, nurture learning in their offspring.

“Genetic nurture” is used to describe the phenomenon by which parental nature (i.e., parental genotype) influences offspring outcomes by shaping the environment that parents provide⁸. Genetic nurture effects can therefore be considered to be indirect effects from parental genotype to offspring outcomes that are mediated through environmental pathways whereas “nature” effects correspond to the direct transmission of parental genotypes to the child. Importantly, such direct genetic transmission from parent to offspring can generate

correlations between parental and child educational outcomes in the absence of any effect of parental nurture in shaping child outcomes (a phenomenon akin to passive gene-environment correlation). Conversely, genetic nurture effects are free from genetic confounding arising from genetic variants shared between parents and offspring. As such, evidence of genetic nurture effects suggests that environmental pathways matter when it comes to shaping children's educational outcomes, even after accounting for genetic transmission. The interpretation of genetic nurture effects must be considered in light of some limitations and assumptions, outlined here and further developed in the discussion section. First, despite the term “nurture”, genetic nurture may exist without actual parent-offspring nurturing behaviour but operate through distal factors, inside or outside the home, that are correlated with parental genotypes, such as income or school quality. Thus, detecting genetic nurture effects does not, per se, identify which environmental pathways are implicated. In addition, genetic nurture effects only reflect genuine environmental pathways of transmission when population stratification and assortative mating are entirely accounted for. In the presence of population stratification and assortative mating, spurious genetic nurture effects may be detected even in the absence of what has been termed cultural transmission (i.e. the causal effect of the environment on child outcomes) ⁹.

Recent methodological advances combined with genome-wide data have enabled the estimation of genetic nurture and direct genetic effects. These methods rely on genome-wide association studies (GWAS) for educational attainment (EA) to generate polygenic scores. Specifically, polygenic scores (PGSs) can be derived from GWASs of EA to provide a single value reflecting an individual's genetic propensity to educational attainment (referred to as “EA PGS”; it is a sum of an individual's effect alleles weighted by effect sizes obtained from the EA GWAS). Two studies ^{8,10} adopted a novel design to assess the magnitude of genetic

nurture effects by constructing a parental PGS based on alleles that are not transmitted to the offspring. The association of such a PGS with offspring outcomes cannot arise from genetic transmission but can occur through environmental pathways and thereby reflects genetic nurture effects by design. This approach is termed the “*virtual parent design*” (further description in Supplemental Notes 1.1). Notably, because the effect of a child's genotype on their outcomes can reflect both direct and genetic nurture effects, the association between a child's PGS and their own outcomes can be overestimated when genetic nurture is not accounted for⁸. Direct genetic effects represent genetic influences that originate in the child genotype and must be corrected for genetic nurture effects. In addition to assessing non-transmitted and transmitted alleles, genetic nurture and direct genetic effects can also be obtained by estimating the effect of parental PGS(s) on offspring outcomes, while statistically controlling for the offspring PGS (for further description see Supplemental Notes 1.2). This statistical control approach has been applied in several studies^{11,12}. The statistical control approach requires genotyped trios (mother-father-child) to obtain unbiased estimates, but can nonetheless provide an approximation of genetic nurture effects when only genetic data of parent-child pairs are available^{13,14}.

Such approaches have now been implemented to estimate genetic nurture and direct effects on child educational outcomes in different contexts, such as using cohorts from different countries, using maternal and/or paternal PGS(s), or capitalising on increasingly larger genomic datasets^{15,16}. However, these findings have yet to be systematically appraised and moderators fully investigated. Here we present a meta-analysis of (1) genetic nurture effects on child educational outcomes, (2) direct genetic effects child educational outcomes, and (3) key moderators of these effects.

Methods

Search Strategy and Study Selection

This systematic review and meta-analysis was performed in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and the Meta-Analyses (PRISMA¹⁷) statement and Meta-Analyses of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE¹⁸) guidelines (Tables S1 and S2). The protocol was registered on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/q8b25/>). The literature search was performed in July 2020. We searched Ovid (MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO), Web of Science Core Collection and PubMed for peer-reviewed articles written in English. To estimate genetic nurture effects on educational outcomes, we considered articles estimating genetic nurture in parent(s)-offspring samples using EA PGSs. Therefore, the publication period was limited to 2013 onwards, when the first EA GWAS¹⁹ became available. To retrieve relevant publications, the search included terms related to: (1) educational outcomes, (2) polygenic scores, and (3) genetic nurture effects. A detailed literature search strategy and terms are presented in Supplemental Notes 2.1. Two authors (B.W. and T.S.) independently screened titles and abstracts of all articles retrieved during the search before reviewing the full text of potentially eligible studies (see criteria below). Disagreements were resolved through discussion with the senior researcher (J.B.P).

Eligible studies met the following criteria: (1) they assessed offspring educational attainment (e.g., years of education, highest degree obtained) or educational achievement (e.g., national test scores or levels, school grades) in the general population, (2) the exposure variable(s) included genomic proxies for education in parents and offspring, measured in the form of PGSs²⁰ derived from the EA GWASs, and (3) studies derived estimates for genetic nurture effects on education based on one of the following designs that rely on genotype data from parents and their biological offspring: (a) virtual parent: testing whether the PGSs calculated

from parents' non-transmitted alleles predict offspring educational outcomes; or (b) statistical control: testing whether parents' PGSs predict offspring educational outcomes over and above offspring's own PGS. For more information on inclusion criteria see Supplemental Notes 2.2.

Quality Assessment, Data Extraction and Effect Size Calculation

The methodological quality of each included study was independently assessed by two of the authors (B.W. and one additional author among J.B., W.B., and R.C.) using an adapted version of the Newcastle–Ottawa scale (NOS ²¹). The NOS was adapted for use on genetically informed studies and included nine questions tapping into four wider aspects relevant to study quality, including the quality of cohort selection, the assessment of exposure, the level of comparability of the cohort, and the assessment of outcomes. Overall study quality was indexed as a sum score ranging from 0 to 9 (see Supplemental Notes 2.3 for detailed scoring criteria and Table S3 for scores of included studies).

Data extraction for each included study was independently performed by two of the authors (B.W. and one additional author among J.B., W.B., and R.C.). The following data were extracted: publication characteristics (study name, first author, year), sample characteristics (cohort name, sample size, population source, ethnicity, sex distribution), study design (virtual parent or statistical control), calculation of PGSs (the GWAS used to derive the PGS, PGS threshold, source/parent of origin of genotype, whether standardised), education-related outcomes assessed (educational outcome, outcome type, age at assessment, whether standardised), effect size (estimation type, estimation, 95% CI or standard error of the estimation), and confounding variables adjusted for. Where information was missing, original study authors were contacted to request the information.

As a common metric, we extracted (or converted effect sizes to) standardised beta coefficients and corresponding standard errors from all individual studies. These data were then included in our meta-analytical models to derive the pooled estimate of genetic nurture effects. For studies using the virtual parent design, we extracted standardised regression coefficients for the non-transmitted PGS. For studies using the statistical control design, we extracted adjusted standardised regression coefficients for the parental PGS(s), while controlling for the offspring's PGS. For studies reporting effect estimates in metrics other than standardised beta or without corresponding standard errors, we transformed the reported statistics using the formulae included in the R package `compute.es_0.2-4`²². One estimate of genetic nurture derived from an average parental PGS was recalibrated to be comparable with other studies using PGSs of individual parents (for justification see Supplemental Notes 7.2). Estimates of direct genetic effects were extracted when available or imputable (i.e., the difference between standardised regression coefficients of transmitted PGS and non-transmitted PGS in the virtual parent design or adjusted standardised regression coefficients of offspring's PGS while statistically controlling for parental PGSs). Whenever applicable, we also derived unadjusted parental or child effects, namely unadjusted regression coefficients of the effect of parental or offspring's PGSs on offspring educational outcomes. For more information on the effect size transformation and calculation see Supplemental Notes 3.1.

With each article reviewed and coded by two authors, the two coders had inter-rater reliabilities of 92.6% on quality assessment and 97.8% on data extraction. Before moving onto analyses, discrepancies were reviewed and arbitrated by the two coders, and disagreements were resolved through discussion with the senior researcher (J.B.P).

Statistical Analysis

Analyses were conducted in R version 3.6.1²³ using the *metafor* package (version 2.4-0)²⁴. Since multiple effect sizes were reported in individual studies and cohorts, we used three-level Multilevel Random-Effects Models (MREMs) to account for dependencies among effect sizes within single studies/cohorts (i.e., correlation between effect sizes). These models incorporate three variance components; namely sampling variance at level 1 (variance that is unique for each estimated effect size), within-cohort variance at level 2 (variance across outcomes within a cohort), and between-cohort variance at level 3 (variance across cohorts). For more information on multilevel random-effects models see Supplemental Notes 3.2. We assessed the heterogeneity between studies using the I^2 statistic and tested whether heterogeneity of effect sizes at level 2 (within-cohort heterogeneity) and level 3 (between-cohort heterogeneity) were statistically significant by conducting two separate one-sided log-likelihood ratio tests²⁵. Publication bias was visually assessed by checking the asymmetry of funnel plots and more formally tested by using precision (sampling variance) as a moderator in meta-analysis models²⁶.

Meta-regression analyses were performed to explore potential sources of heterogeneity in effect sizes. We tested four main categorical moderators: (1) Whether the parental PGS was constructed based on maternal, paternal or the mixture of both parents' genotypes, (2) The type of analytic method used to estimate the genetic nurture effects (virtual parent, partial or full statistical control), (3) the type of educational outcome assessed (educational attainment or educational achievement), or (4) the specific GWAS summary statistics used to derive PGSs (EA1 with $N = 101,069$ ¹⁹, EA2 with $N = 293,723$ ²⁷, or EA3 with $N = 1,131,881$ ²⁸). In addition, we tested the moderating role of study characteristics (i.e., methodological quality, sample size and attrition in cohorts). For more information on moderator analyses, see

Supplemental Notes 5. To explore potential environmental pathways genetic nurture operates through, we tested to the extent to which genetic nurture effects attenuated in estimates that adjusted for observed parental educational levels and family socioeconomic status (SES) (details in Supplemental Notes 6).

Lastly, we undertook a series of sensitivity checks to evaluate the robustness of our results including computing robust confidence intervals, evaluating the impact of recalibrating effects derived from average parental PGS in one study²⁹, assessing the impact of a potentially influential study⁸, performing jackknife leave-one-out analyses and assessing the moderating effect of outcome type within studies (i.e., when educational attainment and achievement were measured in the same study). For more information on sensitivity analyses, see Supplemental Notes 7. In all tests, a 2-tailed $p < .05$ was considered statistically significant.

Results

Study Description

Twelve studies met the inclusion criteria (see Figure 1 for the study selection procedure, Table 1 for a study summary, and Table S4 for further details). The studies comprised 38,654 distinct offspring individuals with at least one genotyped parent (for computation of total sample size see Supplemental Notes 5.4) across eight study cohorts from the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States, the Netherlands and Iceland. We derived $k = 22$ estimates of genetic nurture effects on educational outcomes and $k = 16$ estimates of direct genetic effects. The majority of genetic nurture estimates were derived from studies using the statistical control approach [68.2% ($k = 15$)] and the rest from the virtual parent design

[31.8% ($k = 7$)]. Slightly more studies focused on educational achievement [54.5% ($k = 12$)] versus educational attainment [45.5% ($k = 10$)].

Genetic Nurture Effects on Offspring Educational Outcomes

Genetic nurture had a small but robust effect on offspring educational outcomes ($\beta_{\text{genetic nurture}} = 0.08$, 95% CI [0.07, 0.09], robust CI [0.06, 0.10]; Table 2; Figure 2). Variances among different estimates of genetic nurture effects was largely attributed to sampling differences ($I^2_{\text{Level 1}} = 76.80\%$). Within-cohort heterogeneity was close to null ($I^2_{\text{Level 2}} = <0.01\%$) and between-cohort heterogeneity was minimal ($I^2_{\text{Level 3}} = 23.20\%$), suggesting largely homogeneous genetic nurture effects across studies. We found some evidence of publication bias in genetic nurture effects ($Q = 6.12$, $p = .0134$) although the funnel plot was visually symmetric (Figure S1). This bias was no longer present in the sensitivity analysis when excluding the potentially influential study ⁸($Q = 0.88$, $p = .3486$, see Table S5). Results from jackknife analyses suggested no unduly large effects arising from any individual study (Figure S2). The supplemental material includes more findings regarding unadjusted effects of parental PGS on offspring educational outcomes (Supplemental Notes 4.1, Table S6, Figures S3, S5, S6).

Direct Genetic Effects on Offspring Educational Outcomes

Direct genetic effects on offspring educational outcomes were greater in magnitude than genetic nurture effects ($\beta_{\text{direct genetic}} = 0.17$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.20], robust CI [0.12, 0.21]; Table 2; Figure 2). Variance among estimates of direct genetic effects was largely attributable to between-cohort heterogeneity ($I^2_{\text{Level 3}} = 82.33\%$), with 17.67% (i.e., $I^2_{\text{Level 1}}$) explained by random sampling and negligible within-cohort heterogeneity ($I^2_{\text{Level 2}} = <0.01\%$). The funnel plot (Figure S1) and formal test with precision as a moderator (Table 2) suggested no

publication bias in estimates of direct genetic effects. Jackknife analyses suggested that no single study unduly influenced meta-analysis estimates (Figure S2). For findings regarding unadjusted effects of child PGS on educational outcomes, see Supplemental Notes 4.2, Table S6, Figures S4-S6.

Sources of Heterogeneity in Genetic Nurture and Direct Genetic Effects on Educational Outcomes

Moderator analyses (Table 3) suggested similar effects of genetic nurture on educational outcomes regardless of whether effect sizes were obtained using polygenic scores derived from mothers only ($\beta_{\text{mother}} = 0.08$, 95% CI [0.07, 0.10]), from fathers only ($\beta_{\text{father}} = 0.07$, 95% CI [0.06, 0.09]), or from either parent or a mean parental PGS ($\beta_{\text{parents}} = 0.08$, 95% CI [0.06, 0.10]). Likewise, whether PGSs were based on mothers, fathers or the mixture of both did not moderate direct genetic effects ($\beta_{\text{mother}} = 0.17$, 95% CI [0.12, 0.23], $\beta_{\text{father}} = 0.20$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.27], $\beta_{\text{parents}} = 0.16$, 95% CI [0.12, 0.20]). There was no evidence for moderating effects of parent of origin ($p_{\text{genetic nurture}} = .6680$ and $p_{\text{direct genetic}} = .4885$). These findings were robust to the removal of the potentially influential study⁸ (Table S8). Results for other potential moderators are reported in Supplemental Notes 5 and Table S7. After adjusting for phenotypic family-level factors (i.e., parental educational level or family SES), genetic nurture effects attenuated to a large extent ($k_{\text{unadjusted}} = 22$, $\beta_{\text{unadjusted}} = 0.07$, 95% CI [0.07, 0.08] vs. $k_{\text{adjusted}} = 18$, $\beta_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.02$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.03], $p_{\text{adjustment}} < .0001$); for more details see Supplemental Notes 6.

Discussion

Across 12 studies that included 38,654 distinct parent(s)-offspring pairs or trios from eight cohorts, we found strong evidence to support the notion that genetic nurture plays an

important role in children's educational outcomes. The magnitude of genetic nurture effects was largely consistent across studies, was similar in both parents and was largely explained by parental educational level and family socioeconomic status. After accounting for genetic nurture, we also observed substantial direct genetic effects on offspring education, due to genetic inheritance.

Genomic Prediction of Education: Evidence for Genetic Nurture and Direct Genetic Effects

We observed a small effect of genetic nurture ($\beta_{\text{genetic nurture}} = 0.08$) on educational outcomes. Scaled with reference to two of the included studies, this could be translated to approximately 2 months of schooling^{14, 29} or 0.07 of GPA (4.0 scale)³⁰ gained in the United States for every standard deviation change in parental EA PGS(s). Our pooled estimate of direct genetic effects ($\beta_{\text{direct genetic}} = 0.17$) free from inflation due to genetic nurture, corresponds to the lower bound of previous genomic predictions of educational outcomes within twin pairs (e.g., $\beta = 0.17-27$)^{29, 31}. While we did observe substantial heterogeneity across cohorts in estimates of direct genetic effects, this may reflect differences in cohort characteristics (i.e. measurement of achievement or attainment) rather than actual heterogeneity in direct genetic effects between populations. Previous findings suggested that differential effects of the same variants across environments may reflect heterogeneity in phenotypic measurement or gene-environment interactions rather than true genetic heterogeneity^{28, 32}.

It is worth noting that our pooled estimate of genetic nurture represents the effects from an individual parent and should therefore be recalibrated to compare its relative size to the pooled estimate for direct genetic effects. With genetic nurture from both parents explaining potentially 1.28% ($2 * \beta_{\text{genetic nurture}}^2$) of variance in offspring educational outcomes, the

standardised effect size of genetic nurture from both parents can be estimated to be 0.11 (i.e., $\sqrt{1.28\%}$). As such, the ratio of genetic nurture effects originating in both parents and direct genetic effects originating in the offspring is about 0.65 (further information regarding this ratio is provided in Supplemental Notes 7.2). This ratio corresponds well to the ratio of 0.63 derived from the Relatedness Disequilibrium Regression (RDR) method, in which heritability is estimated by exploiting variation in relatedness due to random Mendelian segregation³³. In addition to methods relying on genomic data of children and their biological parent(s), a few recent studies have implemented sibling³¹ and adoption^{34,35} designs to investigate genetic nurture effects. As evidence from these alternative designs accumulate, it will be key to examine the consistency of estimates across designs³⁶.

It is worth noting that this meta-analysis can only detect genetic nurture and direct genetic effects to the extent that PGS capture heritability in educational outcomes. To date, PGSs based on the most accurate GWASs still only capture a fraction of the corresponding heritabilities^{37,38}. RDR findings provided a ‘ceiling’ for potential gains from increasing the predictive accuracy of PGSs³³. Our estimate of genetic nurture based on PGSs explained 1.28% (Supplementary Notes 7.2) of variance in offspring educational outcomes (versus 6.6% for RDR), while direct genetic effects based on PGSs explained 2.89% of variance in educational outcomes (calculated as $\beta_{\text{direct genetic}}^2$) (versus 17% for RDR).

While missing heritability may lead to underestimates of the true extent of genetic nurture, assortative mating and population stratification may have inflated our genetic nurture effects⁹. Bias resulting from assortative mating has been found to be small in magnitude⁸, although its exact magnitude remains unclear⁹. Population stratification was controlled for by using principal component analysis in most studies included in the meta-analysis but residual

population stratification may still exist. Emerging methods should, in the future, better account for these potential sources of bias by capitalising further on family-based designs³⁹⁻⁴¹.

Genomic Prediction of Education: Sources of Heterogeneity

There are several explanations for observing genetic nurture effects of similar magnitude in mothers and fathers. First, it is possible that both parents are equally important in shaping the environment that, in turn, influences their offspring's educational outcomes. However, our findings do not preclude the possibility that parents may influence child educational outcomes through different mechanisms (e.g. via distal factors like increased family income or by proximal factors like reading to the child). Behavioural studies have shown that the relationship between parental involvement and children's educational achievement was equally strong for fathers and mothers^{42, 43}. In light of this and our findings, a renewed emphasis on the role of fathers is needed and, whenever possible, fathers should be included in research and intervention efforts. Research should also examine genetic nurture effects in alternative family arrangements (e.g., single-parent families) and in families with varying levels of parental involvement. In the presence of genuine nurturing effects, we would expect genetic nurture effects on educational outcomes to vary accordingly (e.g., be stronger for the most involved parent), which could help shedding further light on environmental factors mediating genetic nurture effects. Second, genetic nurture may operate through the broad family-level environments shared by both parents (e.g., neighbourhood). Future investigations are required to identify such environmental mediators. A new genomic variance decomposition method⁴⁴ makes it possible to estimate the total variance explained by maternal versus paternal indirect genetic effects (not limited to PGS), and the covariance between maternal and paternal effects. This opens up opportunities to understand

intrafamilial mechanisms in more depth. Third, spurious genetic nurture effects can arise from residual population stratification, in the absence of cultural transmission. This may help to explain why intergenerational twin studies, which are not affected by population stratification, report very weak or no evidence for cultural transmission. For example, twin studies found very little evidence of cultural transmission for intelligence^{45,46}, reading performance^{47,48} and educational attainment.⁴⁹ Alternatively, it is possible that the polygenic score for education captures genuine genetic nurture effects reflecting a multiplicity of small environmentally mediated effects via a large range of intermediate variables within or outside the home. In which case, we would expect intergenerational twin studies to find only weak effects for any particular phenotype. We discuss additional sources of heterogeneity in genetic nurture in Supplemental Notes 5.

Notably, accounting for observed measures of parental education or family SES decreased the effect of genetic nurture by three quarters. This suggests that a substantial amount of genetic nurture effects may be attributed to environmental pathways directly related to parental education, occupation and income. It echoes the evidence that children's educational outcomes are influenced by the availability of resources in their family, either indicated by socioeconomic background or the education of their parents^{5,50,51}. Future investigations should explore specific family-level pathways through which genetic nurture operates to inform compensatory interventions (e.g., financial support vs. schooling access). Importantly, the finding that broad family-level social economic characteristics largely explain genetic nurture effects does not preclude the importance of proximal factors such as parenting in the chain of factors leading to educational outcomes.

Implications

Our study highlights that the environment created by parents relates to their offspring's educational outcomes independent of genetic transmission. Although the magnitude of this genetic nurture effect is small based on conventional metrics⁵², it is likely to be an underestimate given that PGSs only capture a fraction of heritability in educational outcomes - and thus will likely increase as the explanatory power of PGSs increases. Understanding the specific environmental pathways through which genetic nurture operates may help to design better compensatory interventions to break the intergenerational cycle of educational underachievement. Such interventions could target environmental pathways by either targeting distal risk factors for educational outcomes (e.g. parental education, income distribution, equal access to good quality schooling) or more proximal pathways (rearing environment such as parenting). Nevertheless, it is important to note that how well children do in school does depend to a substantial degree on the genetic lottery (i.e., inheriting more genetic variants associated with educational success), a finding that policy-makers often overlook⁵³ or arguably misinterpret⁵⁴. At a broader level, our findings provide strong evidence that differences in education are consistently influenced by both endogenous sources of educational inequalities (e.g. one's own genetics) and exogenous sources of inequalities including genetic nurture effects originating in parents and mediated partially through broad-level family characteristics like SES. All these endogenous and exogenous sources of educational inequalities are largely beyond a child's responsibility/control and each may therefore further motivate compensatory interventions.

Limitations

First, we cannot completely rule out bias from unmeasured assortative mating, residual population stratification and sibling genetic nurture^{39,40}, which may inflate genetic nurture effects. Second, all included studies were conducted in a few developed Western countries. The similarities in populations and social contexts may lead to an overestimation of the

homogeneity of genetic nurture effects. Third, all included studies were based on European ancestry populations and thus have a profound Eurocentric bias. The generalisability of our estimates to non-European population is unclear as genomic measures are not necessarily accurate across populations⁵⁵. For example, the PGS constructed from EA3, which was conducted in white Europeans, captures 10.6% of the variation of educational attainment in white Americans but only about 1.6% of the variation among African Americans²⁸. Fourth, differential measurement error in outcomes may affect genetic (nurture) effect sizes. Comparison between different outcome types (e.g. educational attainment versus achievement) should therefore be interpreted with caution.

Conclusions

This meta-analysis demonstrates that parents' genetics influence their children's educational outcomes through the rearing environments that parents provide. This "genetic nurture" effect is largely consistent across studies and is similar for mothers and fathers. Genetic nurture effects originating in both parents are about two thirds of the size of direct genetic effects originating in the offspring due to genetic transmission. The effect of genetic nurture on child educational outcomes is largely explained by observed parental education and socioeconomic status. Further research is required to explore other downstream environmental pathways through which genetic nurture affects the intergenerational cycle of educational achievement.

Declaration of Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgements

B.W. and J.B.P. are funded by a Nuffield Foundation project (EDO/43939); J.R.B is funded by a Wellcome Trust Sir Henry Wellcome fellowship (215917/Z/19/Z); T.S. is funded by a Wellcome Trust Sir Henry Wellcome fellowship (218641/Z/19/Z). D.B. is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ES/M001660/1) and Medical Research Council (MR/V002147/1). F.D. is a consultant for University College London funded by the Nuffield Foundation project.

Data and code availability

The dataset generated during this study can be retrieved by using the search strategy and term reported in Supplemental Notes 2 and 3.1. All included estimates are reported in detail in Table S4. The code supporting the current study is available on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/gau5y/>).

Supplemental Data

Supplemental Data include 3 figures, 9 tables, 7 notes and references.

Supplemental Figures

Figure S1. Funnel plots for effects on educational outcomes

Figure S2. Jackknife sensitivity analyses for effects on educational outcomes

Figure S3. Forest plot of multilevel random effects model for unadjusted effects on educational outcomes

Supplemental Tables

Table S1. MOOSE checklist

Table S2. PRISMA checklist

Table S3. Methodological quality assessment

Table S4. Studies investigating genetic nurture effects on education

Table S5. Three-level random effects models after removing the potentially influential study

Table S6. Three-level random effects models of unadjusted parental and child effects on educational outcomes

Table S7. Moderator analysis: sources of heterogeneity in MREM of unadjusted parental and child effects

Table S8. Moderator analyses after removing the potentially influential study

Table S9. Moderating role of educational outcome type within study

Supplemental Notes

1. Capturing genetic nurture effects with parent(s)-offspring genotype
2. Study selection and assessment
3. Data extraction and synthesis
4. Unadjusted parental and child effects
5. Other sources of heterogeneity in genetic nurture effects
6. Family-level adjustment
7. Sensitivity analyses

Supplemental References

References

1. Conti G, Heckman J, Urzua S. The education-health gradient. *American Economic Review* 2010; **100**(2): 234-238.
2. Foundation RS, Kaplan GA, House JS, Schoeni RF, Pollack HA. *Making Americans healthier: Social and economic policy as health policy*. Russell Sage Foundation 2008.
3. Crespo L, López-Noval B, Mira P. Compulsory schooling, education, depression and memory: New evidence from SHARELIFE. *Economics of Education Review* 2014; **43**: 36-46.
4. Dubow EF, Boxer P, Huesmann LR. Long-term effects of parents' education on children's educational and occupational success: Mediation by family interactions, child aggression, and teenage aspirations. *Merrill-Palmer quarterly (Wayne State University Press)* 2009; **55**(3): 224.
5. Björklund A, Salvanes KG. Chapter 3 - Education and Family Background: Mechanisms and Policies. In: Hanushek EA, Machin S, Woessmann L (eds). *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, vol. 3. Elsevier 2011, pp 201-247.
6. Hertz T, Jayasundera T, Piraino P, Selcuk S, Smith N, Verashchagina A. The inheritance of educational inequality: International comparisons and fifty-year trends. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* 2008; **7**(2).
7. Koellinger PD, Harden KP. Using nature to understand nurture. *Science* 2018; **359**(6374): 386-387.
8. Kong A, Thorleifsson G, Frigge ML, Vilhjalmsón BJ, Young AI, Thorgeirsson TE *et al*. The nature of nurture: Effects of parental genotypes. *Science* 2018; **359**(6374): 424-428.
9. Shen H, Feldman MW. Genetic nurturing, missing heritability, and causal analysis in genetic statistics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2020; **117**(41): 25646-25654.
10. Bates TC, Maher BS, Medland SE, McAloney K, Wright MJ, Hansell NK *et al*. The Nature of Nurture: Using a Virtual-Parent Design to Test Parenting Effects on Children's Educational Attainment in Genotyped Families. *Twin Research and Human Genetics* 2018; **21**(2): 73-83.
11. Morris T, Davies N, Hemani G, Smith GD. Population phenomena inflate genetic associations of complex social traits. *Science Advances* 2020; **6**(16).
12. Conley D, Domingue BW, Cesarini D, Dawes C, Rietveld CA, Boardman JD. Is the Effect of Parental Education on Offspring Biased or Moderated by Genotype? *Sociological science* 2015; **2**(6): 82-105.

13. Armstrong-Carter E, Trejo S, Hill LJB, Crossley KL, Mason D, Domingue BW. The Earliest Origins of Genetic Nurture: The Prenatal Environment Mediates the Association Between Maternal Genetics and Child Development. *Psychological Science* 2020.
14. Liu HX. Social and Genetic Pathways in Multigenerational Transmission of Educational Attainment. *American Sociological Review* 2018; **83**(2): 278-304.
15. Bates TC, Maher BS, Colodro-Conde L, Medland SE, McAloney K, Wright MJ *et al.* Social competence in parents increases children's educational attainment: Replicable genetically-mediated effects of parenting revealed by non-transmitted DNA. *Twin Research and Human Genetics* 2019; **22**(1): 70-74.
16. de Zeeuw EL, Hottenga JJ, Ouwens KG, Dolan CV, Ehli EA, Davies GE *et al.* Intergenerational Transmission of Education and ADHD: Effects of Parental Genotypes. *Behavior Genetics*.
17. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* 2009; **6**(7): e1000097.
18. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D *et al.* Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. *Jama* 2000; **283**(15): 2008-2012.
19. Rietveld CA, Medland SE, Derringer J, Yang J, Esko T, Martin NW *et al.* GWAS of 126,559 individuals identifies genetic variants associated with educational attainment. *science* 2013; **340**(6139): 1467-1471.
20. Dudbridge F. Power and predictive accuracy of polygenic risk scores. *PLoS Genet* 2013; **9**(3): e1003348.
21. Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2010; **25**(9): 603-605.
22. Del Re AC. compute.es: Compute Effect Sizes. *R Package* 2013.
23. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria, 2019.
24. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of statistical software* 2010; **36**(3): 1-48.
25. Assink M, Wibbelink CJ. Fitting three-level meta-analytic models in R: A step-by-step tutorial. *The Quantitative Methods for Psychology* 2016; **12**(3): 154-174.

26. Rodgers MA, Pustejovsky JE. Evaluating meta-analytic methods to detect selective reporting in the presence of dependent effect sizes. *Psychological methods* 2020.
27. Okbay A, Beauchamp JP, Fontana MA, Lee JJ, Pers TH, Rietveld CA *et al.* Genome-wide association study identifies 74 loci associated with educational attainment. *Nature* 2016; **533**(7604): 539-542.
28. Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okbay A, Kong E, Maghzian O, Zacher M *et al.* Gene discovery and polygenic prediction from a 1.1-million-person GWAS of educational attainment. *Nature genetics* 2018; **50**(8): 1112.
29. Willoughby EA, McGue M, Iacono WG, Rustichini A, Lee JJ. The role of parental genotype in predicting offspring years of education: evidence for genetic nurture. *Molecular Psychiatry* 2019.
30. Rustichini A, Iacono WG, Lee J, McGue M. Polygenic score analysis of educational achievement and intergenerational mobility 2018.
31. Selzam S, Ritchie SJ, Pingault J-B, Reynolds CA, O'Reilly PF, Plomin R. Comparing within-and between-family polygenic score prediction. *The American Journal of Human Genetics* 2019; **105**(2): 351-363.
32. Tropf FC, Lee SH, Verweij RM, Stulp G, Van Der Most PJ, De Vlaming R *et al.* Hidden heritability due to heterogeneity across seven populations. *Nature human behaviour* 2017; **1**(10): 757-765.
33. Young AI, Frigge ML, Gudbjartsson DF, Thorleifsson G, Bjornsdottir G, Sulem P *et al.* Relatedness disequilibrium regression estimates heritability without environmental bias. *Nature genetics* 2018; **50**(9): 1304-1310.
34. Domingue BW, Fletcher J. Separating measured genetic and environmental effects: Evidence linking parental genotype and adopted child outcomes. *Behavior genetics* 2020: 1-9.
35. Cheesman R, Hunjan A, Coleman JR, Ahmadzadeh Y, Plomin R, McAdams TA *et al.* Comparison of adopted and nonadopted individuals reveals gene–environment interplay for education in the UK Biobank. *Psychological Science* 2020; **31**(5): 582-591.
36. Lawlor DA, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Triangulation in aetiological epidemiology. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2017; **45**(6): 1866-1886.
37. Cesarini D, Visscher PM. Genetics and educational attainment. *npj Science of Learning* 2017; **2**(1): 1-7.

38. Allegrini AG, Selzam S, Rimfeld K, von Stumm S, Pingault J-B, Plomin R. Genomic prediction of cognitive traits in childhood and adolescence. *Molecular psychiatry* 2019; **24**(6): 819-827.
39. Young AI, Nehzati SM, Lee C, Benonisdottir S, Cesarini D, Benjamin DJ *et al.* Mendelian imputation of parental genotypes for genome-wide estimation of direct and indirect genetic effects. *bioRxiv* 2020.
40. Demange PA, Hottenga JJ, Abdellaoui A, Malanchini M, Domingue BW, de Zeeuw EL *et al.* Parental influences on offspring education: indirect genetic effects of non-cognitive skills. *bioRxiv* 2020.
41. Balbona J, Kim Y, Keller MC. Estimation of parental effects using polygenic scores. *bioRxiv* 2020: 2020.2008.2011.247049.
42. Kim Sw, Hill NE. Including fathers in the picture: A meta-analysis of parental involvement and students' academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 2015; **107**(4): 919-934.
43. Barger MM, Kim EM, Kuncel NR, Pomerantz EM. The relation between parents' involvement in children's schooling and children's adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 2019; **145**(9): 855-890.
44. Eilertsen EM, Jami ES, McAdams TA, Hannigan LJ, Havdahl AS, Magnus P *et al.* Direct and Indirect Effects of Maternal, Paternal, and Offspring Genotypes: Trio-GCTA. *Behavior Genetics* 2021; **51**(2): 154-161.
45. Van Leeuwen M, Van Den Berg SM, Boomsma DI. A twin-family study of general IQ. *Learning and Individual Differences* 2008; **18**(1): 76-88.
46. Vinkhuyzen AA, Van Der Sluis S, Maes HH, Posthuma D. Reconsidering the heritability of intelligence in adulthood: taking assortative mating and cultural transmission into account. *Behavior genetics* 2012; **42**(2): 187-198.
47. Wadsworth S, Corley R, Hewitt J, Plomin R, DeFries J. Parent-offspring resemblance for reading performance at 7, 12 and 16 years of age in the Colorado Adoption Project. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 2002; **43**(6): 769-774.
48. Swagerman SC, Van Bergen E, Dolan C, de Geus EJ, Koenis MM, Pol HEH *et al.* Genetic transmission of reading ability. *Brain and Language* 2017; **172**: 3-8.
49. Lyngstad TH, Ystrøm E, Zambrana IM. An Anatomy of Intergenerational Transmission: Learning from the educational attainments of Norwegian twins and their parents. 2017.
50. Sirin SR. Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of educational research* 2005; **75**(3): 417-453.

51. Shavit Y, Blossfeld H-P. *Persistent Inequality: Changing Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries. Social Inequality Series*. ERIC1993.
52. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, (L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ). Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, NJ, USA1988.
53. Dewar M, ESSER FC, Benczur P, Campolongo F, Harasztosi P, KARAGIANNIS S *et al*. What makes a fair society? Insights and evidence: Joint Research Centre (Seville site); 2017.
54. Crosswaite M, Asbury K. 'Mr Cummings clearly does not understand the science of genetics and should maybe go back to school on the subject': an exploratory content analysis of the online comments beneath a controversial news story. *Life sciences, society and policy* 2016; **12**(1): 1-16.
55. Martin AR, Kanai M, Kamatani Y, Okada Y, Neale BM, Daly MJ. Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health disparities. *Nature genetics* 2019; **51**(4): 584-591.

Figures

Figure 1. Flow chart of identification of eligible studies

Figure 2. Forest plot of multilevel random effects model for genetic nurture effects and direct genetic effects on educational outcomes

Note. Effect sizes were standardised beta coefficients, which represent how many standard deviations of change in educational outcome occur per standard deviation of change in EA PGS.

Tables

Table 1. Studies investigating genetic nurture effects on educational outcomes

Table 2. Three-level random effects models of genetic nurture and direct genetic effects on educational outcomes

Table 3. Moderator analysis: sources of heterogeneity in MREM of genetic nurture effects and direct genetic effects




Figure 1. Flow chart of identification of eligible studies




Figure 2. Forest plot of multilevel random effects model for genetic nurture effects and direct genetic effects on educational outcomes

Note. Effect sizes were standardised beta coefficients, which represent how many standard deviations of change in educational outcome occur per standard deviation of change in EA PGS.

Table 1. Studies investigating genetic nurture effects on educational outcomes

Cohort ^a	Publication	Outcome ^b	Effective N ^c	Design	GWAS ^d	NOS score ^e
Born in Bradford birth cohort (BiB), United Kingdom	Armstrong-Carter et al., 2020	Key stage 1 school-based exam score	1267	Statistical control	EA3	6.5
The Brisbane Adolescent Twin Study (BATS), Australia	Bates et al., 2018	The Queensland Core Skills Test	2335	Virtual parent	EA2	7.5
The Brisbane Adolescent Twin Study (BATS), Australia	Bates et al., 2019	The Queensland Core Skills Test	2335	Virtual parent	EA3	7.5
The Environmental Risk Longitudinal Twin Study (E-Risk), United Kingdom	Belsky et al., 2018	GCSE academic qualification level	1574	Statistical control	EA3	7.0
The Framingham Heart Study (FHS), United States	Conley et al., 2015	Years of schooling	968	Statistical control	EA1	5.0
The Netherlands Twin Register (NTR), Netherlands	de Zeeuw et al., 2020	Highest obtained degree; Nationwide educational achievement test	1931; 1120	Virtual parent	EA3	7.0
The Icelandic quantitative trait cohorts (deCODE), Iceland	Kong et al., 2018	Years of education completed	21637	Virtual parent	EA2	7.5
The Framingham Heart Study (FHS), United States	Liu et al., 2018	Years of education completed	6298	Statistical control	EA2	6.5
The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC), United Kingdom	Morris 2020	Key stage 4 school-based exam score	1095	Statistical control	EA3	7.0
The Minnesota Twin Family Study (MTFS), United States	Rustichini et al., 2018	Years of education completed; High school grades	1690; 1583	Statistical control	EA3	6.0

The Environmental Risk Longitudinal Twin Study(E-Risk), United Kingdom	Wertz et al., 2019	GCSE academic qualification level	860	Statistical control	EA3	6.0
The Minnesota Center for Twin and Family Research (MCTFR) ^a , United States	Willoughy et al., 2019	Years of education completed	2517	Statistical control	EA3	5.5

Note. ^a Participants in the MCTFR cohort were drawn from several longitudinal studies including the MTFSS cohort, thus in the meta-analysis they were considered as the same cohort. ^b Educational outcomes consists of two broad categories, i.e., attainment and achievement. Years of schooling/education completed and highest obtained degree are categorized as educational attainment; the rest are categorized as educational achievement. More details of outcomes, including assessment time, are provided in Table S3. ^c The largest sample size used to assess genetic nurture effects. ^d GWAS (genome-wide association studies) used to derive the polygenic scores, including EA1 with N = 101,069 (Rietveld et al., 2013), EA2 with N = 293,723 (Okbay et al., 2016), EA3 with N = 1,131,881 (Lee et al., 2018). ^e Quality score ranged from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest) on methodological quality using an adjusted version of the Newcastle–Ottawa scale, criteria showed in sMethods and detailed scoring showed in Table S4.

Table 2. Three-level random effects models of genetic nurture and direct genetic effects on educational outcomes

	Genetic nurture effects	Direct genetic effects
k_{cohort}	8	8
k_{estimate}	22	16
β_{pooled}	0.08	0.17
$\beta_{95\% \text{ CI}}$	0.07-0.09	0.13-0.20
$\beta_{\text{robust CI}}^{\text{a}}$	0.06-0.10	0.12-0.21
$\sigma^2_{\text{Level 2}}$	$\chi^2 < 0.01, p = .5000$	$\chi^2 < 0.01, p = .5000$
$\sigma^2_{\text{Level 3}}$	$\chi^2 = 1.94, p = .0817$	$\chi^2 = 5.09, p = .0120$
$I^2_{\text{Level 1}}$	76.80%	17.67%
$I^2_{\text{Level 2}}$	<0.01%	<0.01%
$I^2_{\text{Level 3}}$	23.20%	82.33%
Publication bias	$Q = 6.12, p = .0134$	$Q = 0, p = .9976$

Note. ^a Robust confidence intervals were cluster-robust variance estimations, for details see Supplemental Notes 7.1. MREM = Multilevel random effects model; β = standardised regression coefficients (i.e., the metric of effect sizes); CI = confidence interval; χ^2 Statistics from likelihood-ratio test to test within-cohort variance ($\sigma^2_{\text{Level 2}}$) and between-cohort variance ($\sigma^2_{\text{Level 3}}$) for significance; I^2 = % of the total variance accounted for by random sampling variance (Level 1), variation within cohorts (Level 2), variation between cohorts (Level 3); Publication bias was assessed by using precision (sampling variance) to predict the effect size.

Table 3. Moderator analysis: sources of heterogeneity in MREM of genetic nurture effects and direct genetic effects

Moderator	Subgroup	Genetic nurture effects					Direct genetic effects				
		k_{cohort}	k_{estimate}	β_{pooled}	$\beta_{95\% \text{ CI}}$	$p_{\text{moderator}}$	k_{cohort}	k_{estimate}	β_{pooled}	$\beta_{95\% \text{ CI}}$	$p_{\text{moderator}}$
Parental PGS ^a	Maternal	6	9	0.08	0.07-0.10	.6680	4	4	0.17	0.12-0.23	.4885
	Paternal	4	6	0.07	0.06-0.09		2	2	0.20	0.13-0.27	
	Mixed parental	5	7	0.08	0.06-0.09		6	10	0.16	0.12-0.20	
Design ^b	Virtual parent	3	7	0.07	0.06-0.08	.0443	3	5	0.15	0.08-0.21	.5039
	Partial statistical control	5	9	0.09	0.07-0.10		5	8	0.18	0.13-0.24	
	Full statistical control	2	6	0.09	0.06-0.11		2	3	0.15	0.08-0.22	
Outcome ^c	Educational attainment	4	10	0.09	0.07-0.11	.3079	4	7	0.14	0.08-0.19	.0466
	Educational achievement	6	12	0.07	0.05-0.10		6	9	0.19	0.14-0.24	
GWAS ^d	EA3	6	15	0.09	0.08-0.11	.0066	6	11	0.18	0.14-0.23	.1784
	EA2	3	7	0.07	0.06-0.08		3	5	0.14	0.08-0.20	
Methodological quality ^e	NOS score	8	22	-0.02	-0.03-0.00	.0072	8	16	0.01	-0.07-0.08	.8692
Sample size ^f	Effective N	8	22	0.00	0.00-0.00	.0225	8	16	0.00	-0.01-0.00	.7390
Attrition in cohort ^g	Attrition rate	8	22	-0.01	-0.05-0.03	.7046	8	16	0.03	-0.07-0.13	.5466
Parental education/ family SES ^h	Unadjusted	8	22	0.07	0.07-0.08	<.0001	8	16	0.17	0.13-0.20	.0098
	Adjusted	5	18	0.02	0.01-0.03		3	11	0.14	0.10-0.18	

Note. ^a Parental genotype used to calculate polygenic score (PGS) as a categorical moderator with three categories [maternal (PGS derived from maternal genotype), paternal (PGS derived from paternal genotype), mixed parental (PGS derived from mixed information from mothers and fathers, such as PGS from maternal or paternal genotype, PGS from the average of maternal and paternal genotype)]. ^b Study design applied as a categorical moderator with three categories [virtual parent (using non-transmitted PGS to predict offspring EA), partial statistical control (using PGS of one parent to predict offspring educational outcomes while controlling for child's PGS), full statistical control (using PGS of one parent to predict offspring educational outcomes while controlling for child's and the other parent's PGS)]. ^c Type of the outcome assessed as a dichotomized moderator [educational attainment (the highest level of education completed, e.g., year of schooling), educational achievement (performance at school, e.g., high school grades)]. ^d GWAS used to compute PGS as a dichotomized moderator [EA3 (Lee et al. 2018, N = 1,131,881), EA2 (Okbay et al. 2016, N = 293,723). One study used EA1 (Rietveld et al., 2013, N = 101,069) but only reported estimates adjusted for parental education level, and thus was not included in the main meta-analysis but was included in the moderator analysis (moderator h). ^e Quality score assessed by the adapted NOS (see details in eTable 3), reflecting the methodological rigor of the study, as a continuous moderator. ^f Number of participants to compute the estimate, reflecting the effective sample size, as a continuous moderator. ^g Attrition in the cohort due to selective genotyping or outcome availability, reflecting the cohort representativeness, as a continuous moderator. ^h Family-level adjustment as a binary moderator [0 = unadjusted estimates, 1 = adjusted estimates (estimates adjusted for parental education level or family socioeconomic status)].

For moderators abcdh, dummy variables were created for each category of the potential moderator. In order to obtain the mean effect (including significance and confidence interval) of all categories, separate meta-regressions were conducted, taking each category as the reference category in turn.

For moderators efg, the moderator was treated as a continuous variable.