Using genetic risk score approaches to infer whether an environmental factor attenuates or exacerbates the adverse influence of a candidate gene
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Figure S1  Empirical type I error rates under the nominal significance level of 0.05 (binary trait)
Figure S2  The sensitivity of the marginal-association filtering in ENET, LASSO, and SBERIA, for continuous traits and $P(E = 1) = 0.2$

Figure S3  The positive predictive value of the marginal-association filtering in ENET, LASSO, and SBERIA, for continuous traits and $P(E = 1) = 0.2$
Figure S4  Power given a significance level of 0.05, for continuous traits and $P(E = 1) = 0.5$

Figure S5  Percentages of sign-misspecifications for $\gamma_{int}$, under continuous traits and $P(E = 1) = 0.5$
Figure S6  Power given a significance level of 0.05, for continuous traits and a continuous $E$

Figure S7  Percentages of sign-misspecifications for $\gamma_{int}$, under continuous traits and a continuous $E$
Figure S8  Power given a significance level of 0.05, for binary traits, \( P(Y = 1) = 0.1 \), and \( P(E = 1) = 0.2 \)

Figure S9  Percentages of sign-misspecifications for \( \gamma_{int} \), under binary traits, \( P(Y = 1) = 0.1 \), and \( P(E = 1) = 0.2 \)
Figure S10  Power given a significance level of 0.05, for binary traits, \( P(Y = 1) = 0.4 \), and \( P(E = 1) = 0.2 \)

Figure S11  Percentages of sign-misspecifications for \( \gamma_{int} \), under binary traits, \( P(Y = 1) = 0.4 \), and \( P(E = 1) = 0.2 \)
Figure S12  Power given a significance level of 0.05, for binary traits, \( P(Y = 1) = 0.1 \), and \( P(E = 1) = 0.5 \)

Figure S13  Percentages of sign-misspecifications for \( \gamma_{\text{int}} \), under binary traits, \( P(Y = 1) = 0.1 \), and \( P(E = 1) = 0.5 \)
Figure S14  Power given a significance level of 0.05, for binary traits, $P(\gamma = 1) = 0.4$, and $P(\varepsilon = 1) = 0.5$.

Figure S15  Percentages of sign-misspecifications for $\gamma_{int}$, under binary traits, $P(\gamma = 1) = 0.4$, and $P(\varepsilon = 1) = 0.5$.
Figure S16   The sensitivity of the marginal-association filtering in ENET, LASSO, and SBERIA, for binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.4$, and $P(E = 1) = 0.5$

Figure S17   The positive predictive value of the marginal-association filtering in ENET, LASSO, and SBERIA, for binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.4$, and $P(E = 1) = 0.5$
Figure S18  Power given a significance level of 0.05, for binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.1$, and a continuous E

Figure S19  Percentages of sign-misspecifications for $\gamma_{int}$, under binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.1$, and a continuous E
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**Figure S20**  Power given a significance level of 0.05, for binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.4$, and a continuous E

**Figure S21**  Percentages of sign-misspecifications for $\gamma_{int}$, under binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.4$, and a continuous E
**Figure S22**  Average time spent (in seconds) for each simulation replication, under $H_0$, for continuous traits.
Figure S23  Average time spent (in seconds) for each simulation replication, under $H_0$, for binary traits.
Figure S24  Average time spent (in seconds) for each simulation replication, under $H_1$, for continuous traits and $P(E = 1) = 0.2$

Figure S25  Average time spent (in seconds) for each simulation replication, under $H_1$, for continuous traits and $P(E = 1) = 0.5$
Figure S26  Average time spent (in seconds) for each simulation replication, under $H_1$, for binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.1$, and $P(E = 1) = 0.2$.

Figure S27  Average time spent (in seconds) for each simulation replication, under $H_1$, for binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.4$, and $P(E = 1) = 0.2$. 
Figure S28  Average time spent (in seconds) for each simulation replication, under $H_1$, for binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.1$, and $P(E = 1) = 0.5$.

Figure S29  Average time spent (in seconds) for each simulation replication, under $H_1$, for binary traits, $P(Y = 1) = 0.4$, and $P(E = 1) = 0.5$. 