

**Table S2.** The significant allelic association of GWAS-selected SNPs with colorectal cancer parameters.

Compared groups (N)	dbSNP ID <sup>a</sup>	Region	OR (95% CI)	p-value	<i>p</i> <sub>adj</sub> -value
G2 (284) vs. control (1079)	rs17575184	<i>NEGR1</i>	0.59 (0.41-0.84)	4.53×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>7.55×10<sup>-3</sup></b>
	rs10935945	<i>LINC02006</i>	1.47 (1.22-1.77)	4.40×10 <sup>-5</sup>	<b>2.20×10<sup>-4</sup></b>
	rs11060839	<i>PIWIL1</i>	1.37 (1.08-1.73)	8.58×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>3.92×10<sup>-4</sup></b>
	rs9927668	intergenic	0.69 (0.56-0.84)	2.00×10 <sup>-4</sup>	<b>4.90×10<sup>-4</sup></b>
	rs12935896	<i>BCAS3</i>	0.78 (0.62-0.97)	3.00×10 <sup>-2</sup>	<b>3.00×10<sup>-2</sup></b>
G3 (42) vs. control (1079)	rs11060839	<i>PIWIL1</i>	2.06 (1.22-3.37)	4.34×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>2.17×10<sup>-2</sup></b>
	rs12935896	<i>BCAS3</i>	0.49 (0.25-0.88)	2.06×10 <sup>-2</sup>	5.14×10 <sup>-2</sup>
T3 (277) vs. control (1079)	rs17575184	<i>NEGR1</i>	0.63 (0.43-0.88)	8.45×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>1.06×10<sup>-2</sup></b>
	rs10935945	<i>LINC02006</i>	1.35 (1.12-1.63)	1.63×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>2.71×10<sup>-3</sup></b>
	rs11060839	<i>PIWIL1</i>	1.48 (1.16-1.87)	1.12×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>2.71×10<sup>-3</sup></b>
	rs9927668	intergenic	0.70 (0.57-0.85)	4.40×10 <sup>-4</sup>	<b>2.28×10<sup>-3</sup></b>
	rs12935896	<i>BCAS3</i>	0.77 (0.61-0.96)	2.22×10 <sup>-2</sup>	<b>2.22×10<sup>-2</sup></b>
T4 (56) vs. control (1079)	rs10935945	<i>LINC02006</i>	2.04 (1.39-3.02)	2.37×10 <sup>-4</sup>	<b>1.18×10<sup>-3</sup></b>
N0 (245) vs. control (1079)	rs10935945	<i>LINC02006</i>	1.46 (1.20-1.78)	1.42×10 <sup>-4</sup>	<b>7.10×10<sup>-4</sup></b>
	rs11060839	<i>PIWIL1</i>	1.36 (1.06-1.74)	1.56×10 <sup>-2</sup>	<b>2.42×10<sup>-2</sup></b>
	rs9927668	intergenic	0.75 (0.61-0.93)	7.79×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>1.95×10<sup>-2</sup></b>
	rs12935896	<i>BCAS3</i>	0.75 (0.59-0.95)	1.93×10 <sup>-2</sup>	<b>2.42×10<sup>-2</sup></b>
N2 (78) vs. control (1079)	rs10935945	<i>LINC02006</i>	1.69 (1.22-2.35)	1.63×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>8.13×10<sup>-3</sup></b>
	rs9927668	intergenic	0.68 (0.47-0.97)	3.37×10 <sup>-2</sup>	8.42×10 <sup>-2</sup>
RC (173) vs. control (1079)	rs17575184	<i>NEGR1</i>	0.48 (0.29-0.76)	2.28×10 <sup>-3</sup>	<b>5.70×10<sup>-3</sup></b>
	rs10935945	<i>LINC02006</i>	1.59 (1.27-2.00)	5.61×10 <sup>-5</sup>	<b>2.80×10<sup>-4</sup></b>
Metastasis (49) vs. control (1079)	rs11060839	<i>PIWIL1</i>	1.81 (1.10-2.88)	1.38×10 <sup>-2</sup>	5.30×10 <sup>-2</sup>
	rs9927668	intergenic	0.59 (0.37-0.92)	2.12×10 <sup>-2</sup>	5.30×10 <sup>-2</sup>
	rs12935896	<i>BCAS3</i>	0.53 (0.29-0.91)	3.18×10 <sup>-2</sup>	5.30×10 <sup>-2</sup>

Allelic frequencies of all studied SNPs were in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium. Bold denotes significant association after Benjamini-Hochberg algorithm adjustment ( $p_{adj} < 0.05$ ). RC; rectal cancer, OR; odds ratio, CI; confidence interval, G; grading, T; tumor size, N; lymph node status.  
<sup>a/</sup> SNP identifier based on NCBI SNP database (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/snp/>).