

1 **Connecting genomic and proteomic signatures of amyloid burden** 2 **in the brain**

3 Raquel Puerta^{1,2†}, Itziar de Rojas^{1,3†}, Pablo García-González^{1,3}, Clàudia Olivé¹, Oscar
4 Sotolongo-Grau¹, Ainhoa García-Sánchez¹, Fernando García-Gutiérrez¹, Laura
5 Montreal¹, Juan Pablo Tartari¹, Ángela Sanabria^{1,3}, Vanesa Pytel^{1,3}, Carmen Lage^{4,3}, Inés
6 Quintela⁵, Nuria Aguilera¹, Eloy Rodríguez-Rodríguez^{4,3}, Emilio Alarcón-Martín¹, Adelina
7 Orellana^{1,3}, Pau Pastor^{6,7}, Jordi Pérez-Tur^{8,3,9}, Gerard Piñol-Ripoll^{10,11}, Adolfo López de
8 Munian^{12,13,3,14}, Jose María García-Alberca^{15,3}, Jose Luís Royo¹⁶, María Jesús
9 Bullido^{17,3,18,19}, Victoria Álvarez^{20,21}, Luis Miguel Real^{22,16}, Arturo Corbatón
10 Anchuelo²³, Dulcenombre Gómez-Garre^{23,24,25}, María Teresa Martínez Larrad^{23,26}, Emilio
11 Franco-Macías²⁷, Pablo Mir^{28,3}, Miguel Medina^{29,3}, Raquel Sánchez-Valle³⁰, Oriol Dols-
12 Icardo³¹, María Eugenia Sáez³², Ángel Carracedo^{5,33}, Lluís Tàrraga^{1,3}, Montse Alegret^{1,3}, Sergi
13 Valero^{1,3}, Marta Marquíé^{1,3}, Mercè Boada^{1,3}, Pascual Sánchez Juan^{4,3}, Jose Enrique
14 Cavazos^{34,35}, Alfredo Cabrera³⁶, Amanda Cano^{1,3‡}, Agustín Ruiz^{1,3,35‡,*} for the Alzheimer's
15 Disease Neuroimaging Initiative.

16 ¹Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona – Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, Spain. ²Universitat
17 de Barcelona (UB). ³CIBERNED, Network Center for Biomedical Research in
18 Neurodegenerative Diseases, National Institute of Health Carlos III, Madrid, Spain.
19 ⁴Neurology Service, Marqués de Valdecilla University Hospital (University of Cantabria and
20 IDIVAL), Santander, Spain. ⁵Grupo de Medicina Xenómica, Centro Nacional de Genotipado
21 (CEGEN-PRB3-ISCI). Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela,
22 Spain. ⁶Unit of Neurodegenerative diseases, Department of Neurology, University Hospital
23 Germans Trias i Pujol, Badalona, Barcelona, Spain. ⁷The Germans Trias i Pujol Research
24 Institute (IGTP), Badalona, Barcelona, Spain. ⁸Unitat de Genètica Molecular, Institut de
25 Biomedicina de València-CSIC, Valencia, Spain. ⁹Unidad Mixta de Neurología Genética,
26 Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria La Fe, Valencia, Spain. ¹⁰Unitat Trastorns Cognitius,
27 Hospital Universitari Santa Maria de Lleida, Lleida, Spain. ¹¹Institut de Recerca Biomedica de
28 Lleida (IRBLleida), Lleida, Spain. ¹²Department of Neurology. Hospital Universitario
29 Donostia. San Sebastian, Spain. ¹³Department of Neurosciences. Faculty of Medicine and
30 Nursery. University of the Basque Country, San Sebastián, Spain. ¹⁴Neurosciences Area.
31 Instituto Biodonostia. San Sebastian, Spain. ¹⁵Alzheimer Research Center & Memory Clinic,
32 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**
Andalusian Institute for Neuroscience, Málaga, Spain. ¹⁶Departamento de Especialidades

33 Quirúrgicas, Bioquímica e Inmunología. School of Medicine. University of Malaga. Málaga,
34 Spain. ¹⁷Centro de Biología Molecular Severo Ochoa (UAM-CSIC). ¹⁸Instituto de
35 Investigación Sanitaria ‘Hospital la Paz’ (IdIPaz), Madrid, Spain. ¹⁹Universidad Autónoma de
36 Madrid. ²⁰Laboratorio de Genética. Hospital Universitario Central de Asturias, Oviedo, Spain.
37 ²¹Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria del Principado de Asturias (ISPA). ²²Unidad Clínica de
38 Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología. Hospital Universitario de Valme, Sevilla, Spain.
39 ²³Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria del Hospital Clínico San Carlos (IdISSC), Hospital
40 Clínico San Carlos. ²⁴Laboratorio de Riesgo Cardiovascular y Microbiota, Hospital Clínico
41 San Carlos; Departamento de Fisiología, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad Complutense de
42 Madrid (UCM). ²⁵Biomedical Research Networking Center in Cardiovascular Diseases
43 (CIBERCV), Madrid, Spain. ²⁶Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Diabetes y
44 Enfermedades Metabólicas Asociadas (CIBERDEM). ²⁷Dementia Unit, Department of
45 Neurology, Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío, Instituto de Biomedicina de Sevilla
46 (IBiS), Sevilla, Spain. ²⁸Unidad de Trastornos del Movimiento, Servicio de Neurología y
47 Neurofisiología. Instituto de Biomedicina de Sevilla (IBiS), Hospital Universitario Virgen del
48 Rocío/CSIC/Universidad de Sevilla, Seville, Spain. ²⁹CIEN Foundation/Queen Sofia
49 Foundation Alzheimer Center. ³⁰Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive disorders unit. Service
50 of Neurology. Hospital Clínic of Barcelona. Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i
51 Sunyer, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain. ³¹Department of Neurology, Sant Pau
52 Memory Unit, Sant Pau Biomedical Research Institute, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau,
53 Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain. ³²CAEBI, Centro Andaluz de Estudios
54 Bioinformáticos, Sevilla, Spain. ³³Fundación Pública Galega de Medicina Xenómica –
55 CIBERER-IDIS, Santiago de Compostela, Spain. ³⁴South Texas Medical Science Training
56 Program, University of Texas Health San Antonio, San Antonio. ³⁵Glenn Biggs Institute for
57 Alzheimer's & Neurodegenerative Diseases, University of Texas Health Science Center at San
58 Antonio, 7703 Floyd Curl Dr, San Antonio, TX 78229 USA. ³⁶Neuroscience Therapeutic Area,
59 Janssen Research & Development, Turnhoutseweg 30, 2340 Beerse, Belgium.

60 †First co-authors have contributed equally.

61 ‡Senior co-authors have contributed equally.

62 * Correspondence to:

63 **Agustín Ruíz MD, PhD**

64 Address: Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona.

65 C/ Marquès de Sentmenat, 57, 08029, Barcelona, Spain.

66 Tel: +34 93.444.73.18

67 E-mail address: aruiz@fundacioace.org

68

69 **Abstract**

70 **Background** Alzheimer's disease (AD) has a high heritable component characteristic of
71 complex diseases, yet many of the genetic risk factors remain unknown. We combined genome-
72 wide association studies (GWAS) on amyloid endophenotypes measured in cerebrospinal fluid
73 (CSF) and positron emission tomography (PET) as surrogates of amyloid pathology, which
74 may be helpful to understand the underlying biology of the disease.

75 **Methods** We performed a meta-analysis of GWAS of CSF A β 42 and PET measures combining
76 six independent cohorts (n=2,076). Due to the opposite effect direction of A β phenotypes in
77 CSF and PET measures, only genetic signals in the opposite direction were considered for
78 analysis (n=376,599). Polygenic risk scores (PRS) were calculated and evaluated for AD status
79 and amyloid endophenotypes. We then searched the CSF proteome signature of brain
80 amyloidosis using SOMAscan proteomic data (Ace cohort, n=1,008) and connected it with
81 GWAS results of *loci* modulating amyloidosis. Finally, we compared our results with a large
82 meta-analysis using publicly available datasets in CSF (n=13,409) and PET (n=13,116). This
83 combined approach enabled the identification of overlapping genes and proteins associated
84 with amyloid burden and the assessment of their biological significance using enrichment
85 analyses.

86 **Results** After filtering the meta-GWAS, we observed genome-wide significance in the
87 rs429358-*APOE* locus and nine suggestive hits were annotated. We replicated the *APOE* *loci*
88 using the large CSF-PET meta-GWAS and identified multiple AD-associated genes as well as
89 the novel *GADLI* locus. Additionally, we found a significant association between the AD PRS
90 and amyloid levels, whereas no significant association was found between any A β PRS with
91 AD risk. CSF SOMAscan analysis identified 1,387 FDR-significant proteins associated with
92 CSF A β 42 levels. The overlap among GWAS *loci* and proteins associated with amyloid burden
93 was very poor (n=35). The enrichment analysis of overlapping hits strongly suggested several
94 signalling pathways connecting amyloidosis with the anchored component of the plasma
95 membrane, synapse physiology and mental disorders that were replicated in the large CSF-PET
96 meta-analysis.

97 **Conclusions** The strategy of combining CSF and PET amyloid endophenotypes GWAS with
98 CSF proteome analyses might be effective for identifying signals associated with the AD
99 pathological process and elucidate causative molecular mechanisms behind the amyloid
100 mobilization in AD.

101 **Keywords:** A β 42; CSF biomarkers; PET tomography; GWAS; Proteome.

102
103 **Abbreviations:** AD=Alzheimer's disease; ADNI=Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging
104 Initiative; ASD=autism spectrum disorder; A β =amyloid; A β 42=amyloid beta 42;
105 AV45=Florbetapir; CADD=Combined Annotation Dependent Depletion; CDR=Clinical
106 Dementia Rating; CI=Confidence interval; eQTL=expression quantitative trait loci;
107 FBB=Florbetaben; FDR=false discovery rate; FUMA=Functional Mapping and Annotation of
108 Genome-Wide Association Studies; GPI=glycosylphosphatidyl inositol; GWAS=Genome-
109 wide association studies; HC=Healthy Control; LP=lumbar puncture; MAC=minor allele
110 count; MAF=minor allele frequency; MCI=Mild Cognitive impairment; MMSE=Mini-Mental
111 State Exam; n=Sample size; NIA-AA=National Institute on Aging and Alzheimer's
112 Association; NINCDS/ADRDA=National Institute of Neurological and Communicative
113 Disorders and Stroke and Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association; OR=Odds
114 ratio; P=p-value; p-tau=phosphorylated tau in Thr 181; PAD=publicly available datasets;
115 PET=Positron Emission Tomography; PCA=principal component analysis; PCs=Principal
116 components; pQTL=protein quantitative trait loci; PRS=Polygenic risk scores; RFU=relative
117 fluorescent units; SCD=subjective cognitive decline; SNP=single nucleotide polymorphisms;
118 t-tau=total tau; λ =genomic inflation factor.

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127 **Background**

128 Alzheimer's disease (AD) is the most common cause of dementia. AD is a growing epidemic
129 with an expected doubling of annual new diagnosis in the next 20 years prevalence and a major
130 socioeconomic impact with a projected direct economic cost of \$2 trillion by 2030¹⁻³. In this
131 sense, increasing the knowledge of AD aetiology and biomarker development would be an
132 interesting approach to developing a clear understanding of the disease pathophysiology and
133 future drug developments. Genome wide association studies (GWAS) have permitted the
134 discovery of more than 80 genetic variants associated with AD risk^{4,5}. Despite the continued
135 efforts led by international consortia, a large fraction of AD heritability remains to be
136 elucidated since only 31% of AD genetic variance is explained by single-nucleotide
137 polymorphisms (SNPs)⁶.

138 The analysis of heritable quantitative traits tightly linked to disease pathology, called
139 endophenotypes, has become a promising approach in genetic studies⁷⁻⁹. These intermediate
140 phenotypes might be influenced by the same genetic factors that confer risk to AD development
141 and might have low genetic complexity. Compared to disease phenotypes, there are fewer
142 genes or environmental influences affecting the genetic components of endophenotypes which
143 facilitate finding a genuine association between these phenotypes and AD^{7,8,10}.

144 The most common endophenotypes for AD are levels of amyloid beta (A β 42), total tau (t-tau)
145 and phosphorylated tau in threonine 181 (p-tau) in CSF¹⁰⁻¹². Moreover, Positron Emission
146 Tomography (PET) using several radiotracers for measuring amyloid and tau burden has been
147 used as AD endophenotypes^{11,13,14}. These biomarkers are surrogates of AD brain pathology and
148 understanding their biology might provide insights into novel mechanisms of AD^{15,16}. To date,
149 relatively few AD *loci* have been identified using the endophenotype approach^{9,13}. Moreover,
150 GWAS analyses of PET and CSF endophenotypes are commonly analysed separately and
151 comparisons between them have been overlooked.

152 In this study, we combined GWAS of A β CSF levels from four different AD cohorts with two
153 GWAS of A β -burden measured using PET radiotracers. We used this strategy of combining
154 both A β endophenotypes (CSF and PET) to identify novel genetic variants associated with AD
155 and to replicate known AD signals. We then tested polygenic risk scores (PRS) derived from
156 large studies in our datasets, dissected the CSF proteome signature associated with brain

157 amyloidosis in a sizable CSF collection, and checked the overlapping of genomic meta-
158 analyses and proteomic results.

159

160 **Materials and methods**

161 **GWAS Cohorts**

162 This study comprised a total of 2,076 individuals from Ace, Valdecilla and ADNI cohorts and
163 had data for different A β CSF or PET endophenotypes (Supplementary Fig. 1 and
164 Supplementary Table 1). To avoid overlap of subjects between the CSF and PET cohorts, we
165 used only datasets with genotype-level information available.

166

167 **a. Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona**

168 The Ace cohort comprised 1,189 individuals with brain amyloidosis measurements obtained
169 using CSF or PET imaging, divided into three independent and non-overlapping cohorts.
170 Because we used different methods to quantify CSF A β 42, we decided to analyse the GWAS
171 in two independent groups (536 individuals tested using Innostest ELISA kits and 472
172 individuals tested using the Lumipulse automated platform¹⁷). We included a third dataset of
173 181 individuals with subjective cognitive decline (SCD) tested using PET Florbetaben
174 measures from the Fundació ACE Healthy Brain Initiative (FACEHBI) study¹⁸. The clinical
175 protocols of the Ace Alzheimer Center have been previously published¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Briefly, syndromic
176 diagnosis of all subjects was established by a multidisciplinary group of neurologists,
177 neuropsychologists, and social workers. We assigned to healthy controls (HCs) including SCD
178 diagnosis to Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR) of 0 individuals, and mild cognitive impairment
179 (MCI) individuals a CDR of 0.5. For MCI diagnosis, the classification of López *et al.*, and
180 Petersen's criteria were also used²⁰⁻²³. We employed the 2011 National Institute on Aging and
181 Alzheimer's Association (NIA-AA) guidelines for AD diagnosis²⁴. We performed a lumbar
182 puncture (LP) to obtain CSF following consensus recommendations²⁵. The CSF obtained was
183 centrifuged (2000 x g for 10 min at 4°C) and stored at -80°C. For A β 42 analysis, CSF was
184 defrosted at room temperature (20°C), vortexed and protein levels measured using the
185 commercial ELISA kit Innostest β -AMYLOID (1-42) in 536 individuals and the
186 chemiluminescent enzyme-immunoassay LUMIPULSE G600II automated platform (Fujirebio

187 Europe, Belgium) in 472 individuals¹⁷. FACEHBI patients were assessed for brain amyloid
188 deposition by PET imaging using the florbetaben [¹⁸F] radiotracer (FBB) (NeuraCeq©). A
189 single slow intravenous bolus of 300 Mbq of FBB (6 sec/mL) (>10 mL during 20 min) was
190 administered. After 90 min, PET images were acquired¹⁸.

191

192 **b. Valdecilla cohort for the study of memory and brain aging**

193 The Valdecilla cohort comprised 97 individuals who were older than 55 years and extensively
194 phenotyped. Biological samples were collected at baseline and several tests were performed to
195 evaluate early signs of AD. Moreover, core biomarkers in CSF were analysed and a
196 neuropsychological battery including The Free and Cued Selective Reminding Test²⁶, the
197 Spanish version of the Face-Name Associative Memory Exam²⁷, and the Logical Memory Test
198 of the Wechsler Memory Scale-III²⁸ and depression symptoms by the Geriatric Depression
199 Scale²⁹. HC (CDR=0), MCI (CDR=0.1) and dementia individuals (NIA-AA guidelines) were
200 included in this analysis³⁰. In the Valdecilla cohort, the A β 42 biomarker was quantified by
201 Lumipulse G600II which were interpreted according to previously established cut-off points³¹.
202 Further information about phenotype assessment was presented elsewhere³².

203

204 **c. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) cohort**

205 Launched in 2003, ADNI is a longitudinal multicentre cohort for AD research based on United
206 States and Canada^{33,34}. The primary goal of ADNI has been to test whether biological markers,
207 clinical and neuropsychological assessments can be combined to study the progression of MCI
208 and early AD. We selected individuals from two separate ADNI databases: 1) the ADNI1
209 cohort with 378 individuals with available A β 42 in CSF and 2) the ADNI2GO cohort with 412
210 individuals with available PET centiloid measures. In ADNI, syndromic diagnoses were based
211 on a specific cut-off in the WMS-II LM test, education attainment, the Mini-Mental State Exam
212 (MMSE) and CDR score. For HC and those with SCD, an MMSE score of 24–30 and a CDR
213 of 0 were used. For those with MCI, a CDR of 0.5 and MMSE score of 24–30 were used. For
214 those with AD, a CDR of 0.5–1 and an MMSE score of 20–26 were used. For the AD diagnosis,
215 the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke and
216 Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association (NINCDS/ADRDA) criteria for
217 *probable* AD were considered³⁵. In ADNI individuals, A β 42 CSF biomarker was measured
218 using the Luminex xMAP platform (Luminex Corp, Austin, TX) for multiplexing with

219 Innogenetics immunoassay reagents (INNO-BIA AlzBio3, Ghent, Belgium)^{36,37}. ADNI2GO
220 patients were screened for brain amyloid deposits using the Florbetapir [¹⁸F] (AV45)
221 radiotracer. After the injection of 370 MBq (10 mCi), four 5 min scans were acquired 50-70
222 min after the injection³⁶. Further information about PET data acquisition can be found
223 elsewhere³⁸.

224

225 **PET imaging acquisition, harmonization and analysis**

226 As FACEHBI and ADNI cohorts had different radiotracers, PET centiloid measures were used
227 to perform a meta-analysis. Centiloids were calculated using equation (1), which was described
228 for the conversion of FBB measures in the FACEHBI cohort³⁹ and equation (2), which was
229 described for the conversion of AV45 in ADNI⁴⁰.

$$230 \quad \text{Centiloid}_{\text{FACEHBI}} = (153.4 \times \text{SUVR}_{\text{FBB}}) - 154.9 \quad (1)$$

$$231 \quad \text{Centiloid}_{\text{ADNI}} = (196.9 \times \text{SUVR}_{\text{AV45}}) - 196.03 \quad (2)$$

232

233 **Genotyping, quality control and imputation**

234 Ace and Valdecilla DNA samples were genotyped using the Axiom 815K Spanish Biobank
235 Array (Thermo Fisher). The genotyping was performed by the Spanish National Center for
236 Genotyping (CeGen, Santiago de Compostela, Spain). Genotyping procedures have been
237 previously published elsewhere^{5,19}. For the ADNI samples, the Illumina Human610-Quad
238 BeadChip platform was used for genotyping in ADNI1, and the Illumina HumanOmniExpress
239 BeadChip was used for ADNI2GO⁴¹.

240 Common quality control was applied to all GWAS datasets. Briefly, individuals with low-
241 quality samples, excess of heterozygosity, sample call rate below 97%, sex discrepancies,
242 variants call rate below 95% or a deviation from the Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium ($P > 1e-06$)
243 were excluded from the analysis. In addition, familial relatedness ($\text{PI-HAT} > 0.1875$) or ancestry
244 outliers based on principal component analysis (PCA) were also removed. The imputation was
245 performed using the Haplotype Reference Consortium panel in the Michigan Imputation
246 Server⁴². Only the common markers ($\text{MAF} > 1\%$; $\text{MAC} = 20$) and high imputation quality
247 ($R^2 > 0.3$) were selected for the subsequent analyses (GRCh37/hg19 reference assembly).

248 **SOMAscan Proteomic Assay**

249 A subset of 1,008 CSF samples (Ace CSF cohort) was analysed using the SOMAscan panel
250 measuring more than 7,000 proteins (SomaLogic, Boulder, Colorado). Briefly, this multiplex
251 proteomic assay uses a 50 μ L CSF sample and modified DNA aptamers to measure protein
252 abundance. First, proteins are bound to immobilized aptamers using streptavidin beads and
253 tagged with fluorescent markers. After washing unbound proteins, the streptavidin beads are
254 released using ultraviolet light, and the protein–aptamer complex is re-captured by monomeric
255 avidin. To select only specific complexes, the protein–aptamers are exposed to an anionic
256 competitor and then, hybridized in a conventional DNA array for analysis as described in Gold
257 *et al*⁴³. Finally, the protein level measures expressed in relative fluorescent units (RFU) are
258 normalized using the adaptive normalization by maximum likelihood method further described
259 in Candia *et al*⁴⁴.

260

261 **Statistical analysis**

262

263 **a. GWAS and meta-GWAS**

264 We harmonized CSF and PET endophenotypes measures performing a log₁₀ transformation to
265 adjust to a normal distribution, and Z-score values were determined using the *scale* R function
266 (*center*=TRUE, *scale*=TRUE) (Supplementary Fig. 2). We used R software version 4.1.1.

267 The GWAS on each dataset was run using a generalized linear model in the software PLINK2⁴⁵.
268 The statistical model considered population microstratification (four PCs), sex, age, and
269 dementia status for the association analysis. We then performed an inverse-variance weighted
270 meta-analysis on each amyloid burden endophenotype separately, A β 42 (n=1,483) in CSF and
271 amyloid PET imaging (n=593).

272 Thereafter, both A β endophenotypes were further combined into a single meta-analysis
273 (n=2,076) using the sample size weighted method in METAL software. This approach
274 integrates p-values from different studies, weighting them by the sample size of each cohort,
275 which provides a way to combine evidence across studies without relying on the effect size
276 direction⁴⁶. This is particularly useful when dealing with datasets where the effect sizes are not

277 directly comparable or when different methods are used to measure the same biological
278 outcome, as is the case with PET and CSF amyloid measurements.

279 We chose this meta-analysis of p-values approach because the effect directions and methods
280 applied to measure amyloid burden differ between PET and CSF assessments. Specifically, in
281 AD, the two measurements exhibit opposite biological directions: decreased levels of CSF
282 A β 42 are associated with increased amyloid plaque deposition in the brain, as observed through
283 PET imaging. PET measures amyloid burden through radiotracer retention, while CSF
284 measures it through soluble A β 42 levels, which decrease as amyloid plaques accumulate in the
285 brain. Thus, directly comparing effect sizes across these methods could be misleading^{46,47}.

286 By combining p-values, focusing on the statistical significance and opposite effect size
287 direction, this approach accounts for the differing biological contexts and measurement
288 techniques, enabling a more robust and generalized analysis of amyloid burden across different
289 datasets. The genetic markers evaluated in the meta-analysis were filtered considering the
290 opposite effect direction in each CSF and PET endophenotype-independent GWAS and its
291 presence in at least half of the datasets to select SNPs for further analysis.

292 Additionally, we performed another CSF-PET meta-analysis considering the largest publicly
293 available datasets for CSF A β 42 (n=13,116)⁹ and amyloid PET (n=13,409)⁴⁸ (publicly
294 available datasets; PAD analysis). To homogenize the results with our primary analysis, those
295 datasets were converted to the GRCh37 assembly using the UCSC LiftOver software⁴⁹.
296 Because we did not have access to genotype-level information for all cohorts included in these
297 studies, we were unable to prune potential overlapping subjects between both meta-analyses.
298 Therefore, the results of combining these large meta-GWAS should be interpreted cautiously
299 and are considered primarily for generating additional evidence about the pathways observed
300 in our main analysis, where subject overlap was checked at the genotype level and removed to
301 create two genuinely independent datasets (CSF and PET).

302 Finally, we attempted to replicate previously published genes for AD described in Bellenguez
303 *et al*⁴, the significant signals associated with amyloid burden reported by the EADB
304 consortium⁹ and significant markers associated with neuropathological features described in
305 Beecham *et al*⁵⁰ (Supplementary Table 2, Supplementary Table 3, Supplementary Table 4, and
306 Supplementary Material 1).

307

308 **b. Functional examination of identified sentinel SNPs and linked**
309 **genomic regions**

310 Clumping and annotation of suggestive signals ($P < 1e-05$) were performed using the software
311 PLINK1.9⁵¹. Additional annotations of biological function and gene-mapping were performed
312 using meta-analysis summary statistics using the online tool Functional Mapping and
313 Annotation of Genome-Wide Association Studies (FUMA)⁵². We set the threshold for
314 independent significant SNPs at $P < 1e-05$, $R^2 < 0.05$, separated by over 250 kb, and we used the
315 1000G Phase3 reference panel to analyse suggestive signals in European population. For
316 functional annotation, SNPs were matched to available databases such as ANNOVAR,
317 Combined Annotation Dependent Depletion (CADD) scores, RegulomeDB and chromatin
318 states based on a hidden Markov model from the Roadmap Epigenomics Project. Significant
319 hits were mapped to genes according to 3 methods: 1) Physical distance with a maximum of
320 10 kb from nearby genes in the reference assembly, 2) expression quantitative trait *loci* (eQTL)
321 associations assigned to SNP in blood, vascular, heart, brain tissues and embryonic stem cell
322 derived cells, and 3) three-dimensional DNA interactions with SNPs and other gene regions
323 where promoters were considered to be 250 bp upstream and 500 bp downstream of the
324 transcription starting site for chromatin interaction. Moreover, a gene-based analysis was
325 performed using MAGMA v1.08 that assigned exclusively protein-coding genes (Ensembl
326 build 85) to the top SNPs found. Only 11,807 genes were mapped, and the gene-wide
327 significance was defined at $P = 0.05/11,807 = 4.235e-06$. We also conducted FUMA annotations
328 in the amyloid burden meta-analysis considering the largest meta-GWAS for amyloid PET and
329 CSF reported to date^{9,48}.

330

331 **c. Polygenic Risk Scores (PRS)**

332 We computed the AD PRS described in Bellenguez *et al* that considered 83 *loci*. However,
333 some SNPs were not imputed or had a low imputation quality ($R^2 < 0.3$), and we decided to
334 calculate the AD PRS including genetic variants found in all imputed datasets ($n=76$;
335 Supplementary Table 5). For PRS calculation, we added the gene dosages of these SNPs
336 weighting by their effect size (beta coefficients); the allele analysed was matched to the
337 reported allele (A1) by Bellenguez *et al*⁴. Because some control samples were included in the
338 first stage of the AD GWAS, we considered the independent effects reported in the second
339 stage for the PRS calculation. Additionally, due to the large effect on AD risk and its well-

340 established association with most AD endophenotypes, the *APOE locus* was excluded from all
341 these PRS. We then tested its association with AD case-control status, CSF A β 42 and p-tau
342 endophenotypes, and PET amyloid burden measurements. We considered as a covariate the
343 age, sex, and disease status only in associations with biomarkers. These analyses were
344 performed separately in each cohort except for Valdecilla which was excluded due to reduced
345 sample size, while Ace PET cohort was excluded in the case-control analysis because all
346 individuals were cognitively unimpaired. Additionally, we considered the fixed effect meta-
347 analysis model considering the heterogeneity threshold (I^2) of 75% as high⁵³.

348 We also calculated another PRS for A) AD⁴ (n=76 SNPs; Supplementary Table 5), B) CSF
349 A β 42 levels (n=30 SNPs; Supplementary Table 6) considering the genetic variants with a
350 $P < 1e-05$ described in Jansen *et al*⁹, and C) an amyloid burden PRS considering suggestive
351 variants found in our meta-analysis (combining endophenotypes filtering according to the
352 effect size direction; n=9 SNPs; Supplementary Table 7) in GR@ACE cohort individuals,
353 including 8,110 cases and 9,640 controls the same way as described above. Further information
354 about the cohort has been previously published^{5,19}. For PRS computation, the effect (beta
355 coefficients) and standard errors were estimated using the equations described by Zhu *et al*⁵⁴.
356 Again, we associated these scaled PRS with case-control data in non-overlapping individuals
357 to assess if A β genetic determinants are also related to disease risk.

358

359 **d. Association between biomarker levels and SOMAscan proteomics**

360 We assessed the association between SOMAscan 7k proteomic panel and CSF A β 42 levels
361 (n=1,008) in the Ace CSF cohort. Briefly, SOMAscan proteomic measures were log10
362 transformed, outliers were removed at ± 3 standard deviations from the mean and standardized
363 using the scale R function with centring and scaling. For further analysis, we selected 2,682
364 proteins based on correlations between: 1) two independent SOMAscan assay analysing the
365 same samples, and 2) comparing aptamer- and antibody-based proteomic platforms^{55,56}. To
366 identify proteins associated to CSF A β 42, a linear regression model was performed on scaled
367 CSF A β 42 levels and proteomic measures. We considered disease status, sex, age, and the CSF
368 biomarker technique as covariates. Subsequently, the top 500 ranking of significant proteins
369 associated with CSF A β 42 (False discovery rate; $FDR < 1.864e-05$) was analysed in the WEB-
370 based GENE SeT AnaLysis Toolkit (WebGestalt)⁵⁷ to perform an over-representation analysis
371 (ORA) considering several functional databases and the whole genome as built-in reference

372 gene list following the idea of investigating the complete genome (GWAS and gene-based
373 analyses) (Supplementary Table 8). We also performed an enrichment analysis on the complete
374 subset of valid SOMAscan proteins (n=2,682) to evaluate the impact of platform analyte
375 preselection and quality control process on the results obtained.

376 To explore the biological significance of the GWAS results, we displayed the overlap between
377 *loci* controlling amyloidosis and the proteins significantly associated with CSF A β 42 in the
378 Ace CSF cohort using Venn diagrams. The top 500 proteome and genome hits selected from
379 the CSF A β 42 meta-GWAS described in Jansen *et al*, the meta-analysis of CSF-PET
380 endophenotypes filtered by opposite effect size direction, and the gene-based MAGMA
381 analysis performed by FUMA were identified and annotated. The top rankings were reduced
382 to 345, 339, 457, 361 and 465 *loci* for the meta-GWAS by Jansen *et al*, our current CSF-PET
383 meta-analysis and its gene-based MAGMA analysis, the PAD CSF-PET meta-GWAS and its
384 gene-based MAGMA analysis^{9,48}, respectively. These reductions were due to the presence of
385 SNPs that were not annotated and could not be matched to UniProt codes (Supplementary
386 Table 9, Supplementary Table 10, Supplementary Table 11, Supplementary Table 12 and
387 Supplementary Table 13). The top rankings were compared and the overlap between genomic
388 and proteomic analysis was identified and evaluated using WebGestalt tool as described above.

389

390 **Results**

391 **Meta-analysis of A β endophenotypes**

392 The genome-wide meta-analysis of CSF endophenotypes involved 4 independent AD cohorts
393 with A β 42 measures (n=1,483; λ =1.009). The genomic inflation factor (λ) suggested no gross
394 bias or stratification. As it was expected, we observed a consistent genome-wide significant
395 association with rs429358-*APOE locus* as a sentinel variant (Effect=-0.58 [-0.658, -0.503]; P=
396 8.36e-49). We detected 19 additional suggestive pQTL signals for A β 42 levels in CSF
397 (Supplementary Table 14). Similarly, the meta-analysis of amyloid PET endophenotype
398 (n=593; λ =1.013), revealed a genome-wide significant association in the same sentinel variant
399 in the opposite direction (rs429358-*APOE locus*; Effect=0.684 [0.555, 0.813]; P= 2.00e-25).
400 An additional novel hit at rs72737013 close to the *ANXA1* gene (Effect=0.813 [0.528, 1.099];
401 P=2.39e-08) was detected. This gene is related to anti-inflammatory reactions, innate immune

402 response, and inflammatory processes⁵⁸, psychiatric disorders, brain volume^{59,60}, and the
403 degradation of A β species⁶¹. Additionally, there were 43 additional independent suggestive
404 signals annotated for amyloid burden measured using PET (Supplementary Table 15).

405 We combined the summary statistics from both CSF and PET A β meta-analyses without
406 considering the effect direction (n=2,076). Again, we confirmed the sentinel variant rs429358
407 to be the most significant *locus* in the *APOE* region. Other genetic variants emerged as GWAS-
408 significant in this new meta-analysis. However, none of them were inversely associated with
409 CSF and PET endophenotypes in all studies except for the rs429358-*APOE* marker. We
410 considered these hits as false positive signals (Supplementary Table 16).

411 In looking for new suggestive signals beyond *APOE*, we extracted the subset of 376,599 SNPs
412 with consistent opposite effect in CSF and PET analyses. After the SNP selection in the
413 combined A β meta-analysis, the rs429358-*APOE* variant (P=9.50e-67) remained as the only
414 GWAS-significant hit (Fig. 1A, upper) but nine additional suggestive consistent variants were
415 identified in genes such as *NPY5R*, *TIAM2* or *MAGI2*, among others (Table 1). Additionally,
416 the combination of A β endophenotypes enhanced the significant replication of several genetic
417 markers previously described for AD⁴, CSF A β 42 levels⁹ and neuropathological features⁵⁰
418 (Supplementary Material 1, Supplementary Table 2, Supplementary Table 3, Supplementary
419 Table 4).

420 However, the PAD CSF-PET meta-analysis^{9,48} (effective sample size n=23,532) identified
421 several markers previously associated with AD and its endophenotypes. These significant
422 markers were identified on chromosome 19 including the rs429358-*APOE* (P=5.94e-601), as
423 well as, the rs4844610-*CRI* (P=5.76e-18), rs7982-*CLU* (P=7.81e-11), rs12151021-*ABCA7*
424 (P=3.92e-10), rs6733839-*BINI* (P=1.02e-08), rs117834516-*FERMT2* (P=4.82e-08) and the
425 novel rs4955351-*GADLI* (P=3.19e-08) which was not previously associated to AD or amyloid
426 levels (Fig. 1A lower, Supplementary Table 17). Additionally, the PAD analysis replicated the
427 rs115822934-*NPY5R* variant (P=3.21e-04) originally found suggestive in our CSF-PET meta-
428 analysis (Supplementary Table 18). Importantly, we also observe concordances between our
429 local effort (amyloid burden CSF-PET meta-GWAS) and the PAD. Specifically, we detected
430 15 overlapping sentinel markers in the top 500 ranking of the amyloid burden meta-GWAS
431 from both the PAD and our current meta-analysis (Fig.1B), as well as 67 overlapping genes in
432 the PAD and our gene-based top 500 ranking (Fig.1C).

433 To link the variants of interest to specific genes and obtain relevant functional information
434 about these *loci*, we applied FUMA to the suggestive signals from the A β meta-analysis that
435 were filtered based on opposite direction in CSF and PET (Table 1). There were 125 prioritized
436 genes mapped using at least two strategies (positional mapping, eQTL or chromatin
437 interactions) and 45 genes were selected based on the three strategies described in methods. As
438 expected, the majority of the prioritized genes were related to the rs429358-*APOE*. Excluding
439 chromosome 19, we prioritized 23 genes mapped (6 SNPs) with a CADD score > 12.37
440 suggesting a potential deleterious effect (Supplementary Table 19)⁶². In contrast to the
441 univariate SNP analysis, the gene-based analysis performed using MAGMA revealed 15 study-
442 wise significant *loci* ($P < 4.235e-06$) excluding the *APOE* region (Table 2, Supplementary Fig.
443 3). Interestingly, the identified genetic variants in some of these genes (*TENM3*, *TMEM132D*,
444 *PTPRD*, *CNTN5*, *RBFOX1*, *CSMD1*, *TIAM2*, *RORA* and *WWOX*) have been previously related
445 to neuroimaging endophenotypes^{63–65}, extreme AD PRS measures⁶⁶, AD endophenotypes (CSF
446 A β 42 or p-tau levels^{13,67–70}), mental disorders^{71,72} and cognitive decline in AD^{64,73,74}.
447 Additionally, the gene-based analysis of the PAD amyloid burden meta-GWAS revealed genes
448 previously associated to AD such as *APOE* ($P = 2.09e-13$), *CLU* ($P = 2.13e-07$), *FERMT2*
449 ($P = 3.49e-07$) and the *CRI* locus ($P = 3.64e-06$), which reached borderline gene-wide
450 significance threshold at $P < 2.717e-06$ (Supplementary Table 20).

451

452 **Association between AD PRS with AD endophenotypes and other** 453 **clinical features**

454 We observed a significant result in the meta-analysed associations between the AD PRS and
455 A β levels (CSF Effect = -0.05 [-0.10, -0.00]; $P = 3.43e-02$ and PET Effect = 0.10 [0.02, 0.17];
456 $P = 1.30e-02$). These results suggest that genes involved in AD risk indeed modulate amyloid
457 levels (Fig. 2A, Fig. 2B).

458 As expected, we observed a significant result in the association meta-analysis of the AD PRS
459 with case-control dementia status in all 3 endophenotype datasets (OR=1.18 [1.05, 1.32];
460 $P = 5.29e-03$). These results suggest that these genes modulate the disease status as previously
461 reported⁴ (Fig. 3). Even though ADNI2GO did not reach statistical significance, it had a similar
462 effect size and direction, possibly due to the low proportion of AD cases in this cohort (6.55
463 %).

464 **Association between genetic variants of amyloid endophenotypes** 465 **with case-control status**

466 To assess whether CSF A β 42 genetic modulators are also related to AD risk, we constructed
467 different PRS including variants detected in our study and previous meta-GWAS⁴. We then
468 checked the association of calculated PRS in the GR@ACE case-control study⁵. We did not
469 observe any significant association for any calculated PRS for amyloid (Fig. 4) which could be
470 due to the reduced set of independent markers reported for these phenotypes ($P < 1e-05$) or not
471 having an impact on AD pathology. As expected, the AD PRS was highly associated with the
472 case-control (OR=1.35 [1.30, 1.40]; $P = 3.02e-49$), thus confirming that the AD genes
473 previously described by us and the EADB consortium^{4,5} truly modulate disease risk in the
474 GR@ACE/DEGESCO cohort.

475

476 **CSF proteome signatures associated with the A β 42 CSF levels**

477 We regressed the CSF A β 42 peptide levels on CSF SOMAscan aptamer levels to identify the
478 proteomic signature associated with amyloid burden (Fig. 5A). We identified 1,387 study-wide
479 significant proteins in the linear model of CSF A β 42 ($FDR < 1.864e-05$) (Supplementary Table
480 21). Notably, we observed a marked asymmetry in the effect of SOMAmers on CSF A β 42
481 levels, with the majority showing estimates greater than 0, suggesting a positive correlation
482 contributing to increased CSF A β 42 levels (Fig. 5A). Thus, the top 100 ranks of significant
483 associations have an estimate range between 0.449 and 0.317, which contributes to an increase
484 of this magnitude in CSF A β 42 levels, and the variance explained by these highly associated
485 proteins ranges of between 0.202 and 0.297. Importantly, we observed multiple proteins that
486 have been associated with the CSF levels of A β species or its mechanisms in previous studies,
487 such as MTMR7, LMOD4, GD3S, SERA/PHGDH, SELS, ATE1, NPTXR, and the 14-3-3 eta
488 protein, among others⁷⁵⁻⁸¹.

489 An enrichment analysis performed for significant proteins associated with CSF A β 42 levels
490 revealed genes involved in *neuronal projection guidance* (enrichment ratio=11.034;
491 $FDR < 2.2e-16$), *synaptic structure and activity* (enrichment ratio=10.868; $FDR < 2.2e-16$), *cell–*
492 *cell adhesion by plasma membrane molecules* (enrichment ratio=7.660; $FDR < 2.2e-16$),
493 *peptidyl-tyrosine modifications* (enrichment ratio=6.174; $FDR < 2.2e-16$), *regulation of cell*
494 *morphogenesis* (enrichment ratio=5.786; $FDR < 2.2e-16$) and *angiogenesis* (enrichment

495 ratio=5.617; FDR<2.2e-16) which are mainly driven by the large proportion of proteins with a
496 positive effect (n=1,300; 93.73%) (Fig. 5B; Supplementary Table 22, Supplementary Table
497 23). Furthermore, when comparing the enrichment results from the ORA analysis between the
498 entire set of valid SOMAscan proteins and the proteins significantly associated with A β 42
499 levels, we observed a complete lack of overlap, reinforcing the validity of our findings
500 (Supplementary Fig. 4).

501 To identify those genes that were commonly associated with CSF A β 42 levels in genomic and
502 proteomic analyses, we compared the top 500 common list of signals in the following four
503 analyses: meta-GWAS by EADB⁴, our meta-analysis of CSF-PET, gene-based MAGMA, and
504 SOMAscan protein analysis. We found three genes/proteins (*CHST1*, *PTPRD* and
505 *TMEM132D*) present in all four analyses, representing only 0.2% of the total *loci*/proteins
506 analysed (full overlap). In addition, 32 other proteins overlapped between the SOMAscan
507 proteomics and any genomic analysis, including four proteins represented in 3 different
508 analyses (Fig. 6A, Supplementary Table 24). Similar results were obtained in investigating the
509 top rankings of the SOMAscan analysis, the PAD CSF-PET meta-GWAS and its gene-based
510 analysis; only the *TMEM132D* was represented in all analyses (Fig. 6B). Interestingly, we
511 found that 10 of the 23 *loci*/proteins observed were also overlapping with the ranking
512 considering our main CSF-PET meta-GWAS results. This overlapping with PAD CSF-PET
513 meta-GWAS support the validity of our approach (Supplementary Fig. 5, Supplementary Table
514 25). However, there was a reduced consistency between the top 500 SOMAscan proteins
515 associated with CSF A β 42 and any genomic results with less than 2.5% of overlapping
516 proteins. These results suggest that the A β 42-related protein signature in CSF might not be
517 closely linked to amyloid genetic modulators, indicating that the proteome signature associated
518 with A β 42 burden in the brain primarily reflects general disease processes largely unrelated to
519 the genetic elements controlling amyloid production.

520 Finally, to gain insight into the few commonalities identified by comparing genetic and
521 proteome signatures associated to the amyloid burden in the brain, we conducted a new
522 enrichment analysis. Despite the reduced overlapping hits among proteome and genome
523 studies, several significant mechanisms related to the *synthesis of glycosylphosphatidyl inositol*
524 (*GPI*)-anchored proteins by post-translational modifications were identified (enrichment
525 ratio=48.070; FDR=1.86e-04) and the *anchored component of the membrane* (enrichment
526 ratio=31.778; FDR=1.32e-04), *cell-cell adhesion via plasma membrane molecules*
527 (enrichment ratio=26.207; FDR=3.42e-06), *mental disorders* (enrichment ratio=12.853;

528 FDR=3.42e-06) such as *autism* (enrichment ratio=18.556; FDR=0.002) and *anxiety*
529 (enrichment ratio=23.524; FDR=0.004), and *regulation and development of neuron projections*
530 (enrichment ratio=13.035; FDR=0.002) among others (FDR<0.05). Interestingly, six of these
531 mechanisms were also represented in the enrichment analysis of the PAD CSF-PET meta-
532 analysis, which confirms our main results (Fig. 6C, Supplementary Table 26, Supplementary
533 Table 27, Fig.6D, Supplementary Table 28, Supplementary Table 29).

534

535 Discussion

536 For the first time, we have combined meta-GWAS results obtained from analysing amyloid
537 PET and CSF A β 2 levels. Our innovative experimental approach identified novel genetic
538 variants associated with amyloid burden endophenotypes. This meta-analytic approach
539 benefited from combining endophenotypic information from six cohorts thereby increasing our
540 statistical power. As expected, we identified a genome-wide significant hit at the rs429358-
541 *APOE* loci. We also observed a novel genome-wide significant hit near the *ANXA1* locus
542 exclusively associated with PET amyloid. SNPs in this locus were previously linked to
543 psychiatric disorders, brain volume^{59,60}, and the degradation of A β species⁶¹. However, neither
544 the large PET meta-GWAS available nor the PAD meta-analysis conducted by us replicated
545 this finding. For these reasons, we believe that this signal could be a false positive. We attribute
546 the lack of additional hits to the relatively small sample size of our CSF-PET meta-GWAS. By
547 repeating this strategy with a larger sample size, we expect to identify more genetic modulators
548 of A β 2 peptide expression in the brain. Indeed, using a similar approach with currently
549 available summary statistics (PAD study), we were able to detect several sentinel markers
550 surpassing the GWAS significance threshold. Specifically, the PAD CSF-PET meta-analysis
551 identified several significant genes that have been previously related to AD (*CRI*, *BINI*, *CLU*,
552 *ABCA7*, *FERMT2* and *APOE*^{4,82-85}) or amyloid proteins (*CRI*, *CLU*, *APOE* and
553 *FERMT2*^{9,86,87}), as well as *PICALM* and *GPC5* suggestive genes^{84,88}. Notably, we identified
554 the novel *GADLI* locus, which encodes for a protein from the glutamate decarboxylase family,
555 suggesting that it might have a glutamate decarboxylase activity in the CNS^{89,90}.

556 In AD, the glutamate excess generates a continuous glutamatergic activity, impairing neuronal
557 plasticity and long-term potentiation leading to excitotoxicity. Therefore, using receptor

558 antagonists such as memantine, which has shown neuroprotective effects, could be a crucial
559 therapeutic intervention^{91,92}.

560 Importantly, these results should be interpreted with extreme caution because PAD analysis is
561 not entirely independent as various cohorts were represented in both summary statistics of the
562 PAD analysis (Supplementary Table 30). This overlapping samples (11.284%) could lead to
563 overestimated effects and increased proportion of false positive findings. Compared to our local
564 effort, where we eliminated any potential overlap between CSF and PET cohorts, we remain
565 very cautious about the PAD results due to the potential overlap of subjects among studies.
566 Future efforts are necessary to confirm the findings from the PAD analysis. Nevertheless, the
567 PAD analysis replicated the rs115822934-*NPY5R* marker, alongside the rs429358-*APOE*,
568 originally identified in our CSF-PET meta-analysis. These results might suggest that *NPY5R*
569 could be genuinely involved in amyloid pathology, as well as panic disorders^{93,94}. Again,
570 further completely independent studies, expanding the sample size of these analysis, are needed
571 to validate our observation and working hypothesis.

572 In spite of these limitations, our experimental strategy permitted us to evaluate common
573 pathways potentially associated to CSF-soluble A β 42 (circulating amyloid)⁹⁵ and brain
574 amyloid species detected by PET (insoluble species such as amyloid plaques or cerebral
575 amyloid angiopathy)⁹⁶ and proteome signature associated to CSF A β 42 peptide levels. To
576 assess the relationship between genetic modulators and protein levels, we analysed the overlap
577 between *loci*-controlling amyloid levels and significant proteins associated with CSF A β 42
578 levels. Importantly, three genes/proteins (*CHST1*, *PTPRD* and *TMEM132D*) were identified
579 and prioritized in all analyses, thus suggesting that these modulators might be key drivers
580 controlling amyloid pathology. Lower *TMEM132D* levels have been observed in patients with
581 frontotemporal dementia⁹⁷, and genetic markers in this gene have been related to anxiety, panic
582 disorders and the rate of cognitive decline^{73,98,99}. This locus was the only that also overlapped
583 with all PAD rankings, suggesting that might be a potential modulator of amyloid pathology.
584 The *PTPRD* gene, which was also represented in the large meta-GWAS gene-based ranking,
585 has been significantly associated to synaptic process in schizophrenia¹⁰⁰, AD susceptibility,
586 neurofibrillary tangle and neuritic plaques⁶⁸. We consider these two *loci* excellent candidates
587 for further translational research due to their consistent statistical significance and previous
588 literature findings. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that we are not capturing pathological
589 mechanisms occurring similarly in both biofluids due to the opposite direction filtering, which
590 could be contributing to the accumulation or reduction in both CSF and PET amyloid levels.

591 These discordances have been described in previous articles^{101–103}, suggesting that they might
592 be caused due to the differential sensitivity to amyloid species across the AD continuum.
593 Further research is needed to elucidate the role of these common and discordant amyloid
594 mechanisms occurring in brain and their impact on disease development.

595 In this study, we found a limited overlap between genetic modulators of amyloid burden and
596 the proteins associated with the CSF levels of A β 42. This could be interpreted as a result of the
597 inherent statistical noise in these multiomic analyses, the lack of power in our main analysis,
598 or it could indicate that the observed discordance is genuine. The poor heritability reported for
599 CSF traits in previous studies⁹ supports that common SNPs might not strongly modulate the
600 CSF amyloid burden. Moreover, no amyloid PRS showed a significant association with the
601 risk of developing AD, whereas the AD PRS showed a strong association with the AD case-
602 control status and amyloid levels, which is fully consistent with previous studies^{70,104–106}. These
603 results suggest either a lack of statistical power to detect genuine hits associated with amyloid
604 burden or a limited causal role of common genetic modulators of amyloid deposits in the
605 aetiology of clinical AD. Further studies are needed to clarify these discrepancies. Interestingly,
606 we observed a higher number of *loci*/proteins overlapped with the SOMAscan protein
607 associations with CSF A β 42 levels and the gene-based analysis than in the sentinel SNP-based
608 GWAS analyses (our meta-analysis n=21). The gene-based approach could be particularly
609 powerful because the genetic markers summarised at (protein-coding) gene level might reduce
610 the statistical noise on a full GWAS dataset⁵².

611 We also noted a large number of significant CSF SOMAscan proteins associated with CSF
612 A β 42 levels. Notably, most of the observed associations were predominantly positive in our
613 study. Interestingly, Bader *et al*¹⁰⁷ reported a correlation map illustrating high correlations
614 between CSF proteomic measures suggesting that these measures might lead to multiple
615 significant associations. The massive abundance of significant proteins might simply reflect a
616 general neurodegenerative signature that occurs as a result of widespread neuronal cell death
617 or reactive gliosis. These changes are likely to be epiphenomenal rather than specific to the AD
618 process. The potential implication of these findings is important for interpreting CSF proteome
619 results. Indeed, only a minority of proteomic markers associated to A β 42 might be genuine
620 mediators modulating the AD-related amyloid endophenotype. Overall, the lack of overlap
621 between A β 42 and AD risk GWAS studies suggests that genetic factors modulating amyloid
622 production may represent only a relatively small component of overall AD causality. These
623 findings are also in line with several clinical trials targeting amyloid, that have observed a

624 reduced association between A β reduction and AD progression, as well as only modest control
625 of AD progression with these monotherapies. This also suggests that both amyloid-dependent
626 and amyloid-independent mechanisms must be addressed simultaneously to effectively control
627 disease progression^{108,109}.

628 Despite the poor overlap, we detected 35 overlapping genes and proteins pointing to a few
629 enriched mechanisms in our CSF-PET meta-GWAS. We consider these overlapping signals of
630 special importance because they could point to genuine amyloid-related mechanisms involved
631 in AD causality and development. We found A β burden significantly associated with pathways
632 controlling the anchored proteins in the membrane, which had also been represented in the
633 PAD enriched analysis (n=23 loci/proteins). Interestingly, six enriched mechanisms were
634 represented in both overlapping loci/protein rankings of the PAD and our CSF-PET meta-
635 analysis. These results validate our findings and suggest that the enrichment analysis is more
636 powerful in detecting genuine associations than analysing individual genes, particularly in the
637 context of reduced statistical power.

638 Additionally, the enrichment analysis pointed to synapse molecules and cell adhesion
639 mechanisms. Neuronal cadherins and integrins have been linked to the synaptic process,
640 plasticity and long-term potentiation and modulation of A β levels¹¹⁰, while their loss has been
641 correlated to cognitive decline^{111–113}. Furthermore, we detected a link between amyloid levels
642 and mental disorders, such as anxiety which has been associated with high A β deposition across
643 the AD continuum^{114–116}. On the contrary, autism spectrum disorder (ASD) has been associated
644 with A β processing via the non-amyloidogenic pathway leading to reduced A β levels in ASD
645 patients¹¹⁷. Other overlapping *loci* and proteins such as *ROBO2*, *CNTN5*, *OPCML*, *NRG3*,
646 *NGFR* or *CACNA2D3*, have been associated with cognitive performance^{118,119}, age at
647 onset^{120,121}, schizophrenia^{122–124} or ASD^{125,126}, AD^{127,128} and its endophenotypes^{129,130}.

648 Considering all these observations, it is difficult to conceive that all of them can be explained
649 by pure random chance. However, our analysis had important limitations. First, we use a
650 suboptimal p-value-based meta-analysis method, however, this strategy becomes highly
651 valuable for integrating diverse studies reporting different estimate metrics and combining
652 endophenotypes measured by various techniques^{131,132}. Also, the CSF-PET meta-analysis did
653 not report effect size which were estimated. The restrictive SNP filtering allowed the evaluation
654 of only 4.9% of genomic markers, likely due to meta-analysing multiple datasets and reducing
655 marker identification involved in common mechanisms between soluble-CSF and insoluble-

656 PET amyloid species. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, the PAD analysis was not completely
657 independent, with an 8.272% and 3.073% of overlapping samples between our main meta-
658 analysis, the CSF⁹ and PET⁴⁸ summary statistics, respectively. The PAD CSF-PET meta-
659 analysis should be interpreted with extreme caution due to these overlapping samples among
660 summary statistics. Because we used publicly available results, we could not confirm the
661 presence of additional overlapping samples, potentially leading to overfitting. The Ali *et al*
662 meta-GWAS conducted a different data harmonisation process, potentially introducing
663 variability. Furthermore, neuropathological information was not available for these samples,
664 leaving us unaware of other concomitant pathological changes. Finally, the lack of significant
665 findings for several PRS associations may suggest that there is insufficient statistical power to
666 find genetic variants that affect the amyloid endophenotype. These concerns should be
667 addressed in future research.

668 In summary, our results demonstrate the feasibility of combining A β endophenotypes in CSF
669 and PET, along with proteome analysis, to gain novel insights into the fundamental biology of
670 AD. The strong proteomic associations with A β endophenotypes could help identify signalling
671 pathways and molecular mechanisms involved in A β and AD pathology, as well as the
672 overlapping pathways that control the amyloidotic process. Further studies are needed to refine
673 these observed associations, connecting AD *loci* and proposed causal pathways with brain
674 amyloidogenesis.

675

676 **Declarations**

677 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

678 In accordance with Spanish regulations for the biomedical research field, all the protocols of
679 this study were approved by the Clinical Research Ethics Commission of the Hospital Clinic
680 (Barcelona, Spain) for Ace cohort and the Clinical Research Ethics Commission of Cantabria
681 (Spain) for Valdecilla cohort. This research followed the Declaration of Helsinki. All
682 participants were informed about the procedures and objectives of this study by a neurologist
683 before signing an informed consent. Moreover, data confidentiality and privacy of patients
684 were protected as specified in applicable laws.

685

686 Acknowledgments

687 We would like to thank patients and controls who participated in this project. The present work has been performed
688 as part of the doctoral thesis of RPF at the University of Barcelona (Barcelona, Spain). Some control samples and
689 data from patients included in this study were provided in part by the National DNA Bank Carlos III
690 (www.bancoadn.org, University of Salamanca, Spain) and Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme (Sevilla,
691 Spain); they were processed following standard operating procedures with the appropriate approval of the Ethical
692 and Scientific Committee. Data used in this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging
693 Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.usc.edu). As such, the investigators within the ADNI contributed to the
694 design and implementation of ADNI and/or provided data but did not participate in analysis or writing of this
695 report. A complete listing of ADNI investigators can be found at: [http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-](http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/how_to_apply/ADNI_Acknowledgement_List.pdf)
696 [content/uploads/how_to_apply/ADNI_Acknowledgement_List.pdf](http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/how_to_apply/ADNI_Acknowledgement_List.pdf). Data was used for this project of which
697 collection and sharing was funded by the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (National
698 Institutes of Health Grant U01 AG024904) and DOD ADNI (Department of Defense award number W81XWH-
699 12-2-0012). ADNI is funded by the National Institute on Aging, the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and
700 Bioengineering, and through generous contributions from the following: AbbVie, Alzheimer's Association;
701 Alzheimer's Drug Discovery Foundation; Araclon Biotech; BioClinica, Inc.; Biogen; Bristol-Myers Squibb
702 Company; CereSpir, Inc.; Cogstate; Eisai Inc.; Elan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Eli Lilly and Company; EuroImmun;
703 F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd and its affiliated company Genentech, Inc.; Fujirebio; GE Healthcare; IXICO Ltd.;
704 Janssen Alzheimer Immunotherapy Research & Development, LLC.; Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceutical
705 Research & Development LLC.; Lumosity; Lundbeck; Merck & Co., Inc.; Meso Scale Diagnostics, LLC.;
706 NeuroRx Research; Neurotrack Technologies; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation; Pfizer Inc.; Piramal
707 Imaging; Servier; Takeda Pharmaceutical Company; and Transition Therapeutics. The Canadian Institutes of
708 Health Research is providing funds to support ADNI clinical sites in Canada. Private sector contributions are
709 facilitated by the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health (www.fnih.org). The grantee organization is the
710 Northern California Institute for Research and Education, and the study is coordinated by the Alzheimer's
711 Therapeutic Research Institute at the University of Southern California. ADNI data are disseminated by the
712 Laboratory for Neuro Imaging at the University of Southern California.

713

714 **The GR@ACE study group**

715 Nuria Aguilera¹, Emilio Alarcon¹, Montserrat Alegret^{1,3}, Mercè Boada^{1,3}, Mar Buendia¹, Amanda Cano^{1,3}, Pilar
716 Cañabate^{1,3}, Angel Carracedo^{5,33}, Arturo Corbatón-Anchuelo²³, Itziar de Rojas^{1,3}, Susana Diego¹, Ana
717 Espinosa¹, Anna Gailhagenet¹, Pablo García-González^{1,3}, Marina Guitart¹, Antonio González-Pérez³², Marta
718 Ibarria¹, Asunción Lafuente¹, Juan Macias²², Olalla Maroñas⁵, Elvira Martín¹, Maria Teresa Martínez
719 Larrad^{23,26}, Marta Marquí^{1,3}, Laura Montreal¹, Sonia Moreno-Grau^{1,3}, Mariona Moreno¹, Raúl Nuñez-
720 Llaves¹, Clàudia Olivé¹, Adelina Orellana¹, Gemma Ortega^{1,3}, Ana Pancho¹, Ester Pelejà¹, Alba Pérez-
721 Cordon¹, Juan A Pineda¹⁶, Raquel Puerta^{1,2}, Silvia Preckler¹, Inés Quintela⁵, Luis Miguel Real^{22,16}, Maitee
722 Rosende-Roca¹, Agustín Ruiz^{1,3}, Maria Eugenia Sáez³², Angela Sanabria^{1,3}, Manuel Serrano-Rios²³, Oscar
723 Sotolongo-Grau¹, Luís Tárrega^{1,3}, Sergi Valero^{1,3}, Liliana Vargas¹

724 ¹Research Center and Memory Clinic. Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona – Universitat Internacional de Catalunya,
725 Spain. ²Universitat de Barcelona (UB). ³CIBERNED, Network Center for Biomedical Research in
726 Neurodegenerative Diseases, National Institute of Health Carlos III, Madrid, Spain. ⁵Grupo de Medicina
727 Xenómica, Centro Nacional de Genotipado (CEGEN-PRB3-ISCI). Universidade de Santiago de Compostela,
728 Santiago de Compostela, Spain. ¹⁶Departamento de Especialidades Quirúrgicas, Bioquímica e Inmunología.
729 School of Medicine. University of Malaga. Málaga, Spain. ²²Unidad Clínica de Enfermedades Infecciosas y
730 Microbiología.Hospital Universitario de Valme, Sevilla, Spain. ²³Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria del Hospital
731 Clínico San Carlos (IdISSC), Hospital Clínico San Carlos. ²⁶Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de
732 Diabetes y Enfermedades Metabólicas Asociadas (CIBERDEM). ³²CAEBI, Centro Andaluz de Estudios
733 Bioinformáticos, Sevilla, Spain. ³³Fundación Pública Galega de Medicina Xenómica – CIBERER-IDIS, Santiago
734 de Compostela, Spain.

735

736 **DEGESCO consortium**

737 Astrid Daniela Adarmes-Gómez^{28,3}, Miquel Aguilar^{36,37}, Nuria Aguilera¹, Emilio Alarcón-Martín¹, Daniel
738 Alcolea^{31,3}, Montserrat Alegret^{1,3}, María Dolores Alonso³⁸, Ignacio Alvarez^{36,37}, Victoria Álvarez^{20,21}, Guillermo
739 Amer-Ferrer³⁹, Martirio Antequera⁴⁰, Anna Antonell³⁰, Carmen Antúnez⁴¹, Alfonso Pastor Arias^{10,11}, Miquel
740 Baquero⁴², Olivia Belbin^{31,3}, María Bernal Sánchez-Arjona²⁷, Mercè Boada^{1,3}, Mar Buendía¹, Dolores Buiza-
741 Rueda^{28,3}, María Jesús Bullido^{17,3,18,19}, Mariateresa Buongiorno^{36,37}, Juan Andrés Burguera⁴², Miguel
742 Calero^{29,3,43}, Amanda Cano^{1,3}, Pilar Cañabate^{1,3}, Fernando Cardona Serrate^{8,9,3}, Ángel Carracedo^{5,33}, Fátima
743 Carrillo^{28,3}, María José Casajeros⁴⁴, Jordi Clarimon^{31,3}, Arturo Corbatón-Anchuelo²³, Anaïs Corma-Gómez²², Paz
744 de la Guía¹⁵, Itziar de Rojas^{1,3}, Teodoro del Ser⁴⁵, Susana Diego¹, Mónica Diez-Fairen^{36,37}, Oriol Dols-
745 Icardo^{31,3}, Ana Espinosa¹, Marta Fernández-Fuertes²², Juan Fortea^{31,3}, Emilio Franco-Macías²⁷, Ana Frank-
746 García^{19,3,46,47}, Anna Gailhagenet¹, Jose María García-Alberca¹⁵, Pablo García-González^{1,3}, Sebastián García-
747 Madrona⁴⁴, Guillermo Garcia-Ribas⁴⁴, Lorena Garrote-Espina^{28,3}, Pilar Gómez-Garre^{28,3}, Antonio González-
748 Pérez³², Marina Guitart¹, Raquel Huerto Vilas^{10,11}, Marta Ibarria¹, Silvia Jesús^{28,3}, Miguel Angel Labrador
749 Espinosa^{28,3}, Asunción Lafuente¹, Carmen Lage^{4,3}, Agustina Legaz⁴⁰, Alberto Lleó^{31,3}, Sara López-
750 García^{4,3}, Adolfo Lopez de Munain^{12,13,3,14}, Juan Macías²², Daniel Macías-García^{28,3}, Salvadora
751 Manzanares⁴⁰, Marta Marín²⁷, Juan Marín-Muñoz⁴⁰, Olalla Maroñas⁵, Marta Marquié^{1,3}, Elvira Martín¹, Angel
752 Martín Montés^{47,48}, Begoña Martínez⁴⁰, Victoriana Martínez⁴⁰, Pablo Martínez-Lage Álvarez⁴⁹, María Teresa
753 Martínez-Larrad^{23,26}, Marian Martinez de Pancorbo⁵⁰, Carmen Martínez Rodríguez^{51,21}, Miguel Medina^{3,29}, Maite
754 Mendioroz Iriarte⁵², Silvia Mendoza¹⁵, Manuel Menéndez-González^{21,53}, Pablo Mir^{28,3}, Laura Molina-
755 Porcel^{30,54}, Laura Montreal¹, Mariona Moreno¹, Fermin Moreno^{12,14,3}, Laura Muñoz-Delgado^{28,3}, Fuensanta
756 Noguera Perea⁴⁰, Raúl Núñez-Llaves¹, Clàudia Olivé¹, Gemma Ortega¹, Ana Pancho¹, Ana Belén Pastor^{29,55}, Pau
757 Pastor^{6,7}, Ester Pelejá¹, Alba Pérez-Cordón¹, Jordi Pérez-Tur^{8,3,9}, María Teresa Periñán^{28,3}, Juan Antonio
758 Pineda²², Rocío Pineda-Sánchez^{28,3}, Gerard Piñol-Ripoll^{10,11}, Silvia Preckler¹, Raquel Puerta^{1,2}, Inés
759 Quintela⁵, Alberto Rábano^{29,55,3}, Luis Miguel Real²², Diego Real de Asúa⁵⁶, Eloy Rodríguez-Rodríguez^{4,3}, Irene
760 Rosas Allende^{20,21}, Maitée Rosende-Roca^{1,3}, Jose Luís Royo¹⁶, Agustín Ruiz^{1,3}, María Eugenia Sáez³², Ángela
761 Sanabria^{1,3}, Pascual Sánchez-Juan^{4,3}, Raquel Sánchez-Valle³⁰, Isabel Sastre^{17,3}, Manuel Serrano-Ríos²³, Oscar

762 Sotolongo-Grau¹, Lluís Tàrraga^{1,3}, Sergi Valero^{1,3}, Liliana Vargas¹, María Pilar Vicente⁴⁰, Laura Vivancos-
763 Moreau⁴⁰, Miren Zulaica^{14,3}

764 ¹Research Center and Memory Clinic. Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona – Universitat Internacional de Catalunya,
765 Spain. ²Universitat de Barcelona (UB). ³CIBERNED, Network Center for Biomedical Research in
766 Neurodegenerative Diseases, National Institute of Health Carlos III, Madrid, Spain. ⁴Neurology Service, Marqués
767 de Valdecilla University Hospital (University of Cantabria and IDIVAL), Santander, Spain. ⁵Grupo de Medicina
768 Xenómica, Centro Nacional de Genotipado (CEGEN-PRB3-ISCI). Universidade de Santiago de Compostela,
769 Santiago de Compostela, Spain. ⁶Unit of Neurodegenerative diseases, Department of Neurology, University
770 Hospital Germans Trias i Pujol, Badalona, Barcelona, Spain. ⁷The Germans Trias i Pujol Research Institute
771 (IGTP), Badalona, Barcelona, Spain. ⁸Unitat de Genètica Molecular, Institut de Biomedicina de València-CSIC,
772 Valencia, Spain. ⁹Unidad Mixta de Neurología Genética, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria La Fe, Valencia,
773 Spain. ¹⁰Unitat Trastorns Cognitius, Hospital Universitari Santa Maria de Lleida, Lleida, Spain. ¹¹Institut de
774 Recerca Biomedica de Lleida (IRBLLeida), Lleida, Spain. ¹²Department of Neurology. Hospital Universitario
775 Donostia. San Sebastian, Spain. ¹³Department of Neurosciences. Faculty of Medicine and Nursery. University of
776 the Basque Country, San Sebastián, Spain. ¹⁴Neurosciences Area. Instituto Biodonostia. San Sebastian, Spain.
777 ¹⁵Alzheimer Research Center & Memory Clinic, Andalusian Institute for Neuroscience, Málaga, Spain.
778 ¹⁶Departamento de Especialidades Quirúrgicas, Bioquímica e Inmunología. School of Medicine. University of
779 Malaga. Málaga, Spain. ¹⁷Centro de Biología Molecular Severo Ochoa (UAM-CSIC). ¹⁸Instituto de Investigacion
780 Sanitaria ‘Hospital la Paz’ (IdIPaz), Madrid, Spain. ¹⁹Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. ²⁰Laboratorio de
781 Genética. Hospital Universitario Central de Asturias, Oviedo, Spain. ²¹Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria del
782 Principado de Asturias (ISPA). ²²Unidad Clínica de Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología. Hospital
783 Universitario de Valme, Sevilla, Spain. ²³Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria del Hospital Clínico San Carlos
784 (IdISSC), Hospital Clínico San Carlos. ²⁶Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Diabetes y Enfermedades
785 Metabólicas Asociadas (CIBERDEM). ²⁷Dementia Unit, Department of Neurology, Hospital Universitario Virgen
786 del Rocío, Instituto de Biomedicina de Sevilla (IBiS), Sevilla, Spain. ²⁸Unidad de Trastornos del Movimiento,
787 Servicio de Neurología y Neurofisiología. Instituto de Biomedicina de Sevilla (IBiS), Hospital Universitario
788 Virgen del Rocío/CSIC/Universidad de Sevilla, Seville, Spain. ²⁹CIEN Foundation/Queen Sofia Foundation
789 Alzheimer Center. ³⁰Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive disorders unit. Service of Neurology. Hospital Clínic
790 of Barcelona. Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer, University of Barcelona, Barcelona,
791 Spain. ³¹Department of Neurology, Sant Pau Memory Unit, Sant Pau Biomedical Research Institute, Hospital de
792 la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain. ³²CAEBI, Centro Andaluz de
793 Estudios Bioinformáticos, Sevilla, Spain. ³³Fundación Pública Galega de Medicina Xenómica – CIBERER-IDIS,
794 Santiago de Compostela, Spain. ³⁶Fundació Docència i Recerca MútuaTerrassa, Terrassa, Barcelona, Spain.
795 ³⁷Memory Disorders Unit, Department of Neurology, Hospital Universitari Mutua de Terrassa, Terrassa,
796 Barcelona, Spain. ³⁸Servei de Neurologia. Hospital Clínic Universitari de València. ³⁹Department of Neurology,
797 Hospital Universitario Son Espases, Palma, Spain. ⁴⁰Unidad de Demencias. Hospital Clínico Universitario Virgen
798 de la Arrixaca, Palma, Spain. ⁴¹Unidad de Demencias, Hospital Clínico Universitario Virgen de la Arrixaca,
799 Murcia, Spain. ⁴²Servei de Neurologia, Hospital Universitari i Politènic La Fe, Valencia, Spain. ⁴³UFIEC,
800 Instituto de Salud Carlos III. ⁴⁴Hospital Universitario Ramon y Cajal, IRYCIS, Madrid, Spain. ⁴⁵Department of

801 Neurology/CIEN Foundation/Queen Sofia Foundation Alzheimer Center. ⁴⁶Department of Neurology, La Paz
802 University Hospital. Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria del Hospital Universitario La Paz. IdiPAZ. ⁴⁷Hospital La
803 Paz Institute for Health Research, IdiPAZ, Madrid, Spain. ⁴⁸Department of Neurology, La Paz University
804 Hospital. ⁴⁹Centro de Investigación y Terapias Avanzadas. Fundación CITA-Alzheimer, San Sebastián, Spain.
805 ⁵⁰BIOMICS País Vasco; Centro de investigación Lascaray, Universidad del País Vasco UPV/EHU, Vitoria-
806 Gasteiz, Spain. ⁵¹Hospital de Cabueñes, Gijón, Spain. ⁵²Navarrabiomed, Pamplona, Spain. ⁵³Departamento de
807 Medicina, Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain. ⁵⁴Neurological Tissue Bank of the Biobanc-Hospital Clinic-
808 IDIBAPS, Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer, Barcelona, Spain. ⁵⁵BT-CIEN. ⁵⁶Hospital
809 Universitario La Princesa, Madrid, Spain.

810

811 **The FACEHBI study group**

812 JA Allué⁵⁷, F Appiani¹, DM Ariton¹, M Berthier⁵⁸, U Bojaryn¹, M Buendia¹, S Bullich⁵⁹, F Campos⁶⁰, P
813 Cañabate^{1,3}, L Cañada¹, C Cuevas¹, S Diego¹, JM Escudero⁶¹, A Espinosa^{1,3}, A Gailhajenet¹, J Giménez⁶¹, M
814 Gómez-Chiari⁶¹, M Guitart¹, I Hernández^{1,3}, M Ibarria¹, A Lafuente¹, N Leonart¹, F Lomeña⁶⁰, E Martín¹, M
815 Moreno¹, A Morera¹, N Muñoz¹, A Niñerola⁶⁰, AB Nogales¹, L Núñez⁶², G Ortega^{1,3}, A Páez⁶², A Pancho¹, E
816 Pelejà¹, E Pérez-Martínez⁵⁹, A Pérez-Cordon¹, V Pérez-Grijalba⁵⁷, M Pascual-Lucas⁵⁷, A Perissinotti⁶⁰, S
817 Preckler¹, M Ricciardi¹, N Roé-Vellvé⁵⁹, J Romero⁵⁷, MI Ramis¹, M Rosende-Roca¹, M Sarasa⁵⁷, S Seguer¹, A
818 Stephens⁵⁹, MA Tejero⁶¹, J Terencio⁵⁷, M Torres⁶², L Vargas¹, A Vivas-Larruy⁶¹

819 ¹Research Center and Memory Clinic. Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona – Universitat Internacional de Catalunya,
820 Spain. ³CIBERNED, Network Center for Biomedical Research in Neurodegenerative Diseases, National Institute
821 of Health Carlos III, Madrid, Spain. ⁵⁷Araclon Biotech-Grífols.Zaragoza, Spain. ⁵⁸Cognitive Neurology and
822 Aphasia Unit (UNCA). University of Malaga. Málaga, Spain. ⁵⁹Life Molecular Imaging GmbH. Berlin, Germany.
823 ⁶⁰Servei de Medicina Nuclear, Hospital Clínic i Provincial. Barcelona, Spain. ⁶¹Departament de Diagnòstic per la
824 Imatge. Clínica Corachan,

825

826 **Funding**

827 The Genome Research @ Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona project (GR@ACE) is supported by Grifols SA,
828 Fundación bancaria 'La Caixa', Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona and CIBERNED. Ace Alzheimer Center
829 Barcelona is one of the participating centers of the Dementia Genetics Spanish Consortium (DEGESCO). The
830 FACEHBI study is supported by funds from Ace Alzheimer Center Barcelona, Grifols, Life Molecular Imaging,
831 Araclon Biotech, Alkahest, Laboratorio de análisis Echevarne and IrsiCaixa. Authors acknowledge the support of
832 the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, Proyectos de Generación de Conocimiento grants PID2021-
833 122473OA-I00, PID2021-123462OB-I00 and PID2019-106625RB-I00. ISCIII, Acción Estratégica en Salud,
834 integrated in the Spanish National R+D+I Plan and financed by ISCIII Subdirección General de Evaluación and
835 the Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER "Una manera de hacer Europa") grants PI13/02434,

836 PI16/01861, PI17/01474, PI19/00335, PI19/01240, PI19/01301, PI22/01403, PI22/00258 and the ISCIII national
837 grant PMP22/00022, funded by the European Union (NextGenerationEU). The support of CIBERNED (ISCIII)
838 under the grants CB06/05/2004 and CB18/05/00010. The support from the ADAPTED and MOPEAD projects,
839 European Union/EFPIA Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint (grant numbers 115975 and 115985, respectively);
840 from PREADAPT project, Joint Program for Neurodegenerative Diseases (JPND) grant N° AC19/00097; from
841 HARPONE project, Agency for Innovation and Entrepreneurship (VLAIO) grant N° PR067/21 and Janssen.
842 DESCARTES project is funded by German Research Foundation (DFG). Additionally, IdR is supported by the
843 Instituto de Salud Carlos III (ISCIII) under grant FI20/00215. PGG is supported by CIBERNED employment plan
844 (CNV-304-PRF-866). ACF received support from the ISCIII under the grant *Sara Borrell* (CD22/00125). JEC
845 received support from National Institute of Health award P30AG066546.
846

847 **Author contributions**

848 ACF, IdR and AR designed and conceptualized the study and interpreted the data. RP, AR and IdR contributed to
849 data acquisition, analysis, interpreted the data and co-wrote the manuscript. PGG, CO, OSG contributed to data
850 interpretation. AR supervised the study. MA, SV, MMS, MB, PSJ, ACS, ACF, JEC, AR contributed to the critical
851 revision of the paper. All authors critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and approved
852 the final manuscript. GR@ACE/DEGESCO Data generation: RP, IdR, PGG, CO, AGS, FGG, LM, CL, IQ, NA,
853 ERR, EAM, AO, AC, MES and ACF. Sample contribution: RP, IdR, PGG, CO, AGS, FGG, LM, VP, CL, IQ,
854 NA, ERR, EAM, AO, PP, JPT, GPR, ALM, JMGA, JLR, MJB, VA, LMR, ACA, DGG, MML, EFM, PM, MM,
855 ODI, LT, MA, SV, MMS, MB, PSJ, ACS, ACF and AR. Analysis: RP and IdR. Study supervision/management:
856 LT, MB, PSJ, ACF and AR.

857 **Competing interests**

858 All authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any conflict of interest.

859 **Availability of data and materials**

860 The data that support the findings of this study are publicly available from the corresponding
861 authors upon reasonable request. Additionally, the raw SOMAscan proteomic data is publicly
862 accessible through the Alzheimer's Disease Data Initiative (ADDI) community.

863

864 **References**

- 865 1. El-Hayek YH, Wiley RE, Khoury CP, et al. Tip of the Iceberg: Assessing the Global
866 Socioeconomic Costs of Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias and Strategic Implications
867 for Stakeholders. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*. 2019;70:323-341. doi:10.3233/JAD-190426

- 868 2. 2022 Alzheimer's disease Facts and Figures: More Than Normal Aging: Understanding Mild
869 Cognitive Impairment. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2022;18(4):700-789.
- 870 3. Nandi A, Counts N, Chen S, et al. Global and regional projections of the economic burden of
871 Alzheimer's disease and related dementias from 2019 to 2050: A value of statistical life
872 approach. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2022;51(101580):1-10. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101580
- 873 4. Bellenguez C, Küçükali F, Jansen I, et al. New insights on the genetic etiology of Alzheimer's
874 and related dementia. *Nat Genet*. 2022;54:412-436. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-
875 01024-z
- 876 5. de Rojas I, Moreno-Grau S, Tesi N, et al. Common variants in Alzheimer's disease and risk
877 stratification by polygenic risk scores. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):1-16. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-
878 22491-8
- 879 6. Ridge P, Adams PM, Albert MS, et al. Assessment of the genetic variance of late-onset
880 Alzheimer's disease. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2016;41:200.e13-200.e20.
881 doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2016.02.024
- 882 7. Glahn DC, Bearden CE, Niendam TA, Escamilla MA. The feasibility of neuropsychological
883 endophenotypes in the search for genes associated with bipolar affective disorder. *Bipolar*
884 *Disord*. 2004;6(3):171-182. doi:10.1111/j.1399-5618.2004.00113.x
- 885 8. Zhang Q, Cai Z, Lhomme M, et al. Inclusion of endophenotypes in a standard GWAS facilitate
886 a detailed mechanistic understanding of genetic elements that control blood lipid levels.
887 *Scientific Report Nature*. 2020;10(18434):1-14. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-75612-6
- 888 9. Jansen IE, van der Lee SJ, Gomez-Fonseca D, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis for
889 Alzheimer's disease cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2022;144(5):821-842.
890 doi:10.1007/S00401-022-02454-Z
- 891 10. Gottesman II, Todd Gould HD, FRCPsych. The Endophenotype Concept in Psychiatry:
892 Etymology and Strategic Intentions. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2003;160:637-645.
893 doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.160.4.636
- 894 11. Cruchaga C, Kauwe JS, Harari O, et al. GWAS of cerebrospinal fluid tau levels identifies novel
895 risk variants for Alzheimer's disease The Alzheimer Disease Genetic Consortium (ADGC), and.
896 *Neuron*. 2013;78(2):256-268. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2013.02.026
- 897 12. Hall MH, Smoller JW. A New Role for Endophenotypes in the GWAS Era: Functional
898 Characterization of Risk Variants. *Harv Rev Psychiatry*. 2010;18(1):67-74.
899 doi:10.3109/10673220903523532
- 900 13. Deming Y, Li Z, Kapoor M, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies four novel loci
901 associated with Alzheimer's endophenotypes and disease modifiers. *Acta Neuropathol*.
902 2017;17(5):839-856. doi:10.1007/s00401-017-1685-y
- 903 14. Kauwe JSK, Wang J, Mayo K, et al. Alzheimer's disease risk variants show association with
904 cerebrospinal fluid amyloid beta. *Neurogenetics*. 2009;10(1):13-17. doi:10.1007/s10048-008-
905 0150-4
- 906 15. Hardy J, Higgins G. Alzheimer's disease: The amyloid cascade hypothesis. *Science (1979)*.
907 1992;256(5054):184-185. doi:10.1126/science.1566067
- 908 16. Hardy J, Selkoe D. The Amyloid Hypothesis of Alzheimer's Disease: Progress and Problems on
909 the Road to Therapeutics. *Science (1979)*. 2002;297:353-356.

- 910 17. Orellana A, García-gonzález P, Valero S, et al. Establishing In-House Cutoffs of CSF
911 Alzheimer's Disease Biomarkers for the AT(N) Stratification of the Alzheimer Center Barcelona
912 Cohort. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2022;23(13):1-18. doi:10.3390/IJMS23136891/S1
- 913 18. Rodriguez-Gomez O, Sanabria A, Perez-Cordon A, et al. FACEHBI: A Prospective Study of
914 Risk Factors, Biomarkers and Cognition in a Cohort of Individuals with Subjective Cognitive
915 Decline. Study Rationale and Research Protocols. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis.* 2017;4(2):100-108.
916 doi:10.14283/jpad.2016.122
- 917 19. Moreno-Grau S, de Rojas I, Hernández I, et al. Genome-wide association analysis of dementia
918 and its clinical endophenotypes reveal novel loci associated with Alzheimer's disease and three
919 causality networks: The GR@ACE project. *Alzheimer's and Dementia.* 2019;15(10):1333-1347.
920 doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2019.06.4950
- 921 20. Jessen F, Amariglio RE, van Boxtel M, et al. A conceptual framework for research on subjective
922 cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's Dementia* . 2014;10(6):844-
923 852. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2014.01.001
- 924 21. Lopez OL, Jagust WJ, Dulberg C, et al. Risk factors for mild cognitive impairment in the
925 cardiovascular health study cognition study. *Arch Neurol.* 2003;60(10):1394-1399.
926 doi:10.1001/archneur.60.10.1394
- 927 22. Petersen RC, Caracciolo B, Brayne C, Gauthier S, Jelic V, Fratiglioni L. Mild cognitive
928 impairment: a concept in evolution. *Journal of Intern Med.* 2014;275(3):214-228.
929 doi:10.1111/joim.12190
- 930 23. Petersen RC, Smith GE, Waring SC, Ivnik RJ, Tangalos EG, Kokmen E. Mild Cognitive
931 Impairment: Clinical Characterization and Outcome. *American Medical Association.*
932 1999;56:303-308.
- 933 24. Jack CR, Bennett DA, Blennow K, et al. NIA-AA Research Framework: Toward a biological
934 definition of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia.* 2018;14(4):535-562.
935 doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2018.02.018
- 936 25. Vanderstichele H, Bibl M, Engelborghs S, et al. Standardization of preanalytical aspects of
937 cerebrospinal fluid biomarker testing for Alzheimer's disease diagnosis: A consensus paper from
938 the Alzheimer's Biomarkers Standardization Initiative. *Alzheimer's & Dementia.* 2012;8(1):65-
939 73. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.07.004
- 940 26. Buschke H. Cued recall in Amnesia. *J Clin Neuropsychol.* 1984;6(4):433-440.
941 doi:10.1080/01688638408401233
- 942 27. Alegret M, Valero S, Ortega G, et al. Validation of the Spanish Version of the Face Name
943 Associative Memory Exam (S-FNAME) in Cognitively Normal Older Individuals. *Arch Clin*
944 *Neuropsychol.* 2015;30(7):712-720. doi:10.1093/ARCLIN/ACV050
- 945 28. Wechsler D. A Standardized Memory Scale for Clinical Use. *The Journal of Psychology:*
946 *Interdisciplinary and Applied.* 1945;19(1):87-95. doi:10.1080/00223980.1945.9917223
- 947 29. Sheikh JJ, Yesavage JA. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): Recent evidence and development
948 of a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health.* 1986;5(1-
949 2):165-173. doi:10.1300/J018V05N01_09
- 950 30. Morris JC. The Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR). *Neurology.* 1993;43(11):2412-2414.
951 doi:10.1212/wnl.43.11.2412-a

- 952 31. Alcolea D, Pegueroles J, Muñoz L, et al. Agreement of amyloid PET and CSF biomarkers for
953 Alzheimer's disease on Lumipulse. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.* 2019;6(9):1815-1824.
954 doi:10.1002/acn3.50873
- 955 32. López-García S, Lage C, Pozueta A, et al. Sleep Time Estimated by an Actigraphy Watch
956 Correlates With CSF Tau in Cognitively Unimpaired Elders: The Modulatory Role of APOE.
957 *Front Aging Neurosci.* 2021;13:1-9. doi:10.3389/FNAGI.2021.663446/FULL
- 958 33. Mueller SG, Weiner MW, Thal LJ, et al. Ways toward an early diagnosis in Alzheimer's disease:
959 The Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI). *Alzheimer's & Dementia.*
960 2005;1(1):55-66. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2005.06.003
- 961 34. ADNI | Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. <https://adni.loni.usc.edu/>
- 962 35. Petersen RC, Aisen PS, Beckett LA, et al. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative
963 (ADNI): Clinical characterization. *Neurology.* 2010;74(3):201-209.
964 doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181cb3e25
- 965 36. Landau SM, Lu M, Joshi AD, et al. Comparing positron emission tomography imaging and
966 cerebrospinal fluid measurements of β -amyloid. *Ann Neurol.* 2013;74(6):826-836.
967 doi:10.1002/ana.23908
- 968 37. Shaw LM, Vanderstichele H, Knapik-Czajka M, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid biomarker signature
969 in alzheimer's disease neuroimaging initiative subjects. *Ann Neurol.* 2009;65(4):403-413.
970 doi:10.1002/ana.21610
- 971 38. PET Acquisition Methods ADNI. Accessed May 29, 2023.
972 <https://adni.loni.usc.edu/methods/pet-analysis-method/pet-analysis/>
- 973 39. Rowe CC, Doré V, Jones G, et al. 18F-Florbetaben PET beta-amyloid binding expressed in
974 Centiloids. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2017;44(12):2053-2059. doi:10.1007/S00259-017-
975 3749-6/FIGURES/4
- 976 40. Klunk WE, Koeppe RA, Price JC, et al. The Centiloid Project: Standardizing quantitative
977 amyloid plaque estimation by PET. *Alzheimer's & Dementia.* 2015;11(1):1-15.
978 doi:10.1016/J.JALZ.2014.07.003
- 979 41. Saykin AJ, Shen L, Foroud TM, et al. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative biomarkers
980 as quantitative phenotypes: Genetics core aims, progress, and plans. *Alzheimers Dement.*
981 2010;6(3):265-273. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2010.03.013
- 982 42. Michigan Imputation Server. Accessed June 9, 2023.
983 <https://imputationserver.sph.umich.edu/index.html#!>
- 984 43. Gold L, Ayers D, Bertino J, et al. Aptamer-Based Multiplexed Proteomic Technology for
985 Biomarker Discovery. Gelain F, ed. *PLoS One.* 2010;5(12):e15004.
986 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0015004
- 987 44. Candia J, Cheung F, Kotliarov Y, et al. Assessment of Variability in the SOMAscan Assay.
988 *Scientific Reports 2017 7:1.* 2017;7(1):1-13. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-14755-5
- 989 45. Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LCAM, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-generation
990 PLINK: Rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *Gigascience.* 2015;4(1):1-16.
991 doi:10.1186/S13742-015-0047-8/2707533
- 992 46. Willer CJ, Li Y, Abecasis GR. METAL: Fast and efficient meta-analysis of genomewide
993 association scans. *Bioinformatics.* 2010;26(17):2190-2191. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq340

- 994 47. Stouffer SA, Suchman EA, DeVinney LC, Star SA, Williams RM. American soldier:
995 Adjustment during army life (Vol. 1). *Princeton University Press*. 1949;28(1):87-90.
996 doi:10.2307/2572105
- 997 48. Ali M, Archer DB, Gorijala P, et al. Large multi-ethnic genetic analyses of amyloid imaging
998 identify new genes for Alzheimer disease. *Acta Neuropathol Commun*. 2023;11(1):1-20.
999 doi:10.1186/S40478-023-01563-4/FIGURES/4
- 1000 49. Lift Genome Annotations. Accessed November 20, 2023. [https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-](https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgLiftOver)
1001 [bin/hgLiftOver](https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgLiftOver)
- 1002 50. Beecham GW, Hamilton K, Naj AC, et al. Genome-Wide Association Meta-analysis of
1003 Neuropathologic Features of Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias. *PLoS Genet*.
1004 2014;10(9):e1004606. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PGEN.1004606
- 1005 51. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, et al. PLINK: A tool set for whole-genome association and
1006 population-based linkage analyses. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2007;81(3):559-575. doi:10.1086/519795
- 1007 52. Watanabe K, Taskesen E, Van Bochoven A, Posthuma D. Functional mapping and annotation
1008 of genetic associations with FUMA. *Nat Commun*. 2017;8(1):1-11. doi:10.1038/s41467-017-
1009 01261-5
- 1010 53. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses.
1011 *BMJ*. 2003;327(7414):557-560. doi:10.1136/BMJ.327.7414.557
- 1012 54. Zhu Z, Zhang F, Hu H, et al. Integration of summary data from GWAS and eQTL studies
1013 predicts complex trait gene targets. *Nat Genet*. 2016;48(5):481-487. doi:10.1038/ng.3538
- 1014 55. Puerta R, Cano A, García-González P, et al. Head-to-head comparison of aptamer- and antibody-
1015 based proteomic platforms in human cerebrospinal fluid samples from a real-world memory
1016 clinic cohort. *medRxiv*. Published online July 18, 2024:2024.07.18.24310563.
1017 doi:10.1101/2024.07.18.24310563
- 1018 56. Frick EA, Emilsson V, Jonmundsson T, et al. Serum proteomics reveal APOE- ϵ 4-dependent and
1019 APOE- ϵ 4-independent protein signatures in Alzheimer's disease. *Nature Aging 2024*. Published
1020 online August 21, 2024:1-19. doi:10.1038/s43587-024-00693-1
- 1021 57. Liao Y, Wang J, Jaehnig EJ, Shi Z, Zhang B. WebGestalt 2019: gene set analysis toolkit with
1022 revamped UIs and APIs. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2019;47(W1):W199-W205.
1023 doi:10.1093/NAR/GKZ401
- 1024 58. Shen X, Zhang S, Guo Z, Xing D, Chen W. The crosstalk of ABCA1 and ANXA1: A potential
1025 mechanism for protection against atherosclerosis. *Molecular Medicine*. 2020;26(1):1-8.
1026 doi:10.1186/S10020-020-00213-Y/FIGURES/1
- 1027 59. Zhao B, Luo T, Li T, et al. Genome-wide association analysis of 19,629 individuals identifies
1028 variants influencing regional brain volumes and refines their genetic co-architecture with
1029 cognitive and mental health traits. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(11):1637-1644. doi:10.1038/S41588-
1030 019-0516-6
- 1031 60. Suhre K, Arnold M, Bhagwat AM, et al. Connecting genetic risk to disease end points through
1032 the human blood plasma proteome. *Nat Commun*. 2017;8:1-14. doi:10.1038/NCOMMS14357
- 1033 61. Ries M, Loiola R, Shah UN, Gentleman SM, Solito E, Sastre M. The anti-inflammatory Annexin
1034 A1 induces the clearance and degradation of the amyloid- β peptide. *J Neuroinflammation*.
1035 2016;13(234):1-15. doi:10.1186/S12974-016-0692-6

- 1036 62. Kircher M, Witten DM, Jain P, et al. A general framework for estimating the relative
1037 pathogenicity of human genetic variants. *Nat Genet.* 2014;46(3):310-315. doi:10.1038/ng.2892
- 1038 63. Brouwer RM, Klein M, Grasby KL, et al. Genetic variants associated with longitudinal changes
1039 in brain structure across the lifespan. *Nature Neuroscience* 2022 25:4. 2022;25(4):421-432.
1040 doi:10.1038/s41593-022-01042-4
- 1041 64. Homann J, Osburg T, Ohlei O, et al. Genome-Wide Association Study of Alzheimer's Disease
1042 Brain Imaging Biomarkers and Neuropsychological Phenotypes in the European Medical
1043 Information Framework for Alzheimer's Disease Multimodal Biomarker Discovery Dataset.
1044 *Front Aging Neurosci.* 2022;14:1-14. doi:10.3389/FNAGI.2022.840651/BIBTEX
- 1045 65. Furney SJ, Simmons A, Breen G, et al. Genome-wide association with MRI atrophy measures
1046 as a quantitative trait locus for Alzheimer's disease. *Mol Psychiatry.* 2010;16(11):1130-1138.
1047 doi:10.1038/mp.2010.123
- 1048 66. Gouveia C, Gibbons E, Dehghani N, Eapen J, Guerreiro R, Bras J. Genome-wide association of
1049 polygenic risk extremes for Alzheimer's disease in the UK Biobank. *Sci Rep.* 2022;12:1-12.
1050 doi:10.1038/S41598-022-12391-2
- 1051 67. Hong S, Prokopenko D, Dobricic V, et al. Genome-wide association study of Alzheimer's
1052 disease CSF biomarkers in the EMIF-AD Multimodal Biomarker Discovery dataset.
1053 *Translational Psychiatry* 2020 10:1. 2020;10(1):1-12. doi:10.1038/s41398-020-01074-z
- 1054 68. Chibnik LB, White CC, Mukherjee S, et al. Susceptibility to neurofibrillary tangles: role of the
1055 PTPRD locus and limited pleiotropy with other neuropathologies. *Mol Psychiatry.*
1056 2018;23(6):1521-1529. doi:10.1038/MP.2017.20
- 1057 69. Raghavan NS, Dumitrescu L, Mormino E, et al. Association Between Common Variants in
1058 RBFOX1, an RNA-Binding Protein, and Brain Amyloidosis in Early and Preclinical Alzheimer
1059 Disease. *JAMA Neurol.* 2020;77(10):1288-1298. doi:10.1001/JAMANEUROL.2020.1760
- 1060 70. Kunkle BW, Grenier-Boley B, Sims R, et al. Genetic meta-analysis of diagnosed Alzheimer's
1061 disease identifies new risk loci and implicates A β , tau, immunity and lipid processing. *Nat*
1062 *Genet.* 2019;51:414-430. doi:10.1038/s41588-019-0358-2
- 1063 71. Bigdeli TB, Fanous AH, Li Y, et al. Genome-Wide Association Studies of Schizophrenia and
1064 Bipolar Disorder in a Diverse Cohort of US Veterans. *Schizophr Bull.* 2021;47(2):517-529.
1065 doi:10.1093/SCHBUL/SBAA133
- 1066 72. Luciano M, Hagenaars SP, Davies G, et al. Association analysis in over 329,000 individuals
1067 identifies 116 independent variants influencing neuroticism. *Nat Genet.* 2018;50(1):6-11.
1068 doi:10.1038/S41588-017-0013-8
- 1069 73. Sherva R, Gross A, Mukherjee S, et al. Genome-wide association study of rate of cognitive
1070 decline in Alzheimer's disease patients identifies novel genes and pathways. *Alzheimers*
1071 *Dement.* 2020;16(8):1134-1145. doi:10.1002/ALZ.12106
- 1072 74. Lee E, Giovanello KS, Saykin AJ, et al. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms are associated with
1073 cognitive decline at Alzheimer's disease conversion within mild cognitive impairment patients.
1074 *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring.* 2017;8(1):86-95.
1075 doi:10.1016/J.DADM.2017.04.004
- 1076 75. Ramanan VK, Lesnick TG, Przybelski SA, et al. Coping with brain amyloid: genetic
1077 heterogeneity and cognitive resilience to Alzheimer's pathophysiology. *Acta Neuropathol*
1078 *Commun.* 2021;9(1):1-14. doi:10.1186/S40478-021-01154-1/FIGURES/4

- 1079 76. Leuba G, Vernay A, Vu D, et al. Differential expression of LMO4 protein in Alzheimer's
1080 disease. *Neuropathol Appl Neurobiol.* 2004;30(1):57-69. doi:10.1046/J.0305-
1081 1846.2003.00511.X
- 1082 77. Bernardo A, Harrison FE, McCord M, et al. Elimination of GD3 synthase improves memory
1083 and reduces amyloid- β plaque load in transgenic mice. *Neurobiol Aging.* 2009;30(11):1777-
1084 1791. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROBIOLAGING.2007.12.022
- 1085 78. Hamano M, Ichinose T, Yasuda T, et al. Bioinformatics Analysis of the Molecular Networks
1086 Associated with the Amelioration of Aberrant Gene Expression by a Tyr-Trp Dipeptide in
1087 Brains Treated with the Amyloid- β Peptide. *Nutrients.* 2023;15(12):2731.
1088 doi:10.3390/NU15122731/S1
- 1089 79. Galiano MR, Goitea VE, Hallak ME. Post-translational protein arginylation in the normal
1090 nervous system and in neurodegeneration. *J Neurochem.* 2016;138(4):506-517.
1091 doi:10.1111/JNC.13708
- 1092 80. Wesenhagen KEJ, Gobom J, Bos I, et al. Effects of age, amyloid, sex, and APOE ϵ 4 on the CSF
1093 proteome in normal cognition. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease*
1094 *Monitoring.* 2022;14(1):e12286. doi:10.1002/DAD2.12286
- 1095 81. Do AN, Ali M, Timsina J, et al. CSF proteomic profiling with amyloid/tau positivity identifies
1096 distinctive sex-different alteration of multiple proteins involved in Alzheimer's disease.
1097 *medRxiv.* Published online March 16, 2024:2024.03.15.24304164.
1098 doi:10.1101/2024.03.15.24304164
- 1099 82. Lambert JC, Ibrahim-Verbaas CA, Harold D, et al. Meta-analysis of 74,046 individuals
1100 identifies 11 new susceptibility loci for Alzheimer's disease. *Nature Genetics* 2013 45:12.
1101 2013;45(12):1452-1458. doi:10.1038/ng.2802
- 1102 83. Lambert JC, Heath S, Even G, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies variants at CLU
1103 and CR1 associated with Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Genet.* 2009;41(10):1094-1100.
1104 doi:10.1038/ng.439
- 1105 84. Harold D, Abraham R, Hollingworth P, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies variants
1106 at CLU and PICALM associated with Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Genet.* 2009;41(10):1088-1093.
1107 doi:10.1038/ng.440
- 1108 85. Corder EH, Saunders AM, Gaskell PC, et al. Gene Dose of Apolipoprotein E Type 4 Allele and
1109 the Risk of Alzheimer's Disease in Late Onset Families. *Science (1979).* 1993;261:921-923.
1110 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.8346443>
- 1111 86. Chapuis J, Flaig A, Grenier-Boley B, et al. Genome-wide, high-content siRNA screening
1112 identifies the Alzheimer's genetic risk factor FERMT2 as a major modulator of APP
1113 metabolism. *Acta Neuropathol.* 2017;133(6):955-966. doi:10.1007/S00401-016-1652-
1114 Z/FIGURES/5
- 1115 87. Calero M, Rostagno A, Matsubara E, Zlokovic B, Frangione B, Ghiso J. Apolipoprotein J
1116 (Clusterin) and Alzheimer's Disease. *Microsc Res Tech.* 2000;50:305-315.
- 1117 88. Harper JD, Fan KH, Aslam MM, et al. Genome-Wide Association Study of Incident Dementia
1118 in a Community-Based Sample of Older Subjects. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease.*
1119 2022;88(2):787-798. doi:10.3233/JAD-220293


- 1120 89. Goudet C, Magnaghi V, Landry M, Nagy F, Gereau IV RW, Pin JP. Metabotropic receptors for
1121 glutamate and GABA in pain. *Brain Res Rev.* 2009;60(1):43-56.
1122 doi:10.1016/J.BRAINRESREV.2008.12.007
- 1123 90. Chen CH, Lee CS, Lee MTM, et al. Variant GADL1 and Response to Lithium Therapy in
1124 Bipolar I Disorder . *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2014;370(2):119-128.
1125 doi:10.1056/NEJMOA1212444
- 1126 91. Li S, Mallory M, Alford M, Tanaka S, Masliah E. Glutamate Transporter Alterations in
1127 Alzheimer Disease Are Possibly Associated with Abnormal APP Expression. *J Neuropathol*
1128 *Exp Neurol.* 1997;56(8):901-911. doi:10.1097/00005072-199708000-00008
- 1129 92. Molinuevo JL, Lladó A, Rami L. Memantine: Targeting glutamate excitotoxicity in Alzheimer's
1130 disease and other dementias. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/153331750502000206>. 2005;20(2):77-
1131 85. doi:10.1177/153331750502000206
- 1132 93. Domschke K, Hohoff C, Jacob C, et al. Chromosome 4q31-34 panic disorder risk locus:
1133 Association of neuropeptide Y Y5 receptor variants. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part*
1134 *B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics.* 2008;147B(4):510-516. doi:10.1002/AJMG.B.30629
- 1135 94. Otowa T, Kawamura Y, Nishida N, et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies for
1136 panic disorder in the Japanese population. *Transl Psychiatry.* 2012;2(11):1-8.
1137 doi:10.1038/TP.2012.89
- 1138 95. Strozyk D, Blennow K, White LR, Launer LJ. CSF A β 42 levels correlate with amyloid-
1139 neuropathology in a population-based autopsy study. *Neurology.* 2003;60(4):652-656.
1140 doi:10.1212/01.WNL.0000046581.81650.D0
- 1141 96. Sabri O, Sabbagh MN, Seibyl J, et al. Florbetaben PET imaging to detect amyloid beta plaques
1142 in Alzheimer's disease: Phase 3 study. *Alzheimer's & Dementia.* 2015;11(8):964-974.
1143 doi:10.1016/J.JALZ.2015.02.004
- 1144 97. Remnestål J, Öijerstedt L, Ullgren A, et al. Altered levels of CSF proteins in patients with FTD,
1145 presymptomatic mutation carriers and non-carriers. *Transl Neurodegener.* 2020;9(1):1-13.
1146 doi:10.1186/S40035-020-00198-Y
- 1147 98. Erhardt A, Akula N, Schumacher J, et al. Replication and meta-analysis of TMEM132D gene
1148 variants in panic disorder. *Transl Psychiatry.* 2012;2(9):1-6. doi:10.1038/TP.2012.85
- 1149 99. Haaker J, Lonsdorf TB, Raczka KA, Mechias ML, Gartmann N, Kalisch R. Higher anxiety and
1150 larger amygdala volumes in carriers of a TMEM132D risk variant for panic disorder. *Transl*
1151 *Psychiatry.* 2014;4(2):1-2. doi:10.1038/TP.2014.1
- 1152 100. Trubetskoy V, Pardiñas AF, Qi T, et al. Mapping genomic loci implicates genes and synaptic
1153 biology in schizophrenia. *Nature* 2022 604:7906. 2022;604(7906):502-508.
1154 doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04434-5
- 1155 101. Mattsson N, Insel PS, Donohue M, et al. Independent information from cerebrospinal fluid
1156 amyloid- β and florbetapir imaging in Alzheimer's disease. *Brain.* 2015;138(3):772-783.
1157 doi:10.1093/BRAIN/AWU367
- 1158 102. Blennow K, Mattsson N, Schöll M, Hansson O, Zetterberg H. Amyloid biomarkers in
1159 Alzheimer's disease. *Trends Pharmacol Sci.* 2015;36(5):297-309.
1160 doi:10.1016/J.TIPS.2015.03.002

- 1161 103. Reimand J, Boon BDC, Collij LE, et al. Amyloid- β PET and CSF in an autopsy-confirmed
1162 cohort. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol*. 2020;7(11):2150-2160. doi:10.1002/ACN3.51195
- 1163 104. Kumar A, Janelidze S, Stomrud E, Palmqvist S, Hansson O, Mattsson-Carlsson N. β -Amyloid-
1164 Dependent and -Independent Genetic Pathways Regulating CSF Tau Biomarkers in Alzheimer
1165 Disease. *Neurology*. 2022;99(5):E476-E487. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000200605
- 1166 105. Jansen IE, Savage JE, Watanabe K, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis identifies new loci and
1167 functional pathways influencing Alzheimer's disease risk. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(3):404-413.
1168 doi:10.1038/S41588-018-0311-9
- 1169 106. Hong S, Prokopenko D, Dobricic V, et al. Genome-wide association study of Alzheimer's
1170 disease CSF biomarkers in the EMIF-AD Multimodal Biomarker Discovery dataset. *Transl*
1171 *Psychiatry*. 17:41. doi:10.1038/s41398-020-01074-z
- 1172 107. Bader JM, Geyer PE, Müller JB, et al. Proteome profiling in cerebrospinal fluid reveals novel
1173 biomarkers of Alzheimer's disease. *Mol Syst Biol*. 2020;16(6):e9356.
1174 doi:10.15252/MSB.20199356
- 1175 108. Hyman BT. Amyloid-Dependent and Amyloid-Independent Stages of Alzheimer Disease. *Arch*
1176 *Neurol*. 2011;68(8):1062-1064. doi:10.1001/ARCHNEUROL.2011.70
- 1177 109. Leonenko G, Shoai M, Bellou E, et al. Genetic risk for alzheimer disease is distinct from genetic
1178 risk for amyloid deposition. *Ann Neurol*. 2019;86(3):427-435. doi:10.1002/ANA.25530
- 1179 110. Asada-Utsugi M, Uemura K, Noda Y, et al. N-cadherin enhances APP dimerization at the
1180 extracellular domain and modulates A β production. *J Neurochem*. 2011;119(2):354-363.
1181 doi:10.1111/J.1471-4159.2011.07364.X
- 1182 111. Terry RD, Masliah E, Salmon DP, et al. Physical basis of cognitive alterations in Alzheimer's
1183 disease: synapse loss is the major correlate of cognitive impairment. *Ann Neurol*.
1184 1991;30(4):572-580. doi:10.1002/ANA.410300410
- 1185 112. Uemura T. The cadherin superfamily at the synapse: More members, more missions. *Cell*.
1186 1998;93(7):1095-1098. doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(00)81452-X
- 1187 113. Wu X, Reddy DS. Integrins as receptor targets for neurological disorders. *Pharmacol Ther*.
1188 2012;134(1):68-81. doi:10.1016/J.PHARMTHERA.2011.12.008
- 1189 114. Bensamoun D, Guignard R, Furst AJ, et al. Associations between Neuropsychiatric Symptoms
1190 and Cerebral Amyloid Deposition in Cognitively Impaired Elderly People. *Journal of*
1191 *Alzheimer's Disease*. 2016;49(2):387-398. doi:10.3233/JAD-150181
- 1192 115. Kuo HC, Yen HC, Huang CC, Hsu WC, Wei HJ, Lin CL. Cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers for
1193 neuropsychological symptoms in early stage of late-onset Alzheimer's disease.
1194 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/002074542014971787>. 2014;125(10):747-754.
1195 doi:10.3109/00207454.2014.971787
- 1196 116. Cai WJ, Tian Y, Ma YH, Dong Q, Tan L, Yu JT. Associations of Anxiety with Amyloid, Tau,
1197 and Neurodegeneration in Older Adults without Dementia: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of*
1198 *Alzheimer's Disease*. 2021;82(1):273-283. doi:10.3233/jad-210020
- 1199 117. Lahiri DK, Maloney B, Wang R, Sokol DK, Rogers JT, Westmark CJ. How autism and
1200 Alzheimer's disease are TrAPPed. *Molecular Psychiatry* 2020 26:1. 2020;26(1):26-29.
1201 doi:10.1038/s41380-020-00928-8

- 1202 118. Liu F, Arias-Vásquez A, Slegers K, et al. A genomewide screen for late-onset Alzheimer
1203 disease in a genetically isolated Dutch population. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2007;81(1):17-31.
1204 doi:10.1086/518720
- 1205 119. Li Z, Liu L, Lin W, et al. NRG3 contributes to cognitive deficits in chronic patients with
1206 schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res.* 2020;215:134-139. doi:10.1016/J.SCHRES.2019.10.060
- 1207 120. Hollingworth P, Sweet R, Sims R, et al. Genome-wide association study of Alzheimer's disease
1208 with psychotic symptoms. *Molecular Psychiatry* 2012 17:12. 2011;17(12):1316-1327.
1209 doi:10.1038/mp.2011.125
- 1210 121. Wang KS, Xu N, Wang L, et al. NRG3 gene is associated with the risk and age at onset of
1211 Alzheimer disease. *J Neural Transm.* 2014;121(2):183-192. doi:10.1007/S00702-013-1091-0
- 1212 122. Morar B, Dragović M, Waters FAV, Chandler D, Kalaydjieva L, Jablensky A. Neuregulin 3
1213 (NRG3) as a susceptibility gene in a schizophrenia subtype with florid delusions and relatively
1214 spared cognition. *Molecular Psychiatry* 2011 16:8. 2010;16(8):860-866.
1215 doi:10.1038/mp.2010.70
- 1216 123. Zhang T, Zhu L, Ni T, et al. Voltage-gated calcium channel activity and complex related genes
1217 and schizophrenia: A systematic investigation based on Han Chinese population. *J Psychiatr*
1218 *Res.* 2018;106:99-105. doi:10.1016/J.JPSYCHIRES.2018.09.020
- 1219 124. Potkin SG, Turner JA, Guffanti G, et al. A Genome-Wide Association Study of Schizophrenia
1220 Using Brain Activation as a Quantitative Phenotype. *Schizophr Bull.* 2009;35(1):96-108.
1221 doi:10.1093/SCHBUL/SBN155
- 1222 125. Suda S, Iwata K, Shimmura C, et al. Decreased expression of axon-guidance receptors in the
1223 anterior cingulate cortex in autism. *Mol Autism.* 2011;2(1):1-5. doi:10.1186/2040-2392-2-14
- 1224 126. Zuko A, Kleijer KTE, Oguro-Ando A, et al. Contactins in the neurobiology of autism. *Eur J*
1225 *Pharmacol.* 2013;719(1-3):63-74. doi:10.1016/J.EJPHAR.2013.07.016
- 1226 127. Tosto G, Fu H, Vardarajan BN, et al. F-box/LRR-repeat protein 7 is genetically associated with
1227 Alzheimer's disease. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.* 2015;2(8):810-820. doi:10.1002/ACN3.223
- 1228 128. Dauar MT, Labonté A, Picard C, et al. Characterization of the contactin 5 protein and its risk-
1229 associated polymorphic variant throughout the Alzheimer's disease spectrum. *Alzheimer's &*
1230 *Dementia.* Published online 2022:1-15. doi:10.1002/ALZ.12868
- 1231 129. Cano A, Esteban-de-Antonio E, Bernuz M, et al. Plasma extracellular vesicles reveal early
1232 molecular differences in amyloid positive patients with early-onset mild cognitive impairment.
1233 *J Nanobiotechnology.* 2023;21(1):1-19. doi:10.1186/S12951-023-01793-7
- 1234 130. Van Der Meer D, Kaufmann T, Shadrin AA, et al. The genetic architecture of human cortical
1235 folding. *Sci Adv.* 2021;7(51):9446. doi:10.1126/SCIADV.ABJ9446
- 1236 131. Borenstein M, Hedges L V., Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. Introduction to meta-analysis.
1237 *Introduction to Meta-Analysis.* Published online January 1, 2009:1-421.
1238 doi:10.1002/9780470743386
- 1239 132. Yoon S, Baik B, Park T, Nam D. Powerful p-value combination methods to detect incomplete
1240 association. *Scientific Reports* 2021 11:1. 2021;11(1):1-11. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-86465-y
- 1241
- 1242

1243


1244



1245

1246 **Figure 1. Plots of the $A\beta$ burden meta-analysis combining data of CSF-PET endophenotypes.** A) (upper) Manhattan plot of
 1247 our CSF-PET meta-analysis (n=2,076). Results were filtered according effect size direction and dataset missingness.
 1248 Suggestive independent markers were annotated with the nearest gene name. Mapped genes coloured in grey represent those
 1249 that were not replicated in the PAD CSF-PET meta-GWAS. (lower) Manhattan plot of the PAD CSF-PET meta-analysis
 1250 filtered (n=23,532). Genome-wide significant independent markers were annotated with the nearest gene name. The Y-axis
 1251 was restricted to visualize suggestive signals. The genome-wide significance threshold was set to $P < 5e-08$ (red line) and the
 1252 suggestive threshold was set to $P < 1e-05$ (blue line). B) Venn diagram representing the overlap between the top 500 ranking
 1253 of independent genetic markers comparing the PAD and our amyloid burden meta-analysis. C) Venn diagram representing
 1254 the overlap between the top 500 ranking of independent genes in the PAD and our gene-based analysis.

1255




1256

1257 **Figure 2. Forest plot of the meta-analysis association between the AD PRS. A) CSF A β 42, and B) A β PET endophenotypes.**

1258 The significance threshold was set to 0.05.

1259

1260




1261

1262 **Figure 3. Forest plot of the meta-analysis association between the AD PRS and dementia status as case-control. In ACE**

1263 **(305 cases and 703 controls, 30.25%), ADNI1 (94 cases and 285 controls, 24.80%) and ADNI2GO cohorts (27 cases and 385**

1264 **controls, 6.55%).**

1265



1266

1267 **Figure 4. Forest plot of the association between the AD, A β PRS and case-control status. PRS for AD (76 SNPs from**


1268 **Bellenguez et al., 2022) and A β 42 (30 SNPs from Jansen et al., 2022, 9 SNPs from our meta-analysis). The GR@ACE cohort**

1269 **included 8110 cases and 9640 controls.**

1270


1271

1272



1273

1274 **Figure 5. Associations between CSF SOMAscan and CSF A β 42 levels.** A) Volcano plot only considering proteins with good
1275 inter-assay correlation ($n=2,682$), significant proteins ($FDR < 1.864e-05$) were highlighted in red ($n=1,387$). B) Top 10
1276 results of the enrichment analysis of significant protein associations with CSF A β 42 levels using the WebGestalt tool.



1277

1278 **Figure 6. Overlapping loci/proteins in genomic and proteomic analysis.** A) Venn diagram of the top 500 ranking of CSF
 1279 *Aβ42*-associated proteins in the SOMAScan panel (orange), our gene-based MAGMA analysis (red), GWAS of CSF *Aβ42*
 1280 (Jansen et al., 2022) (dark blue) and our amyloid burden meta-analysis of filtered CSF-PET endophenotypes (light blue). B)
 1281 Venn diagram of the top 500 ranking of CSF *Aβ42*-associated proteins in the SOMAScan panel (orange), PAD gene-based
 1282 MAGMA meta-analysis (red) and PAD amyloid burden meta-analysis of filtered CSF-PET endophenotypes (light blue). C)
 1283 Top 10 enrichment analysis results of the overlapping proteins between our genomic and proteomic analyses. C) Top 10
 1284 enrichment analysis results of the overlapping proteins between proteomic and PAD genomic analyses. The analysis was done
 1285 using the WebGestalt tool.

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293 **Table 1. Results of the genome wide meta-analysis filtered combining CSF and PET endophenotypes (4.9% of total SNPs).**

1294 **Bold: significant results $P < 5e-08$ with consistent effect direction.**

rsID	SNP	Nearest Gene	REF	ALT	A1	FreqA1	Call Rate	n	Zscore	P-value	Direction
rs429358	19:45411941	APOE (0 kb)	T	C	C	0.211	1.000	2076	-17.259	9.50E-67	----++
rs78402940	2:59125664	FLJ30838 (0 kb)	A	G	G	0.089	0.999	1979	-4.849	1.24E-06	--?-++
rs62354504	5:36361976	RANBP3L (59.96 kb)	G	A	A	0.027	0.999	1262	-4.807	1.53E-06	?-?-+?
rs62340552	4:180023617	NA	C	T	T	0.041	0.993	1798	-4.582	4.61E-06	--?-+?
rs2902373	11:43637563	MIR129-2 (34.53 kb)	C	T	T	0.222	0.993	2076	-4.571	4.84E-06	----++
rs73141455	7:78648931	MAGI2 (0 kb)	G	T	T	0.038	0.995	1798	-4.555	5.24E-06	--?-+?
rs115822934	4:164308011	NPY5R (34.92 kb)	G	T	T	0.032	0.998	1798	-4.448	8.65E-06	++?+?-?
rs1523589	18:30242590	KLHL14 (-10.04 kb)	C	A	A	0.201	0.996	2076	-4.440	8.99E-06	++++--
rs4395536	4:168504316	NA	A	G	G	0.914	0.987	1979	-4.435	9.23E-06	++?+--
rs11963901	6:155436138	TIAM2 (0 kb)	C	T	T	0.106	0.999	1979	-4.434	9.23E-06	--?-++

Note: Meta-analysis was performed using a sample size weighted method without considering effect size direction and filtered by effect size and data availability in at least half of each endophenotypes cohorts. Reference SNP (rs) code for the SNP: rsID, Genetic markers in GRCh37/hg19 genomic assembly: SNP, Reference allele: REF, Alternative allele: ALT, Effect allele: A1, Sample size: n.

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308 **Table 2. Gene-based MAGMA results from FUMA analysis considering genome-wide significant results $P < 4.235e-06$.**

Gene	EntrezID	UniProtID	CHR	Start	Stop	n SNPS	Zscore	P-value
NECTIN2	5819	Q92692	19	45349432	45392485	37	7.787	3.442E-15
APOE	348	P02649	19	45409011	45412650	4	7.282	1.648E-13
APOC1	341	P02654	19	45417504	45422606	5	6.774	6.278E-12
CSMD1	64478	Q96PZ7	8	2792875	4852494	929	6.437	6.076E-11
TOMM40	10452	O96008	19	45393826	45406946	24	6.109	5.000E-10
WWOX	51741	Q9NZC7	16	78133310	79246564	323	5.566	1.307E-08
LHPP	64077	Q9H008	10	126150403	126306457	153	5.507	1.822E-08
BCL3	602	P20749	19	45250962	45263301	6	5.449	2.540E-08
CNTN5	53942	O94779	11	98891683	100229616	556	5.358	4.217E-08
TENM3	55714	Q9P273	4	183065140	183724177	114	5.312	5.432E-08
PTPRD	5789	P23468	9	8314246	10612723	332	5.258	7.272E-08
TIAM2	26230	Q8IVF5	6	155153831	155578857	60	5.243	7.904E-08
RBFOX1	54715	Q9NWB1	16	6069095	7763340	382	5.079	1.900E-07
GPC5	2262	P78333	13	92050929	93519490	275	4.956	3.604E-07
RORA	6095	P35398	15	60780483	61521518	185	4.827	6.948E-07
MACROD2	140733	A1Z1Q3	20	13976015	16033842	354	4.787	8.471E-07
TMEM132D	121256	Q14C87	12	129556270	130388211	205	4.759	9.717E-07
CDH13	1012	P55290	16	82660408	83830204	315	4.592	2.201E-06
LRP1B	53353	Q9NZR2	2	140988992	142889270	318	4.549	2.696E-06
KIR3DX1	90011	Q9H7L2	19	55043909	55057053	9	4.487	3.616E-06
FAM53B	9679	Q14153	10	126307861	126432838	42	4.479	3.751E-06

Chromosome: CHR, Number of SNPs: NSNP, Sample size: n, Entrez Gene Identifier: EntrezID, UniProt Swiss Protein Identifier: UniProtID.

1309