

1 SUPPLEMENTAL TEXT

2 1 Causal eQTL Fine-mapping Functional Annotations

3 1.1 Brain: *MTCH2*

4 We retained the strength of our initially identified AD-TWAS association with *MTCH2*
5 genetically-regulated expression using the causal eQTLs identified by SuSiE [1] fine-
6 mapping and later applied to the OTTERS pipeline. While all OTTERS methods
7 produced models that were significantly associated with AD, the most parsimonious
8 model was generated by the lassosum method which retained only a single causal
9 eQTL ($p_{\text{Lassosum}} = 3.53 \times 10^{-8}$; $z_{\text{Lassosum}} = -5.51$). This causal eQTL
10 (chr11_47594246_G_C_b38; Effect Size = 0.30) was positively associated with *MTCH2*
11 expression and falls with several epigenomic marks associated with active enhancers
12 and promoters including H3K4me1, H3K4me3, H3K9ac, H3K27ac, and regions of open-
13 chromatin (DNase-seq, ATAC-seq, ChIA-PET CTCF peaks) based on FILER
14 annotations.

15 Previously, Gockley et al. 2021 found *MTCH2* genetically-regulated gene expression
16 was negatively associated with AD risk (Model: bsImm; $z_{\text{TWAS}} = -5.73$; $p_{\text{TWAS}} = 1.02 \times 10^{-8}$) [2]. In this study, researchers used six neo-cortical brain tissues ($N_{\text{RNA-seq}} = 888$)
17 and five different genetically-regulated expression modeling approaches (blup, bsImm,
18 lasso, top1, and enet) for Stage I of the AD-TWAS. Notably, the training sample used in
19 this prior study is approximately 34% of the size of the MetaBrain Brain_Cortex dataset
20 ($N = 2,683$) [2,3]. We further investigated whether any of the identified causal eQTLs
21 either identified by SuSiE and/or later selected by the OTTERS modeling methods using
22 the fine-mapped causal eQTLs overlapped with the reported variants included in the
23

24 models produced by Gockley et al. 2021 [2]. We lifted down the credible causal eQTLs
25 identified initially using SuSiE fine-mapping and the set of variants selected by the
26 OTTERS modeling approaches using the UCSC browser ([https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-](https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgLiftOver)
27 [bin/hgLiftOver](https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgLiftOver)) with the original assembly as GRCh38/hg38 and the new assembly
28 GRCh37/hg19. We downloaded the available models (GRCh37) from this prior work
29 using the following link
30 ([https://adknowledgeportal.synapse.org/Explore/Studies/DetailsPage?Study=syn223137](https://adknowledgeportal.synapse.org/Explore/Studies/DetailsPage?Study=syn22313785)
31 [85](https://adknowledgeportal.synapse.org/Explore/Studies/DetailsPage?Study=syn22313785)). For *MTCH2*, none of the identified causal eQTLs initially identified by SuSiE and/or
32 later used by the OTTERS approach were found within any of the five models produced
33 by Gockley et al. 2021. These results illustrate the importance of fine-mapping causal
34 eQTL variants to understand the key variants driving TWAS associations.

35 1.2 Brain: *CYB561*

36 The *CYB561* OTTERS association was driven originally by the SDPR approach
37 modeling 1,616 SNPs (ACAT- O_{CON} $p = 1.99 \times 10^{-33}$; $p_{SDPR_CON} = 3.98 \times 10^{-34}$; $z_{SDPR} = -9.83$;
38 $R^2_{SDPR} = 28.1\%$). Fine-mapping identified seven credible sets each containing a single
39 causal eQTL SNP. OTTERS analysis of these SNPs identified a six SNP SDPR model
40 with nearly identical performance ($R^2_{SDPR} = 24\%$) and produced a TWAS result of similar
41 significance ($p_{SDPR} = 1.8 \times 10^{-20}$; $z_{SDPR} = -9.3$) We further explored the functional
42 annotations associated with the six SNPs within the SDPR model. There were two
43 SNPs (chr17_62990456_A_T_b38 & chr17_63325078_G_A_b38) that were positively
44 associated with *CYB561* expression and these SNPs shared H3K4me1 marks
45 indicating active or poised enhancers. In comparison, the remaining four SNPs were
46 negatively associated with the expression of *CYB561* and while they all shared

47 H3K36me3 histone marks, which are general indicators of active transcription and
48 prevention of spurious transcription initiation, they also all shared markers of
49 heterochromatin with histone marks of either H3K9me3 (chr17_63111035_G_A_b38,
50 chr17_63183402_G_A_b38, and chr17_63222967_C_T_b38) or H3K27me3
51 (chr17_63323907_G_A_b38). Overall, these results highlight the biological complexity
52 that may be underlying why these variants are associated with changes in *CYB561*
53 expression.

54 1.3 Brain: *ZNF439*

55 The OTTERS association for *ZNF439* was driven by the lassosum approach, which
56 originally modeled 1,336 SNPs. This model yielded a highly significant association to
57 AD (ACAT-O_{CON} $p = 2.21 \times 10^{-52}$; $p_{\text{Lassosum_CON}} = 1.1 \times 10^{-52}$; $z_{\text{Lassosum}} = 9.94$; $R^2_{\text{Lassosum}} =$
58 5.7%). Through causal eQTL fine-mapping, we identified five credible sets each
59 containing a single causal eQTL and subsequent application of these SNPs to the
60 OTTERS approach led to the generation of a four SNP lassosum model demonstrating
61 slightly reduced model performance in terms of variance explained ($R^2_{\text{Lassosum}} = 5.0\%$)
62 but further strengthened the association to AD ($p_{\text{Lassosum}} = 3.79 \times 10^{-97}$; $z_{\text{Lassosum}} = 20.92$).
63 We further explored the functional annotations associated with the four SNPs within the
64 lassosum model. There were two SNPs (chr19_11890134_C_T_b38 &
65 chr19_11896203_G_C_b38) that were positively associated with *ZNF439* expression
66 and these SNPs shared H3K36me3 marks indicative of active transcription. In addition,
67 chr19_11890134_C_T_b38 was also enriched for several other markers of active
68 enhancers and promoters such as H3K27ac, H3K4me1, H3K4me3, and H3K9ac. In
69 comparison, the remaining two SNPs were negatively associated with the expression of

70 *ZNF439* and all shared H3K9me3 markers which are indicative of transcriptionally
71 repressive heterochromatin regions. Of note, one of the positively associated SNPs
72 (chr19_11896203_G_C_b38) also had annotations for H3K9me3 indicating the
73 epigenomic regulation of this SNP is complex.

74

75 1.4 Blood: *MYBPC3*

76 Fine-mapping of *MYBPC3* yielded four credible sets each containing a single causal
77 eQTL. Restricting the OTTERS method to the credible causal eQTLs, the SDPR,
78 lassosum, and PRS-CS modeling approaches were able to explain only a negligible
79 proportion of gene expression, falling short of our $R^2 > 1\%$ filtering threshold. In contrast,
80 the P+T methods used a two-SNP model and maintained a statistically significant
81 positive association with AD risk ($p_{P+T_{0.001}} = 6.48 \times 10^{-44}$, $z_{P+T_{0.001}} = 13.9$, $R^2_{P+T_{0.001}} = 1\%$).
82 In terms of the functional relevance of these SNPs, chr11_47403380_G_A_b38 was
83 positively associated with the expression of *MYBPC3* and this location corresponds with
84 several epigenetic markers of active enhancers/promoters such as H3K27ac,
85 H3K4me1, H3K9ac. The second SNP chr11_47433036_G_A_b38 selected by the P+T
86 approaches was negatively associated with the expression of *MYBPC3* and, while this
87 location is associated with heterochromatin marks (i.e., H3K9me3), we also found some
88 markers of active transcription (H3K4me3, H3K36me3), which suggests location is not
89 sufficient alone to understand the full functional impact of this SNPs. Overall, this result
90 illustrated how fine-mapping the causal eQTLs within a TWAS association could lead
91 sparse genetic models that were sufficiently powered to generate a similar strength
92 TWAS associations that were otherwise lost by the original method.

93 2 Elucidating the role of AD-TWAS associations

94 2.1 Brain: *CYB561*

95 *CYB561* (Cytochrome B561) is a transmembrane monodehydroascorbate reductase
96 that serves a vital role in ascorbate-dehydroascorbate recycling within catecholamine
97 secretory vesicles in order to produce norepinephrine (NE) from dopamine [6]. In our
98 study, we found a negative association between the genetically regulated expression of
99 *CYB561* and AD risk (ACAT-O_{CON} $p = 1.99 \times 10^{-33}$) and validated that significantly lower
100 levels of *CYB561* were found in AD brains relative to controls (t-test $p = 2.26 \times 10^{-7}$). In
101 terms of the functional roles of *CYB561*, individuals with homozygous pathogenic
102 mutations within *CYB561* have been found to present with life-threatening orthostatic
103 hypotension, recurrent hypoglycemia, and low levels of norepinephrine [6]. Interestingly,
104 knockout *CYB561* mice displayed significantly reduced whole brain levels of
105 norepinephrine [6]. In addition, another study found using the *Drosophila* mutant *nemy*,
106 which is the *CYB561* homologue, that reduced levels of *nemy* lead to learning and
107 memory deficits [7]. Previous studies have supported the role of NE in AD, as
108 researchers have found that the locus coeruleus (LC) which produces NE is one of the
109 first brain regions that degenerates during early stages of AD and that this loss
110 corresponds with memory impairment [8]. Moreover, several *in vitro* studies have found
111 decreased amyloid-beta toxicity and increased cell viability in the presence of dopamine
112 and NE which further supports the therapeutic potential of NE modulation in AD [9].
113 Overall, our results provide an additional line of evidence to support the mechanistic
114 role of NE in AD risk and motivate further studies to assess the role of *CYB561*
115 expression in AD pathogenesis.

116 2.2 Brain: *C3orf62*

117 *C3orf62* (Chromosome 3 Open Reading Frame 62) is a protein-coding gene associated
118 with spermatogenesis and male fertility. In our study, we found a positive association
119 between the genetically regulated expression of *C3orf62* and AD risk (ACAT-O_{CON}
120 $p=2.25\times 10^{-59}$; $z_{\text{LASSOSUM}} = 10.63$; $R^2_{\text{LASSOSUM}} = 2.3\%$) and validated that significantly
121 higher expression levels of *C3orf62* were found in AD brains relative to controls (Mean
122 Difference [Case vs. Controls]=0.024; t-test $p=3.7\times 10^{-4}$). While little is known about the
123 role of *C3orf62*, one study exploring the spatiotemporal brain transcriptome through
124 various states of human development found *C3orf62* to exhibit female-sex biased
125 differential gene expression in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and medial prefrontal
126 cortex during prenatal development [10]. In another study, two TWAS approaches
127 PrediXcan and MetaXcan identified significant associations between the genetically-
128 regulated expression of *C3orf62* and the chronic inflammatory condition Crohn's
129 Disease (CD) [11]. Finally, when we searched the GWAS catalog, several associations
130 between variants within or near *C3orf62* are associated with depression. Overall, the
131 limited information available about *C3orf62* requires further *in vitro* and *in vivo*
132 exploration for how its expression may be related to AD.

133 2.3 Brain: *LYSMD4*

134 *LYSMD4* (LysM Domain Containing 4) is predicted to encode for an integral membrane
135 component. In our study, we found a negative association between the genetically
136 regulated expression of *LYSMD4* and AD risk (ACAT-O_{CON} $p = 5.58\times 10^{-26}$; $z_{\text{SDPR}} = -8.63$;
137 $R^2_{\text{SDPR}} = 17.5\%$) and validated that significantly lower expression levels of *LYSMD4*
138 were found in AD brains relative to controls (Mean Difference [Case vs. Controls] = -

139 0.02; t-test $p=1.79\times 10^{-5}$). There is little known about the role of *LYSMD4* in the brain.
140 One study by Lorenzi et al. 2018 explored the functional genetic mechanisms of brain
141 atrophy in AD and identified a SNP (rs1808723) within *LYSMD4* that was negatively
142 associated within tibial nerve tissue to brain atrophy ($p=2.9\times 10^{-24}$; Effect size = -0.66;
143 SE=0.057) [12]. Another study performed an epigenome-wide association of stroke
144 outcome and found a nominally significant association ($p=9.75\times 10^{-6}$) between a CpG
145 methylation site within 200 bp of the transcription start site of *LYSMD4* and stroke
146 outcome during the discovery phase of the analysis (N=643), but this finding did not
147 replicate (N=62) [13]. Overall, the role of *LYSMD4* in the brain remains unclear.
148 Therefore, further studies are needed to elucidate the function of *LYSMD4* and its
149 association with AD.

150

151 **SUPPLEMENTAL TEXT REFERENCES**

- 152 [1] Wang G, Sarkar A, Carbonetto P, Stephens M. A simple new approach to variable
153 selection in regression, with application to genetic fine mapping. *J R Stat Soc Ser B*
154 *Stat Methodol* 2020;82:1273–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12388>.
- 155 [2] Gockley J, Montgomery KS, Poehlman WL, Wiley JC, Liu Y, Gerasimov E, et al.
156 Multi-tissue neocortical transcriptome-wide association study implicates 8 genes
157 across 6 genomic loci in Alzheimer’s disease. *Genome Med* 2021;13:76.
158 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-021-00890-2>.
- 159 [3] de Klein N, Tsai EA, Vochteloo M, Baird D, Huang Y, Chen C-Y, et al. Brain
160 expression quantitative trait locus and network analyses reveal downstream effects
161 and putative drivers for brain-related diseases. *Nat Genet* 2023;55:377–88.
162 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-023-01300-6>.
- 163 [4] Bellenguez C, Küçükali F, Jansen IE, Kleindam L, Moreno-Grau S, Amin N, et al.
164 New insights into the genetic etiology of Alzheimer’s disease and related
165 dementias. *Nat Genet* 2022;54:412–36. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01024-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01024-z)
166 [z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01024-z).
- 167 [5] Kunkle BW, Grenier-Boley B, Sims R, Bis JC, Damotte V, Naj AC, et al. Genetic
168 meta-analysis of diagnosed Alzheimer’s disease identifies new risk loci and
169 implicates A β , tau, immunity and lipid processing. *Nat Genet* 2019;51:414–30.
170 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0358-2>.
- 171 [6] van den Berg MP, Almomani R, Biaggioni I, van Faassen M, van der Harst P, Silljé
172 HHW, et al. Mutations in CYB561 Causing a Novel Orthostatic Hypotension

173 Syndrome. *Circ Res* 2018;122:846–54.
174 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.311949>.

175 [7] Iliadi KG, Avivi A, Iliadi NN, Knight D, Korol AB, Nevo E, et al. nemy encodes a
176 cytochrome b561 that is required for Drosophila learning and memory. *Proc Natl*
177 *Acad Sci U S A* 2008;105:19986–91. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0810698105>.

178 [8] Gutiérrez IL, Dello Russo C, Novellino F, Caso JR, García-Bueno B, Leza JC, et al.
179 Noradrenaline in Alzheimer’s Disease: A New Potential Therapeutic Target. *Int J*
180 *Mol Sci* 2022;23:6143. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms23116143>.

181 [9] Allnutt MA, Matera KM. Stabilization and Reduced Cytotoxicity of Amyloid Beta
182 Aggregates in the Presence of Catechol Neurotransmitters. *Neurochem Res*
183 2024;49:379–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11064-023-04036-1>.

184 [10] Kang HJ, Kawasawa YI, Cheng F, Zhu Y, Xu X, Li M, et al. Spatiotemporal
185 transcriptome of the human brain. *Nature* 2011;478:483–9.
186 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10523>.

187 [11] Fryett JJ, Inshaw J, Morris AP, Cordell HJ. Comparison of methods for
188 transcriptome imputation through application to two common complex diseases.
189 *Eur J Hum Genet EJHG* 2018;26:1658–67. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-018-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-018-0176-5)
190 [0176-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-018-0176-5).

191 [12] Lorenzi M, Altmann A, Gutman B, Wray S, Arber C, Hibar DP, et al. Susceptibility of
192 brain atrophy to TRIB3 in Alzheimer’s disease, evidence from functional
193 prioritization in imaging genetics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2018;115:3162–7.
194 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706100115>.

195 [13] Cullell N, Soriano-Tárraga C, Gallego-Fábrega C, Cárcel-Márquez J, Muiño E,
196 Lluçà-Carol L, et al. Altered methylation pattern in EXOC4 is associated with
197 stroke outcome: an epigenome-wide association study. *Clin Epigenetics*
198 2022;14:124. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13148-022-01340-5>.

199