

Sex differences in the associations of socioeconomic factors and cognitive performance with family history of Alzheimer's disease

Jun He^{1,2}, Brenda Cabrera-Mendoza^{1,2}, Eleni Friligkou^{1,2}, Adam P. Mecca^{1,3}, Christopher H. van Dyck^{1,3,4}, Gita A. Pathak^{1,2}, Renato Polimanti^{1,2,5,6}

¹Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

²Veteran Affairs Connecticut Healthcare System, West Haven, CT, USA

³Alzheimer's Disease Research Unit, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

⁴Departments of Neuroscience and Neurology, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

⁵Department of Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

⁶Wu Tsai Institute, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA

Correspondence: Renato Polimanti, PhD. Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine. 60 Temple, Suite 7A, New Haven, CT 06511, USA. Phone: +1 (203) 737-6391. E-mail: renato.polimanti@yale.edu

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION: While higher socioeconomic factors (SEF) and cognitive performance (CP) have been associated with reduced Alzheimer's disease (AD) risk, recent evidence highlighted that these factors may have opposite effects on family history of AD (FHAD).

METHODS: Leveraging data from the UK Biobank (N=448,100) and the All of Us Research Program (N=240,319), we applied generalized linear regression models, polygenic risk scoring (PRS), and one-sample Mendelian randomization (MR) to test the sex-specific SEF and CP associations with AD and FHAD.

RESULTS: Observational and genetically informed analyses highlighted that higher SEF and CP were associated with reduced AD and sibling-FHAD, while these factors were associated with increased parent-FHAD. We also observed that population minorities may present different patterns with respect to sibling-FHAD vs. parent-FHAD. Sex differences in FHAD associations were identified in ancestry-specific and SEF PRS and MR results.

DISCUSSION: This study contributes to understanding the sex-specific relationships linking SEF and CP to FHAD, highlighting the potential role of reporting, recall, and surviving-related dynamics.

KEYWORDS: family history of Alzheimer's disease, socioeconomic factors, cognitive performance, polygenic risk score, Mendelian randomization

1 BACKGROUND

With the increase of the aging population worldwide, Alzheimer's disease (AD) has become one of the most challenging diseases of this century, because of its heavy medical and economic burden on individuals and society.¹ In 2021, an estimated 56.9 million people suffered from AD and other dementias, indicating an age-standardized prevalence rate of 694.0 per 100,000 population.² It is estimated that AD cases in preclinical, prodromal, and dementia stages comprised 416 million individuals, accounting for 22% of the total population aged 50 and older.³ Annually, 1.95 million deaths were attributed to AD and other dementias (25.2 per 100,000 population),² which was the eighth leading cause of death worldwide.⁴ The estimated global economic burden of AD and related dementias has reached \$2.8 trillion in 2019⁵. This figure was predicted to increase to \$16.9 trillion in 2050,⁵ with the prevalence number expected to triple.¹

AD is a complex disease attributable to biological and environmental influences, including genetic, psychosocial, cardiometabolic, and lifestyle factors.⁶⁻¹⁸ Among these, positive socioeconomic factors (SEF; e.g., higher income level and educational attainment) are demonstrated to be protective against AD.^{6,9,11,16,17} As a prodromal symptom, cognitive decline is a good predictor of clinical AD onset among older adults, independent of education and intelligence.¹⁹⁻²² However, in research of late-onset diseases such as AD, one difficulty is that even prospective studies with large sample sizes may not observe enough clinically diagnosed cases for robust analysis, due to the low incidence in middle-aged population.²³ Therefore, researchers used family history of AD (FHAD) as a proxy of AD to improve statistical power, for instance in genome-wide association studies (GWAS).²⁴⁻²⁶ Several analyses reported that FHAD is associated with reduced cognitive performance (CP).²⁷⁻³¹ However, a genetically informed study recently highlighted that investigating FHAD as a proxy for AD can introduce biases due to uncorrected survival bias and non-random participation in parental illness surveys.³² This raises important issues related to the dynamics linking SEF and CP to FHAD. Additionally, because of the known sex differences in AD risk³³ and social determinants of health,³⁴ it is crucial to assess whether these relationships may be influenced by sex-specific effects, differentiating FHAD assessment in females and males.

In the present study, we investigated sex differences in SEF and CP associations with AD and FHAD in two independent cohorts comprising a total of 688,419 participants. Specifically, we conducted observational and genetically informed analyses to explore how SEF (e.g., household income and educational attainment) and CP (e.g., fluid intelligence) are differentially associated with AD, sibling-FHAD, and parent-FHAD considering probands and parents' sex.

2 METHODS

2.1 Study design

We investigated the associations of SEF and CP with FHAD by leveraging multiple analytical approaches (Figure 1). Firstly, we conducted an observational analysis using generalized linear regression models to estimate sex-specific SEF, CP, and *APOE4* allele associations with AD, sibling-FHAD, mother-FHAD, and father-FHAD. To assess the dynamics related to parent-FHAD, we also estimated SEF, CP, and *APOE4* allele associations after controlling for parental death and parental age at death. Using genetic data, we further investigated the associations of mother- and father-FHAD by performing polygenic risk score (PRS) and bidirectional one-sample Mendelian randomization (MR) analyses. In addition to investigating SEF and CP, our PRS analysis also tested the association of mother- and father-FHAD with brain imaging-derived phenotypes (IDPs). This permitted us to explore possible associations of parent-FHAD with brain structure and function.

2.2 Data source

Phenotypic and genetic data were obtained from the UK Biobank (UKB)³⁵ and the All of Us Research Program (AoU).³⁶ UKB is a large population-based cohort including information regarding health conditions and genetic variation from participants recruited in the United Kingdom.³⁵ AoU is a prospective, nationwide cohort study aiming to recruit more than one million participants in the United States.³⁶ The sample investigated in the present study (Table 1) included 448,100 UKB participants (54% females; mean age at recruitment 56.7 years; median year of birth 1950) and 240,319 AoU participants (AoU Controlled Tier Dataset of Curated Data Repository version 7;³⁷ 61% females, mean age at recruitment 54.5 years).

2.3 Alzheimer's disease and family history of Alzheimer's disease

In UKB, AD was assessed with “first occurrence” information derived by combining primary care, hospital admission, death register, and self-reported data. Individuals with a first occurrence date of the ICD10 (Tenth Revision of the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems) G30 (UKB Field ID: 131036) and F00 (UKB Field ID: 130836) codes were considered as AD cases. Sibling-, mother-, and father-FHAD were assessed through the UKB touchscreen questionnaire considering the “Alzheimer's disease/dementia” reply to the following items, “Have any of your brothers or sisters suffered from any of the following illnesses?” (UKB Field ID: 20111), “Has/did your mother ever suffer from?” (UKB Field ID: 20110), and “Has/did your father ever suffer from?” (UKB Field ID: 20107).

In AoU, AD (SNOMED concept ID: 378419) was identified from the domain “conditions” using EHR data standardized by the Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership Common Data Model (OMOP CDM).³⁸ FHAD information was collected using 2-level self-reported survey questions. In the first question, participants were asked: “Have you or anyone in your family ever been diagnosed with the following brain and nervous system conditions? Think only of the people you are related to by blood. Select all that apply.” (Participant-provided information, PPI concept ID: 43529272). If “Dementia (includes Alzheimer's, vascular, etc.)” was selected from the optional diseases, then the second question was applied: “Including yourself, who in your family has had dementia (includes Alzheimer's, vascular, etc.)? Select all that apply.” (PPI concept ID: 836807). Participants' choices of “sibling”, “mother”, and “father” were used to define sibling-, mother-, and father-FHAD, respectively.

2.4 Socioeconomic factors and cognitive performance

In UKB, SEFs were assessed through self-reported information related to material deprivation, household income, and educational attainment. Specifically, material deprivation was assessed using the Townsend deprivation index (UKB Field ID: 189), which combines information regarding unemployment, non-car ownership, non-home ownership, and household overcrowding for any geographical area.³⁹ This was calculated for each UKB participant based on the preceding national census output areas in which their postcode was located. Average total household income before tax (UKB Field ID: 738) was assessed in the touchscreen questionnaire

item “What is the average total income before tax received by your HOUSEHOLD?”. This question provided five answer options: less than £18,000, £18,000 to £30,999, £31,000 to £51,999, £52,000 to £100,000, and greater than £100,000. UKB educational attainment was derived from three touchscreen questionnaire items: “At what age did you complete your continuous full time education?” (UKB Field ID: 845), “In which year did you first finish full-time education (school, college or university)?” (UKB Field ID: 22501), and “Which of the following qualifications do you have?” (UKB Field ID: 6138). With respect to CP, we leveraged information available from the UKB cognitive function assessment considering three items: mean time to correctly identify matching cards (UKB Field ID: 20023), maximum digits remembered correctly (UKB Field ID: 4282), and fluid intelligence score (UKB Field ID: 20016; a sum of the number of correct answers to 13 fluid intelligence questions). A description of the questions and tasks used in the UKB assessment is available at <https://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/>.

In AoU, household income (PPI concept ID: 1585375) was determined through the survey question “What is your annual household income from all sources?” with nine answer options: “Less than \$10,000”, “\$10,000-\$24,999”, “\$25,000-\$34,999”, “\$35,000-\$49,999”, “\$50,000-\$74,999”, “\$75,000-\$99,999”, “\$100,000-\$149,999”, “\$150,000-\$199,999”, and “\$200,000 or more”. Educational attainment (PPI concept ID: 1585940) was assessed via the survey question “What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?” with eight options: “Never attended school or only attended kindergarten”, “Grades 1 through 4 (Primary)”, “Grades 5 through 8 (Middle school)”, “Grades 9 through 11 (Some high school)”, “Grade 12 or GED (High school graduate)”, “1 to 3 years after high school (Some college, Associate’s degree, or technical school)”, “College 4 years or more (College graduate)”, and “Advanced degree (Master’s, Doctorate, etc.)”. No cognitive assessment is currently available in AoU.

2.5 Genetic data

We leveraged individual-level genetic data available from UKB and AoU. UKB genetic information has been described previously.³⁵ Briefly, UKB participants were genotyped using a custom Axiom array and imputed using the Haplotype Reference Consortium reference panel.³⁵ In our analysis, we used quality control criteria and ancestry assignments performed by the Pan-

UKB initiative.⁴⁰ AoU genetic information was extracted from whole-genome sequencing data using the ACAF threshold callset.⁴¹ Quality control criteria and ancestry inference have been described elsewhere.⁴² Based on the dataset provided by AoU, we also removed variants with minor allele frequency (MAF) < 1%, call rate < 0.95, and Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium $P < 1 \times 10^{-6}$.

APOE genotypes were defined considering rs429358 and rs7412 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) as previously described.⁴³ In our analysis, individuals were stratified into *APOE4* carriers and non-carriers based on their genotypes.

To further investigate FHAD, SEF, and CP relationships, we also used sex-stratified genome-wide association statistics previously calculated using UKB cohort. Details regarding the quality control and the association analysis are available at https://github.com/Nealelab/UK_Biobank_GWAS. Briefly, the genome-wide association analysis was conducted using regression models available in Hail (available at <https://hail.is/>) and including the top-20 within-ancestry principal components (PC), age, and age² as covariates. Because of the limited sample size available for other ancestry groups, we used genome-wide data generated from the analysis of 361,194 unrelated individuals of European descent. To explore FHAD associations with brain structure and function, we leveraged sex-stratified genome-wide association statistics of brain IDPs assessed in up to 33,224 individuals of European descent (52% females).⁴⁴ Brain IDPs were derived from six MRI modalities: T1-weighted structural image, T2-weighted fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) structural image, diffusion MRI (dMRI), resting-state functional MRI (rfMRI), task functional MRI (tfMRI), and susceptibility-weighted imaging (SWI). Detailed information regarding imaging processing and quality control information is available at https://biobank.ctsu.ox.ac.uk/crystal/crystal/docs/brain_mri.pdf.

2.6 Observational analysis

We applied logistic regression models to UKB and AoU phenotypic data to investigate SEF and CP associations with AD and FHAD (sibling, father, and mother) in females and males. In UKB, three models were considered. In model 1, we estimated sex-specific associations of SEF, CP,

and *APOE4* status with AD and FHAD, adjusting for age and genetically inferred ancestry. In model 2, we assessed the same sex-specific relationships with father- and mother-FHAD, adjusting for age, genetically inferred ancestry, and parental death (father's death (UKB Field ID: 1797) for father-FHAD and mother's death (UKB Field ID: 1835) for mother-FHAD). In model 3, the sex-specific association analysis was restricted to participants whose parent died (participants whose father died in father-FHAD analysis and participants whose mother died in mother-FHAD analysis) and included age, genetically inferred ancestry, and parental age at death (father's age at death (UKB Field ID: 1807) for father-FHAD and mother's age at death (UKB Field ID: 3526) for mother-FHAD). Bonferroni correction was applied to account for the number of tests performed ($P < 8.33 \times 10^{-4}$ in model 1 and $P < 1.67 \times 10^{-3}$ in model 2 and 3). Variables surviving multiple testing correction were then entered into a multivariable model to estimate whether their sex-specific effects were independent of each other. Additionally, we estimated sex differences by comparing sex-specific association statistics using z-test.

In AoU, we tested the sex-specific association of household income and educational attainment with AD and sibling-, father-, and mother-FHAD including age and genetically inferred ancestry as covariates. Because no information regarding parental death and parental age at death is available in AoU, we could not consider other models. However, because AoU is an ancestrally diverse cohort, we conducted an ancestry stratified analysis to examine whether SEF association with AD and FHAD relationships were consistent across populations. In both cross-ancestry and ancestry-stratified analyses, Bonferroni correction was applied to account for the number of tests performed. All variables were subsequently entered into a multivariable regression model to assess their independent effects.

2.7 Polygenic risk scoring

PRS analysis was employed to investigate SEF, CP, and brain-IDP sex-specific associations with parent-FHAD. Specifically, we derived PRS from previously calculated UKB genome-wide association statistics (see 2.5 Genetic data) and then tested them with respect to parent-FHAD in AoU. As mentioned above, this analysis was limited to European-descent individuals, because of the limited sample size available for other population groups. PRS were estimated using Polygenic Risk Score–Continuous Shrinkage (PRS-CS)⁴⁵ and UKB European-ancestry

participants as the LD reference panel⁴⁶. Then, PRS-CS weights were used to estimate individual PRS for AoU participants of European descent via PLINK 1.9 --score command.⁴⁷ PRS associations were estimated via logistic regression with the PRS as the independent variable, mother- or father-FHAD as the dependent variable, and age and the top 10 within-ancestry PCs as covariates. With respect to SEF and CP, we tested PRS related to Townsend deprivation index, household income, age completed full time education, education qualification, year ended full time education, mean time to correctly identify matches, maximum digits remembered correctly, and fluid intelligence score. To account for the number of PRS tests performed, we applied a Bonferroni correction ($P < 1.56 \times 10^{-3}$).

In addition to SEF and CP PRS, we also performed an exploratory analysis testing sex-specific brain-imaging PRS (see 2.5 Genetic data) with respect to mother- and father-FHAD. The PRS were derived only for brain IDP GWAS with SNP-based heritability $Z > 7$ in both females and males (Supplementary Table S1). Due to the limited sample size of IDP GWAS (up to 33,224), we considered this as an exploratory analysis and used a relaxed significance threshold ($P < 0.01$) for both univariable and multivariable analyses. SEF and CP PRS surviving multiple testing and nominally significant brain-imaging PRS were then entered in a multivariable regression model to assess their independent effects.

2.8 One-sample Mendelian randomization

To investigate further the sex-specific dynamics linking SEF (i.e., educational attainment and household income) to parent-FHAD, we performed a bidirectional one-sample MR analysis in females and males separately^{48,49}. Using PRS as instrumental variables, we performed an MR analysis in AoU European-ancestry participants by applying the two-stage predictor substitution (TSPS) estimator available in *OneSampleMR* package in R.⁵⁰ Age and the top 10 within-ancestry PCs were included as covariates. When the outcome in the model was a binary variable, logistic regression was used in the second stage; when the outcome was a quantitative variable, linear regression was used. Bonferroni correction ($P < 0.005$) was applied to account for the number of MR tests performed. To ensure the reliability of our findings, we also recalculated MR estimates using the two-stage least-squares (2SLS) estimator available in *ivreg* package in R. Finally, we conducted weak-instrument and Wu-Hausman tests to examine whether the instrumental PRS

was weakly correlated with the exposure variables and whether the 2SLS estimator was consistent with the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Observational analysis

After adjusting for age and genetically inferred ancestry, high SEF and CP were associated with reduced AD and sibling-FHAD, while their relationship with father- and mother-FHAD was reversed (i.e., high SEF and CP were associated with increased parent-FHAD; Figure 2, Supplementary Table S2). For instance, with respect to SEF, high household income was associated with reduced AD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = -0.236, P = 1.54 \times 10^{-15}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = -0.267, P = 3.05 \times 10^{-24}$) and sibling-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = -0.148, P = 7.20 \times 10^{-7}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = -0.089, P = 0.003$) but increased mother-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = 0.086, P = 2.98 \times 10^{-33}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = 0.077, P = 3.59 \times 10^{-24}$) and father-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = 0.092, P = 1.29 \times 10^{-22}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = 0.096, P = 5.51 \times 10^{-22}$). This dynamic was consistent also when considering negative SEF such as not having any education qualifications, which was associated with increased AD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = 0.393, P = 4.05 \times 10^{-17}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = 0.365, P = 1.57 \times 10^{-13}$) and sibling-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = 0.406, P = 5.09 \times 10^{-13}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = 0.426, P = 9.60 \times 10^{-11}$), but reduced mother-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = -0.333, P = 9.10 \times 10^{-65}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = -0.303, P = 8.08 \times 10^{-42}$) and father-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = -0.363, P = 2.65 \times 10^{-37}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = -0.375, P = 1.84 \times 10^{-31}$). CP measurements showed the same association pattern. For example, high fluid intelligence was associated with reduced AD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = -0.169, P = 1.03 \times 10^{-12}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = -0.153, P = 3.62 \times 10^{-12}$) and sibling-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = -0.047, P = 0.030$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = -0.070, P = 0.003$) but increased mother-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = 0.065, P = 9.09 \times 10^{-31}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = 0.047, P = 1.31 \times 10^{-15}$) and father-FHAD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = 0.040, P = 6.59 \times 10^{-8}$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = 0.054, P = 2.31 \times 10^{-12}$). Differently from SEF and CP, *APOE4* carrier status showed increasing effects on AD, sibling-FHAD, mother-FHAD, and father-FHAD (Figure 2, Supplementary Table S2). When comparing female and male effects, we observed a sex difference only for *APOE4* carrier status on AD ($\beta_{\text{female}} = 1.676$ vs. $\beta_{\text{male}} = 1.264$, sex-difference $P = 4.95 \times 10^{-10}$). When we entered Bonferroni significant variables from the univariable analyses into multivariable models, SEF and CP associations were strongly attenuated due to their overlap, but their effect directions were consistent with what was observed in the univariable analyses (Supplementary Table S3). To further investigate SEF and CP relationships with parent-FHAD, we tested two additional models. In Model 2, controlling for parental death

(father's death for father-FHAD and mother's death for mother-FHAD) in addition to age and genetically inferred ancestry, we observed no substantial difference with respect to the Model-1 effects (Supplementary Figure S1, Supplementary Tables S4 and S5). In Model 3, restricting the analysis to participants whose parent died (father died in father-FHAD analysis and mother died in mother-FHAD analysis) and including age, genetically inferred ancestry, and parental age at death as covariates, we observed a reduction in the effect size observed with several results becoming null. However, for those surviving Bonferroni multiple testing correction, the effect direction was consistent with Model 1 (Supplementary Figure S1, Supplementary Tables S6 and S7).

In the AoU cohort, high educational attainment and income were also associated with reduced AD and with increased parent-FHAD in both sexes (Supplementary Figure S2, Supplementary Tables S8 and S9). Null effects were observed with respect to sibling-FHAD ($P > 0.05$). Leveraging AoU population diversity, we also investigated ancestry-specific associations (Figure 3; Supplementary Table S10). Controlling for educational attainment and income and applying a Bonferroni correction accounting for the number of tests performed ($P < 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$), genetically inferred African descent (AFR) was associated with increased sibling-FHAD in females ($\beta = 0.412$, $P = 0.002$), while an inverse relationship was present with respect to father-FHAD in both females ($\beta = -0.444$, $P = 8.2 \times 10^{-9}$) and males ($\beta = -0.539$, $P = 2.72 \times 10^{-4}$). AFR descent was also inversely associated with mother-FHAD in males ($\beta = -0.517$, $P = 8 \times 10^{-6}$), but the effect was statistically smaller in females ($\beta = -0.113$, $P = 0.043$; sex-difference $P = 0.002$). In males, mother-FHAD was also inversely associated with genetically inferred Central/South Asian (CSA; $\beta = -0.953$, $P = 3.19 \times 10^{-4}$). Conversely, mother-FHAD was inversely associated with genetically inferred East Asian descent in females (EAS; $\beta = -0.477$, $P = 8.02 \times 10^{-4}$) but not in males ($P = 0.627$). We also conducted an ancestry-stratified analysis, testing income and educational attainment associations with AD and FHAD. In line with the results obtained in the whole AoU cohort, these factors were associated with reduced AD and increased parent-FHAD (Supplementary Tables S11 and S12).

3.2 Polygenic risk scoring

To further investigate parent-FHAD, we leveraged UKB GWAS to derive SEF, CP, and FHAD PRS and tested them in AoU cohort. In both males and females, the strongest parent-FHAD associations were related to PRS derived from “Illnesses of mother: Alzheimer's disease/dementia” and “Illnesses of father: Alzheimer's disease/dementia” (Figure 4, Supplementary Table S13). The direction of the association was in line with the expectation that high parent-AD PRS would be associated with increased parent-FHAD. Interestingly, in both sexes we observed cross-parent PRS associations with mother-FHAD PRS associated with father-FHAD and vice versa (Figure 4, Supplementary Table S13). However, there was a sex difference in the association of mother-AD PRS with father-FHAD, which was stronger in males ($\beta = 2.028$, $P = 1.08 \times 10^{-11}$) than in females ($\beta = 1.004$, $P = 1.07 \times 10^{-5}$; sex-difference $P = 0.006$). Considering Bonferroni-significant SEF PRS associations ($P < 1.56 \times 10^{-3}$), we observed the same pattern of the observational analyses described above, where PRS related to positive SEF were associated with increased parent-FHAD (Figure 4, Supplementary Table S13). For instance, having a college or university degree was associated with increased father-FHAD in both females ($\beta = 0.687$, $P = 2.12 \times 10^{-6}$) and males ($\beta = 0.677$, $P = 3.69 \times 10^{-4}$). While several SEF PRS were Bonferroni significant only in one sex but only nominally replicated or null in the other (Figure 4, Supplementary Table S13), we observed only one statistically significant sex difference. Townsend deprivation index PRS was associated with reduced mother-FHAD in males ($\beta = -0.784$, $P = 0.001$), but not in females ($\beta = 0.034$, $P = 0.868$; sex-difference $P = 0.009$). None of the CP PRS survived Bonferroni multiple testing correction, but the effect direction of the nominally significant results was consistent with the observational findings described above (Supplementary Table S13).

To explore FHAD relationship with brain structure and function, we investigated PRS derived from brain IDPs (Supplemental Table S14). Considering a relaxed significance threshold ($P < 0.01$), we observed that PRS related to the mean diffusion tensor mode in anterior limb of the left internal capsule on fractional anisotropy skeleton (IDP 1544, dMRI TBSS MO Anterior limb of internal capsule L) was associated with reduced father-FHAD in females ($\beta = -0.160$, $P = 0.009$), but not in males ($\beta = 0.127$, $P = 0.103$; sex-difference $P = 0.004$). This brain IDP also showed a nominally significant sex difference with respect to mother-FHAD, but with opposite effect

directions ($\beta_{\text{female}} = 0.099$, $P = 0.049$; $\beta_{\text{male}} = -0.08$, $P = 0.195$; sex-difference $P = 0.025$). Finally, we conducted a multivariate analysis of SEF, FHAD, and brain IDP PRS, which confirmed the independence and the direction of the effects detected in the initial PRS analyses (Supplementary Table S15).

3.3 One-Sample Mendelian randomization

Using the TSPS approach to perform a one-sample MR analysis, we investigated the bidirectional relationship between SEF and parent-FHAD. In both sexes, we observed that genetic liability to mother-FHAD affected father-FHAD and vice versa (Figure 5, Supplementary Table S16). The results derived using the TSPS method were highly consistent with the analyses obtained from the 2SLS approach (Supplementary Table S17). With both methods, female genetic liability to father-FHAD affected mother-FHAD more strongly than female genetic liability to mother-FHAD affected father-FHAD (TSPS difference- $P = 0.038$, Supplementary Table S16; 2SLS difference- $P = 0.008$, Supplementary Table S17). We observed Bonferroni significant effects of educational attainment and household income on father-FHAD in females and of educational attainment on mother-FHAD in males (Figure 5; Supplementary Table 16). The sensitivity analyses confirmed the reliability of the one-sample MR results, highlighting the lack of weak instrument bias and indicating that the outcomes tested are associated with the variables in our models (Supplementary Table S17).

4 DISCUSSION

The prevalence of AD has been rising in the 21st century due to increased life expectancy and an aging population, resulting in an enormous disease and economic burden.^{5,51} FHAD has been used in studies of AD to identify its genetic basis and associated factors with the aim of expanding sample sizes and improving statistical power.²³⁻²⁶ Recently, concerns have been raised about the accuracy of the self-reported parental information.³² In the present study, we used phenotypic and genetic data from two large cohorts to investigate sex-specific associations of SEF and CP with AD and FHAD, also exploring differences across population groups. In line with previous evidence,^{6,11,22} we found that high SEF and CP are associated with reduced AD. However, while the effect was consistent for sibling-FHAD, we observed an inverse relationship with respect to parent-FHAD: UKB and AoU participants with better SEF and/or CP reported

increased father- and mother-FHAD compared to those with poor SEF and/or CP. There are several possible explanations for this unexpected outcome. One is reporting bias, which is prevalent in studies related to self-reported information and varies across different population groups, e.g., individuals of lower SEF and CP may be less likely to report accurate information.⁵² Regarding family history, the bias varies among family members; for example, the number of self-reported paternal family histories of cancer was reported to be significantly lower than that of maternal family histories.⁵³ The second potential bias is misclassification.⁵⁴ As material deprivation and SEF are important determinants of healthcare service accessibility and are intergenerationally transmissible, low-income individuals are more likely to have economical insurance or be uninsured.^{55,56} Consequently, the limited access to medical services and the low frequency of visits lead to underestimates of AD diagnosis of parents. Third, there may be recall bias: self-reported records could suffer more from recall bias in a population with cognitive decline.⁵⁷ Therefore, those with poor CP may report a lower proportion of true FHAD.⁵⁸ Fourth, survival bias may play an important role in these associations. It has been recognized that SEF is associated with all-cause mortality.⁵⁹ In this way, parents of individuals in lower SEF would die early due to competing risks before they had a chance to develop AD.⁶⁰ This is consistent with our finding that the associations substantially attenuated when we restricted the analysis to participants whose father or mother was deceased. Parental age could also be a confounder. Typically, the age at birth of individuals is correlated with socioeconomic status.⁶¹ Thus, those parents in families with lower SEF will be younger, resulting in a relatively lower prevalence rate of FHAD.

However, these dynamics may not affect sibling-FHAD, because they lived at the same period as participants and may have less survival bias and recall bias. Unlike the confounding bias of parental age, sibling's age may not contribute to the bias substantially after adjusting for participants' age. In the observational analysis in UKB cohort, *APOE4* carrier status was consistently a risk factor for both FHAD and AD, as expected.⁴³ Because this is a biological risk factor, it is less likely to be affected by the biases related to self-reported family history. However, we still observed that *APOE4* effect on AD was larger than that on FHAD. With respect to biological factors, in our exploratory analysis regarding brain structure and function, we identified one IDP associated with FHAD in females. In line with previous AD studies,^{62,63} mean

diffusion tensor mode in the left anterior limb of internal capsule (IDP dMRI TBSS MO Anterior limb of internal capsule L) was negatively associated with father-FHAD. However, the association of this brain IDP was not consistent between parents, as it was positively associated with mother-FHAD. This suggests that parent-specific effects may act on the biases discussed above.

Importantly, we found sex differences in AD and FHAD associations. In the UKB observational analysis, *APOE4* was more strongly associated with AD in females than in males, consistent with the finding that females with this allele have a greater risk of developing AD than male *APOE4* carriers.⁶⁴ In AoU, we identified multiple sex differences when investigating FHAD associations among population groups. After controlling for educational attainment and income, AFR and CSA male participants were less likely to report mother-FHAD than females. This sex-specific association was reversed in EAS where females were less likely to report mother-FHAD than males. This suggests that the sex-specific interplay of the biases discussed above with disparities in healthcare access, life expectancy, and AD prevalence observed in population minorities.^{65,66}

Sex differences were also present in the results of our genetically informed analyses. Specifically, mother-AD PRS was more strongly associated with father-FHAD in males than in females. Additionally, one-sample MR analysis highlighted that female genetic liability to father-FHAD affected mother-FHAD more strongly than female genetic liability to mother-FHAD affected father-FHAD. These differences could be related to parental differences in the perception of family history. For example, females reported more obligation to care for their mother than their father, and mother-daughter dyads engaged in more mutually open conversations with less conflict.⁶⁷ Moreover, females might know more about their mother's health than their father's, and maternal family history was more strongly associated with AD risk factors than paternal family history.⁶⁸ Another possible aspect contributing to the sex differences in FHAD genetics is assortative mating (mate choice driven by phenotypic similarity). Recently, assortative mating, SEF, and participation bias have been reported in the context of the polygenic risk of neuropsychiatric and behavioral traits.⁶⁹ Based on this previous evidence and our current results, we hypothesize that the interplay between FHAD and SEF could contribute to sex-specific assortative mating.

Strengths of the present study include the use of phenotypic and genetic data from two large cohorts to investigate the sex-specific associations of SEF and CP with AD and FHAD. This permitted us to triangulate robust evidence integrating multiple approaches and data types. However, we need to acknowledge several limitations. First, because of the UKB and AoU questionnaires, we could not distinguish FHAD from family history of other dementias in our analysis. However, AD is the most common form of dementia, accounting for 60 to 80% of the cases,⁷⁰ implying that our findings are mainly driven by FHAD. Although our analyses accounted for sex, age, genetically inferred ancestry, parental death, and parental age at death, we could not control for other factors. For example, we did not include psychosocial factors, lifestyle, and healthcare accessibility of the first-degree relatives, which may contribute to the biased associations found in this study. Finally, UKB and AoU are not cohorts with randomly selected participants and they are not representative of the general population, which may introduce volunteer bias as an additional source of confounding, thus affecting the estimated associations.⁷¹

In conclusion, the present study contributes to the understanding of how SEF and CP can affect parent FHAD differently than AD and sibling-FHAD. Our findings highlight the possible effects of sex-specific information bias, participation bias, and confounding bias in FHAD assessment. This has major implications for AD research. Further studies will be required to quantify these effects and propose feasible solutions to minimize and eliminate the biases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We sincerely thank all the participants enrolled in the UK Biobank, as well as the investigators contributing to this initiative. We gratefully acknowledge All of Us participants for their contributions, without whom this research would not have been possible. We also thank the National Institutes of Health's All of Us Research Program for making available the participant data examined in this study.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The UKB individual data could be obtained by applying on the website (<http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/>). The UKB GWAS data could be downloaded from the Neale Lab (<http://www.nealelab.is/uk-biobank>) and Oxford Brain Imaging Genetics Server (<https://open.win.ox.ac.uk/ukbiobank/big40/>). The AoU data in this article were accessed from the All of Us Curated Data Repository version 7 (<https://www.researchallofus.org>). PRS was calculated using PRSs (<https://github.com/getian107/PRSs>) and PLINK 1.9 (<https://www.cog-genomics.org/plink/1.9/>). One-sample MR analyses were performed using OneSampleMR (<https://github.com/remlapmot/OneSampleMR>) and ivreg (<https://github.com/zeileis/ivreg/>).

FUNDING INFORMATION

The authors acknowledge support from the National Institutes of Health (R33 DA047527; RF1 MH132337, 5K99AG078503-02), One Mind, Alzheimer's Association Research Fellowship (AARF-22-967171), American Foundation for Suicide Prevention (PDF-1-022-21), and the Yale Franke Program in Science and Humanities. The All of Us Research Program is supported by the National Institutes of Health, Office of the Director: Regional Medical Centers: 1 OT2 OD026549; 1 OT2 OD026554; 1 OT2 OD026557; 1 OT2 OD026556; 1 OT2 OD026550; 1 OT2 OD 026552; 1 OT2 OD026553; 1 OT2 OD026548; 1 OT2 OD026551; 1 OT2 OD026555; IAA #: AOD 16037; Federally Qualified Health Centers: HHSN 263201600085U; Data and Research Center: 5 U2C OD023196; Biobank: 1 U24 OD023121; The Participant Center: U24 OD023176; Participant Technology Systems Center: 1 U24 OD023163; Communications and Engagement: 3 OT2 OD023205; 3 OT2 OD023206; and Community Partners: 1 OT2 OD025277; 3 OT2 OD025315; 1 OT2 OD025337; 1 OT2OD025276.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

RP and JH designed the study. EF and JH extracted and preprocessed the data. BCM and GAP provided statistical methodological support. JH conducted the formal analysis and wrote the manuscript. BCM, EF, APM, CHvD, and GAP contributed to the data interpretation. All the authors participated in the critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content. RP obtained the primary funding and supervised the study. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

RP is paid for his editorial work on the journal *Complex Psychiatry* and received a research grant outside the scope of this study from Alkermes. APM reports grants for clinical trials from Genentech, Eli Lilly, and Janssen Pharmaceuticals. CHvD reports consulting fees from Eisai, Roche, Ono, and Cerevel and grants for clinical trials from Biogen, Eli Lilly, Eisai, Janssen, Roche, Genentech, UCB, and Cerevel. The remaining authors declare that they have no competing interests.

CONSENT STATEMENT

The UK Biobank has approval from the North-West multi-centre research ethics committee as a Research Tissue Bank approval. The All of Us Research Program was approved by the All of Us Institutional Review Board. All participants in the two studies provided informed consent at recruitment. The data used in this study were obtained through an application reference No. 58146 for the UK Biobank and through an approved data use agreement for the All of Us Research Program.

TABLE LEGENDS

TABLE 1 Characteristics of female and male participants available from the UK Biobank and the All of Us Research Program.

FIGURE LEGENDS

FIGURE 1 Flowchart of the analyses performed in the present study. UKB: the UK Biobank; AoU: the All of Us Research Program; Cov: covariates; SEF: socioeconomic factors; CP: cognitive performance; AD: Alzheimer's disease; FHAD: family history of AD; PRS: polygenic risk score; PC: principal component; IDP: imaging-derived phenotype; MR: Mendelian randomization.

FIGURE 2 Associations of socioeconomic factors, cognitive performance, and *APOE4* status with FHAD in the UK Biobank. Full results are available in Supplementary Table S2.

Star symbols indicate associations surviving Bonferroni multiple testing correction. AD: Alzheimer's disease; FHAD: family history of AD.

FIGURE 3 Associations between genetically inferred ancestry and FHAD in the All of Us Research Program. AD betas in CSA (males) and MID (both sexes) are not shown due to extremely small sample sizes. Full results are available in Supplementary Tables S10. AD: Alzheimer's disease; FHAD: family history of AD; EUR: European ancestry; AFR: African ancestry; AMR: Admixed American descent; CSA: Central/South Asian ancestry; EAS: East Asian ancestry; MID: Middle Eastern ancestry.

FIGURE 4 Associations of polygenic risk scores related to socioeconomic factors and cognitive performance with FHAD. Full results are available in Supplementary Table S13. Star symbols indicate associations surviving Bonferroni multiple testing correction. FHAD: family history of Alzheimer's disease.

FIGURE 5 Bidirectional relationships between socioeconomic factors and family history of Alzheimer's disease. (A) Causal effects of household income and educational attainment on parent-FHAD. (B) Causal effects of parent-FHAD. The two-stage predictor substitution estimator was used to assess the causal relationships. Full results are available in Supplementary Table S16. Star symbols indicate associations surviving Bonferroni multiple testing correction.

REFERENCES

1. Scheltens P, De Strooper B, Kivipelto M, et al. Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet*. Apr 24 2021;397(10284):1577-1590. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32205-4
2. Collaborators GBDNSD. Global, regional, and national burden of disorders affecting the nervous system, 1990-2021: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *Lancet Neurol*. Apr 2024;23(4):344-381. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(24)00038-3
3. Gustavsson A, Norton N, Fast T, et al. Global estimates on the number of persons across the Alzheimer's disease continuum. *Alzheimers Dement*. Feb 2023;19(2):658-670. doi:10.1002/alz.12694
4. Collaborators GBDCoD. Global burden of 288 causes of death and life expectancy decomposition in 204 countries and territories and 811 subnational locations, 1990-2021: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *Lancet*. Apr 3 2024;doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00367-2
5. Nandi A, Counts N, Chen S, et al. Global and regional projections of the economic burden of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias from 2019 to 2050: A value of statistical life approach. *EClinicalMedicine*. Sep 2022;51:101580. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101580
6. Karp A, Kareholt I, Qiu C, Bellander T, Winblad B, Fratiglioni L. Relation of education and occupation-based socioeconomic status to incident Alzheimer's disease. *Am J Epidemiol*. Jan 15 2004;159(2):175-83. doi:10.1093/aje/kwh018
7. Imtiaz B, Tolppanen AM, Kivipelto M, Soininen H. Future directions in Alzheimer's disease from risk factors to prevention. *Biochem Pharmacol*. Apr 15 2014;88(4):661-70. doi:10.1016/j.bcp.2014.01.003
8. Xu W, Tan L, Wang HF, et al. Meta-analysis of modifiable risk factors for Alzheimer's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. Dec 2015;86(12):1299-306. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2015-310548
9. Larsson SC, Traylor M, Malik R, et al. Modifiable pathways in Alzheimer's disease: Mendelian randomisation analysis. *BMJ*. Dec 6 2017;359:j5375. doi:10.1136/bmj.j5375
10. Gronek P, Balko S, Gronek J, et al. Physical Activity and Alzheimer's Disease: A Narrative Review. *Aging Dis*. Dec 2019;10(6):1282-1292. doi:10.14336/AD.2019.0226
11. Wang RZ, Yang YX, Li HQ, et al. Genetically determined low income modifies Alzheimer's disease risk. *Ann Transl Med*. Aug 2021;9(15):1222. doi:10.21037/atm-21-344
12. Zhang XX, Tian Y, Wang ZT, Ma YH, Tan L, Yu JT. The Epidemiology of Alzheimer's Disease Modifiable Risk Factors and Prevention. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis*. 2021;8(3):313-321. doi:10.14283/jpad.2021.15
13. Pasqualetti G, Thayanandan T, Edison P. Influence of genetic and cardiometabolic risk factors in Alzheimer's disease. *Ageing Res Rev*. Nov 2022;81:101723. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2022.101723
14. Tarawneh R, Penhos E. The gut microbiome and Alzheimer's disease: Complex and bidirectional interactions. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. Oct 2022;141:104814. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104814
15. Ellouze I, Sheffler J, Nagpal R, Arjmandi B. Dietary Patterns and Alzheimer's Disease: An Updated Review Linking Nutrition to Neuroscience. *Nutrients*. Jul 19 2023;15(14)doi:10.3390/nu15143204
16. Seyedsalehi A, Warriar V, Bethlehem RAI, Perry BI, Burgess S, Murray GK. Educational attainment, structural brain reserve and Alzheimer's disease: a Mendelian randomization analysis. *Brain*. May 2 2023;146(5):2059-2074. doi:10.1093/brain/awac392


17. Li X, Zhang Y, Zhang C, Zheng Y, Liu R, Xiao S. Education counteracts the genetic risk of Alzheimer's disease without an interaction effect. *Front Public Health*. 2023;11:1178017. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2023.1178017
18. Lane CA, Hardy J, Schott JM. Alzheimer's disease. *Eur J Neurol*. Jan 2018;25(1):59-70. doi:10.1111/ene.13439
19. Geerlings MI, Jonker C, Bouter LM, Ader HJ, Schmand B. Association between memory complaints and incident Alzheimer's disease in elderly people with normal baseline cognition. *Am J Psychiatry*. Apr 1999;156(4):531-7. doi:10.1176/ajp.156.4.531
20. Stern Y. Cognitive reserve in ageing and Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet Neurol*. Nov 2012;11(11):1006-12. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(12)70191-6
21. Tabatabaei-Jafari H, Shaw ME, Walsh E, Cherbuin N. Cognitive/Functional Measures Predict Alzheimer's Disease, Dependent on Hippocampal Volume. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. Aug 13 2020;75(7):1393-1402. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbz011
22. Hu Y, Zhang Y, Zhang H, et al. Cognitive performance protects against Alzheimer's disease independently of educational attainment and intelligence. *Mol Psychiatry*. Oct 2022;27(10):4297-4306. doi:10.1038/s41380-022-01695-4
23. Liu JZ, Erlich Y, Pickrell JK. Case-control association mapping by proxy using family history of disease. *Nat Genet*. Mar 2017;49(3):325-331. doi:10.1038/ng.3766
24. Scarabino D, Gambina G, Broggio E, Pelliccia F, Corbo RM. Influence of family history of dementia in the development and progression of late-onset Alzheimer's disease. *Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet*. Mar 2016;171B(2):250-6. doi:10.1002/ajmg.b.32399
25. Marioni RE, Harris SE, Zhang Q, et al. GWAS on family history of Alzheimer's disease. *Transl Psychiatry*. May 18 2018;8(1):99. doi:10.1038/s41398-018-0150-6
26. Bellenguez C, Kucukali F, Jansen IE, et al. New insights into the genetic etiology of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias. *Nat Genet*. Apr 2022;54(4):412-436. doi:10.1038/s41588-022-01024-z
27. Donix M, Ercoli LM, Siddarth P, et al. Influence of Alzheimer disease family history and genetic risk on cognitive performance in healthy middle-aged and older people. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*. Jul 2012;20(7):565-73. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e3182107e6a
28. Mason EJ, Hussey EP, Molitor RJ, Ko PC, Donahue MJ, Ally BA. Family History of Alzheimer's Disease is Associated with Impaired Perceptual Discrimination of Novel Objects. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2017;57(3):735-745. doi:10.3233/JAD-160772
29. Haussmann R, Ganske S, Gruschwitz A, et al. Family History of Alzheimer's Disease and Subjective Memory Performance. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen*. Nov 2018;33(7):458-462. doi:10.1177/1533317518775033
30. Talboom JS, Haberg A, De Both MD, et al. Family history of Alzheimer's disease alters cognition and is modified by medical and genetic factors. *Elife*. Jun 18 2019;8doi:10.7554/eLife.46179
31. Tsai CL, Erickson KI, Sun HS, Kuo YM, Pai MC. A cross-sectional examination of a family history of Alzheimer's disease and ApoE epsilon 4 on physical fitness, molecular biomarkers, and neurocognitive performance. *Physiol Behav*. Mar 1 2021;230:113268. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2020.113268
32. Wu Y, Sun Z, Zheng Q, et al. Pervasive biases in proxy GWAS based on parental history of Alzheimer's disease. *bioRxiv*. Oct 17 2023;doi:10.1101/2023.10.13.562272
33. Lopez-Lee C, Torres ERS, Carling G, Gan L. Mechanisms of sex differences in Alzheimer's disease. *Neuron*. Apr 17 2024;112(8):1208-1221. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2024.01.024

34. Hosseinpoor AR, Williams JS, Jann B, et al. Social determinants of sex differences in disability among older adults: a multi-country decomposition analysis using the World Health Survey. *Int J Equity Health*. Sep 8 2012;11:52. doi:10.1186/1475-9276-11-52
35. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature*. Oct 2018;562(7726):203-209. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0579-z
36. All of Us Research Program I, Denny JC, Rutter JL, et al. The "All of Us" Research Program. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 15 2019;381(7):668-676. doi:10.1056/NEJMsr1809937
37. All of Us Research Program. 2022Q4R9 v7 Data Characterization Report. Accessed Feb. 22, 2024. <https://support.researchallofus.org/hc/en-us/articles/14558858196628-2022Q4R9-v7-Data-Characterization-Report>
38. all of Us Research Program Genomics. OBSERVATIONAL MEDICAL OUTCOMES PARTNERSHIP (OMOP) COMMON DATA MODEL. Accessed Feb. 22, 2024. <https://www.researchallofus.org/data-tools/methods/>
39. Townsend P, Phillimore P, Beattie A. *Health and Deprivation: Inequality and the North*. Croom Helm; 1988.
40. Karczewski KJ, Gupta R, Kanai M, et al. Pan-UK Biobank GWAS improves discovery, analysis of genetic architecture, and resolution into ancestry-enriched effects. *medRxiv*. 2024:2024.03.13.24303864. doi:10.1101/2024.03.13.24303864
41. All of Us Research Program Genomics. How the All of Us Genomic data are organized. Accessed Feb. 22, 2024. <https://support.researchallofus.org/hc/en-us/articles/4614687617556-How-the-All-of-Us-Genomic-data-are-organized>
42. All of Us Research Program Genomics I. Genomic data in the All of Us Research Program. *Nature*. Feb 19 2024;doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06957-x
43. Lumsden AL, Mulugeta A, Zhou A, Hypponen E. Apolipoprotein E (APOE) genotype-associated disease risks: a phenome-wide, registry-based, case-control study utilising the UK Biobank. *EBioMedicine*. Sep 2020;59:102954. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2020.102954
44. Smith SM, Douaud G, Chen W, et al. An expanded set of genome-wide association studies of brain imaging phenotypes in UK Biobank. *Nat Neurosci*. May 2021;24(5):737-745. doi:10.1038/s41593-021-00826-4
45. Ge T, Chen CY, Ni Y, Feng YA, Smoller JW. Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and continuous shrinkage priors. *Nat Commun*. Apr 16 2019;10(1):1776. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-09718-5
46. PRSCs. Accessed Feb. 22, 2024. <https://github.com/getian107/PRSCs?tab=readme-ov-file>
47. Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LC, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *Gigascience*. 2015;4:7. doi:10.1186/s13742-015-0047-8
48. One-sample MR or MR with individual-level data. Accessed Feb. 22, 2024. <https://mr-dictionary.mrcieu.ac.uk/term/one-sample/>
49. Friligkou E, Koller D, Pathak GA, et al. Integrating Genome-wide information and Wearable Device Data to Explore the Link of Anxiety and Antidepressants with Heart Rate Variability. *medRxiv*. Aug 4 2023;doi:10.1101/2023.08.02.23293170
50. Terza JV, Basu A, Rathouz PJ. Two-stage residual inclusion estimation: addressing endogeneity in health econometric modeling. *J Health Econ*. May 2008;27(3):531-43. doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2007.09.009

51. Li X, Feng X, Sun X, Hou N, Han F, Liu Y. Global, regional, and national burden of Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, 1990-2019. *Front Aging Neurosci.* 2022;14:937486. doi:10.3389/fnagi.2022.937486
52. Winckers AN, Mackenbach JD, Compernelle S, et al. Educational differences in the validity of self-reported physical activity. *BMC Public Health.* Dec 26 2015;15:1299. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-2656-7
53. Ozanne EM, O'Connell A, Bouzan C, et al. Bias in the reporting of family history: implications for clinical care. *J Genet Couns.* Aug 2012;21(4):547-56. doi:10.1007/s10897-011-9470-x
54. Althubaiti A. Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. *J Multidiscip Healthc.* 2016;9:211-7. doi:10.2147/JMDH.S104807
55. Becker G, Newsom E. Socioeconomic status and dissatisfaction with health care among chronically ill African Americans. *Am J Public Health.* May 2003;93(5):742-8. doi:10.2105/ajph.93.5.742
56. Senia JM, Neppl TK, Gudmunson CG, Donnellan MB, Lorenz FO. The intergenerational continuity of socioeconomic status: Effects of parenting, personality, and age at first romantic partnership. *J Fam Psychol.* Sep 2016;30(6):647-56. doi:10.1037/fam0000171
57. Innerd P, Catt M, Collerton J, et al. A comparison of subjective and objective measures of physical activity from the Newcastle 85+ study. *Age Ageing.* Jul 2015;44(4):691-4. doi:10.1093/ageing/afv062
58. Coughlin SS. Recall bias in epidemiologic studies. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1990;43(1):87-91. doi:10.1016/0895-4356(90)90060-3
59. Zhang YB, Chen C, Pan XF, et al. Associations of healthy lifestyle and socioeconomic status with mortality and incident cardiovascular disease: two prospective cohort studies. *BMJ.* Apr 14 2021;373:n604. doi:10.1136/bmj.n604
60. Rothman KJ, Greenland S, Lash TL. *Modern epidemiology.* vol 3. Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins Philadelphia; 2008.
61. van Roode T, Sharples K, Dickson N, Paul C. Life-Course Relationship between Socioeconomic Circumstances and Timing of First Birth in a Birth Cohort. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(1):e0170170. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0170170
62. Mayo CD, Garcia-Barrera MA, Mazerolle EL, et al. Relationship Between DTI Metrics and Cognitive Function in Alzheimer's Disease. *Front Aging Neurosci.* 2018;10:436. doi:10.3389/fnagi.2018.00436
63. Harrison JR, Bhatia S, Tan ZX, et al. Imaging Alzheimer's genetic risk using diffusion MRI: A systematic review. *Neuroimage Clin.* 2020;27:102359. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102359
64. Hsu M, Dedhia M, Crusio WE, Delprato A. Sex differences in gene expression patterns associated with the APOE4 allele. *F1000Res.* 2019;8:387. doi:10.12688/f1000research.18671.2
65. Wallace J, Lollo A, Duchowny KA, Lavalley M, Ndumele CD. Disparities in Health Care Spending and Utilization Among Black and White Medicaid Enrollees. *JAMA Health Forum.* Jun 2022;3(6):e221398. doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2022.1398
66. Rajan KB, Weuve J, Barnes LL, McAninch EA, Wilson RS, Evans DA. Population estimate of people with clinical Alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment in the United States (2020-2060). *Alzheimers Dement.* Dec 2021;17(12):1966-1975. doi:10.1002/alz.12362
67. Domene JF, Socholotiuk KD, Young RA. The Early Stages of the Transition to Adulthood: Similarities and Differences between Mother-Daughter and Mother-Son Dyads. *Qualitative Research in Psychology.* 2011/07/01 2011;8(3):273-291. doi:10.1080/14780880903568022


68. Honea RA, Vidoni ED, Swerdlow RH, Burns JM, Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I. Maternal family history is associated with Alzheimer's disease biomarkers. *J Alzheimers Dis.* 2012;31(3):659-68. doi:10.3233/JAD-2012-120676
69. Cabrera-Mendoza B, Wendt FR, Pathak GA, Yengo L, Polimanti R. The impact of assortative mating, participation bias and socioeconomic status on the polygenic risk of behavioural and psychiatric traits. *Nat Hum Behav.* Feb 16 2024;doi:10.1038/s41562-024-01828-5
70. DeTure MA, Dickson DW. The neuropathological diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. *Mol Neurodegener.* Aug 2 2019;14(1):32. doi:10.1186/s13024-019-0333-5
71. Alten Sv, Domingue BW, Galama T, Marees AT. Reweighting the UK Biobank to reflect its underlying sampling population substantially reduces pervasive selection bias due to volunteering. *medRxiv.* 2022:2022.05.16.22275048. doi:10.1101/2022.05.16.22275048

Observational analysis




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308850>; this version posted June 13, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.


Genetically informed analysis




AD




Sibling-FHAD



Mother-FHAD



Father-FHAD



Beta

Female Male

AD

Sibling-FHAD

AFR

AMR

CSA

EAS

MID

Mother-FHAD

Father-FHAD

AFR

AMR

CSA

EAS

MID

-2

0

2


Beta

-2

0

2

● Female ● Male



Mother-FHAD

Father-FHAD

Illnesses of father: Alzheimer's disease/dementia

Illnesses of mother: Alzheimer's disease/dementia

Townsend deprivation index at recruitment



Average total household income before tax

Year ended full time education

Qualifications: College or University degree


Qualifications: A levels/AS levels or equivalent

Qualifications: None of the above



Beta

● Female ● Male

A**B**