Alzheimer's disease genetic risk and sleep phenotypes: association with more slow-waves and daytime sleepiness

Short title: **Linking genetic risk for Alzheimer's to sleep physiology**

Vincenzo Muto[1,2#], Ekaterina Koshmanova[1#], Pouya Ghaemmaghami[1#], Mathieu Jaspar[1,2,3], Christelle Meyer[1,2], Mahmoud Elansary[4], Maxime Van Egroo[1], Daphne Chylinski[1], Christian Berthomier[5], Marie Brandewinder[5], Charlotte Mouraux[1], Christina Schmidt[1,2], Grégory Hammad[1], Wouter Coppieters[4], Naima Ahariz[4], Christian Degueldre[1], André Luxen[1], Eric Salmon[1,3,6], Christophe Phillips[1,7], Simon N. Archer[8], Loic Yengo[10], Enda Byrne[10], Fabienne Collette[1,3], Michel Georges[4], Derk-Jan Dijk[8,9], Pierre Maquet[1,2,6], Peter M. Visscher[10], Gilles Vandewalle[1]*

Affiliations:

[1] GIGA-Cyclotron Research Centre-In Vivo Imaging, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[2] Walloon Excellence in Life sciences and Biotechnology (WELBIO, Belgium).
[3] Psychology and Cognitive Neuroscience Research Unit, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[4] GIGA-Medical Genomics, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[5] Physip, Paris, France.
[6] Department of Neurology, University Hospital of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[7] GIGA-In Silico Medicine, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[8] Sleep Research Centre University of Surrey, University of Surrey, Guildford.
[9] UK Dementia Research Institute.
[10] Institute for Molecular Bioscience, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

[#] These authors contributed equally to this work

*** Correspondence to:** Gilles Vandewalle, GIGA-Cyclotron Research Centre-In Vivo Imaging, Bâtiment B30, Allée du 6 Août, 8, 4000 Liège, Belgium, +3243662316, gilles.vandewalle@uliege.be

Conflict of interest statement

The authors have declared that no conflict of interest exists.

Abstract

Sleep disturbances and genetic variants have been identified as risk factors for Alzheimer's disease. Whether genome-wide polygenic risk scores (PRS) for AD associate with sleep phenotypes in young adults, decades before typical AD symptom onset, is currently not known. We extensively phenotyped sleep under different sleep conditions and compute whole-genome Polygenic Risk Scores (PRS) for AD in a carefully selected homogenous sample of healthy 363 young men (22.1 y ± 2.7) devoid of sleep and cognitive disorders. AD PRS was associated with more slow wave energy, i.e. the cumulated power in the 0.5-4 Hz EEG band, a marker of sleep need, during habitual sleep and following sleep loss. Furthermore higher AD PRS was correlated with higher habitual daytime sleepiness. These results imply that sleep features may be associated with AD liability in young adults, when current AD biomarkers are typically negative, and reinforce the idea that sleep may be an efficient intervention target for AD.

50 **Introduction**

51 Defective proteostasis of brain amyloid-beta (Aβ) and tau protein antedates the clinical
52 manifestations of Alzheimer's disease by decades (1–3). This so-called "preclinical" window
53 constitutes an opportunity for internvention that would hopefully reduce the predicted
54 increase in AD prevalence (4), despite the absence of disease modifying treatments in the
55 foreseeable future. In this respect, the further identification of AD risk factors is of paramount
56 importance.

57 Altered sleep has recently been related to increased risk for AD, over and above sleep
58 disturbances in AD patients (5). Longer latency to fall asleep and reduced sleep slow waves
59 and rapid eye movement (REM) sleep are associated with both Aβ plaques and Tau
60 neurofibrillary tangles (NFTs) in cognitively normal participants (6–8). Sleep fragmentation
61 and the reduction in REM sleep quantity in cognitively normal individuals aged >60 y predict
62 the future risk of developing AD (9, 10). Acute sleep deprivation (11, 12), and experimentally
63 induced reduction of sleep slow waves (13), increases cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) Aβ and Tau
64 protein content.

65 In *post mortem* human brain tissues, the first signs of brain protein aggregation are
66 identified in the locus coeruleus (LC), a brainstem nucleus essential to sleep regulation (14),
67 under the form of pretangles, consisting of phosphorylated Tau protein (15). Critically, LC
68 pretangles can be detected during adolescence, while by age 30, they can be detected in the
69 majority of the population (> 90%) (15). With age, Tau deposits increase in the brain in a
70 stereotypical manner and are tightly associated with cognitive decline in overt 'clinical' AD
71 (15). Individual variations in these intrinsic properties should be reflected in brain function,
72 including sleep, whether or not Tau aggregation has already occurred.

73 Sporadic AD, the most common form of AD in the general population, has an estimated

74 heritability ranging between 58% to 79% (16, 17). Individual Polygenic Risk Scores (PRS) for AD
75 can be computed based on results of published Genome Wide Association Studies (GWAS).
76 These PRS reflect part of the genetic liability for AD in any asymptomatic individual and, at the
77 group level, can be associated with phenotypes of interest which are related to the (risk)
78 pathways leading to AD (18, 19). Recent studies reported significant association between AD
79 PRS and CSF Aβ content (20), cortical thickness (21), memory decline (22), and hippocampus
80 volume (23) in cognitively normal older adults (> 45 y) but, importantly, also in young adults
81 (18 -35 y) (23).

82 Here, we conducted a proof-of-concept study to establish that sleep can be related to
83 AD risk in young adults, using PRS for AD. We phenotyped sleep under different conditions
84 (baseline, sleep extension, recovery sleep after total sleep deprivation) in a homogenous
85 sample of young healthy cognitively normal men without sleep disorders and computed
86 individual PRS for AD. We hypothesized that high PRS would be associated with sleep metrics
87 that had previously been associated with AD features in cognitively normal older adults. We
88 further explored whether subjective assessments and behavioural correlates of sleep quality
89 would be associated with PRS for AD.

Results

Following 3 weeks of imposed regular sleep which was confirmed with actimetry, 363 healthy men aged between 18 and 31 y (**Table 1**) completed a 7-day protocol including polysomnographically recorded sleep during habitual sleep-wake times (range of total sleep duration: 361 to 518 min), during a 12h extended sleep opportunity, and during a 12h recovery sleep opportunity following 40h of total sleep deprivation (**Figure 1**). A blood sample was collected in all participants to assess whole genome common single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). PRS were computed as the weighted sum of the effect sizes of the AD-associated SNPs, obtained from summary statistics of AD cases vs. controls GWAS (18, 19). PRS can indicate the presence of a genetic signal in moderate sample size studies (18, 21) as long as it is computed based on a very large GWAS (24, 25). We therefore used the summary statistics of one of the largest AD-GWAS available to date (N = 388,324) (26) to compute individual PRS for AD in our sample and related these to sleep EEG characteristics following multiple quality control steps (**Supplementary Figure S1**).

Polygenic risk for AD is associated with the generation of slow waves during sleep

We first focused on baseline sleep, as it is most representative of habitual sleep, to evaluate sleep metrics that might be associated with AD liability. Given our sample size, we reduced the multiple comparison burden by selecting *a priori* variables of interest among electrophysiology sleep metrics that have previously been related to Aβ and Tau in cognitively normal older adults: sleep onset latency [SOL] (8, 27), duration of wakefulness after sleep onset [WASO] (27), duration of REM sleep (9), slow wave energy [SWE] during NREM sleep (6, 7), i.e. the cumulated power in the 0.5-4 Hz EEG band, and hourly rate of micro-arousals during sleep (13). To compute PRS, one considers SNPs below a p-value threshold in the reference

114 GWAS; the optimal threshold for SNP selection to best compute a PRS for AD is not
115 established. Previous studies employed very exclusive GWAS p-values ($p \sim 10^{-8}$) (28) to more
116 inclusive p-values (p = .5) (23, 29), leading to the inclusion of effect sizes of a few tens to
117 hundreds of thousands SNPs to compute AD PRS. We opted for computing PRS based on
118 increasingly inclusive p-value thresholds (including SNPs reaching GWAS significance – $p <$
119 5×10^{-8} - to very liberal $p < 1$), whilst also pruning SNPs based on their correlation structure (i.e.
120 linkage disequilibrium) (**Supplementary Table S1**) (23, 29). In addition, we performed a PRS
121 analysis using all SNPs without any selection.

122 General linear model (GLM) analyses controlling for age, body mass index (BMI) and
123 total sleep time (TST), revealed an significant association between baseline night SWE and AD
124 PRS ($p < 0.02$; **$\beta \geq 0.12$**) from a p-value threshold of p=0.05 up to selecting all SNPs; the
125 association reached stringent experiment-wise correction for multiple comparisons when
126 selecting all SNPs (see methods; **$\beta = 0.17$**; **Figure 2A; Supplementary Table S2**). We performed
127 a negative control analysis using a PRS for height, a variable for which no association with
128 sleep metrics was expected, and found no association (**Supplementary Figure S2A**). The
129 association between AD PRS and SWE was positive (**Figure 2B**) indicating that higher SWE was
130 associated with higher AD-PRS. SWE was also positively associated with TST (**Supplementary**
131 **Table S2**), which was expected since TST conditions the opportunity to generate slow waves,
132 and negatively with age, which is in line with the literature (30) but may still be surprising
133 given the young age of our sample. Importantly, since GLM included TST and age, they are not
134 driving the association we find between SWE and PRS for AD.

135 Sleep onset latency (SOL) also reached significant association with AD PRS from a p-
136 value threshold of p=0.05 up to p = 1 ($p \leq 0.04$; **$\beta = -0.11$**), but significance did not reach
137 stringent experiment-wise correction for multiple comparisons (**Figure 2A; Supplementary**

138 **Table S2**). Hence, this result has to be considered with caution and will not be extensively
139 commented upon. It is interesting to note, however, that the association between PRS for AD
140 and SOL is negative, with higher PRS associating with shorter sleep latency (**Figure 2C**). Of
141 note, REM% reached uncorrected significance ($p < 0.05$) for thresholding at $p=0.05$ (**$\beta = 0.1$**),
142 with a positive association with AD PRS (**Figure 2A; Supplementary Table S2**), but, since it is
143 observed for only one p-value threshold, this will not be discussed any further.

144 These results indicate that, particularly when considering all SNPs to construct the AD
145 PRS, the overnight power of the slow waves generated during Non-REM sleep, which is a
146 widely accepted measure of sleep need (31), is linearly and positively associated with AD
147 genetic liability. This finding suggests that individuals with a higher genetic liability for AD have
148 a higher need for sleep. This idea is further reinforced by the fact that association between
149 SWE and AD PRS is also significant when only considering SWE of the first hour of sleep (31)
150 (**Supplementary Figure S3 & Table S3**), and the potential negative association with SOL, which
151 depends in part on sleep need.

152 Since slow oscillations (SO), i.e. EEG slow waves < 1 Hz, may be distinct from faster slow
153 waves (32), we further decomposed SWE into SO-SWE (0.5-1Hz) and faster-oscillations—SWE
154 (FO-SWE; 1.25 – 4 Hz). Both SO-SWE and FO-SWE were similarly and significantly associated
155 with AD PRS and for the same p-value thresholds (**Figure 2D; Supplementary Table S3**). The
156 association we found between SWE and AD PRS does not appear therefore to arise exclusively
157 from either slower or faster slow waves.

158

159 ***Recovery sleep, slow wave sleep rebound and extension night***

160 When considering sleep EEG of the other nights, we only included SWE, as it is the only sleep
161 metric that was associated with PRS for AD at stringent correction for multiple comparisons

threshold. Similarly to baseline night, when considering SWE during the recovery night that followed total sleep deprivation, GLM including age, BMI and TST, reveal that SWE and AD PRS are significantly associated ($p \leq 0.04$; **$\beta \geq 0.11$**) from p-value thresholding at p=0.1 up to using all SNPs (**Figure 3A; Supplementary Table S4**), and the association reached stringent experiment-wise correction for multiple comparisons at p-value threshold of p=1. Again, the association was positive with higher SWE associated with higher AD PRS (**Figure 3B**) and results were similar when considering only SWE of the first hour of sleep (**Supplementary Figure S3 & Table S4**). Individuals typically produce more sleep slow waves in response to sleep loss, as part of the homeostatic regulation of sleep (33). Therefore, individuals with higher need for sleep after sleep loss have a high PRS for AD.

Slow wave sleep rebound quantifies the physiological response to a lack of sleep based on the relative changes from normal sleep to recovery sleep following sleep loss. We computed the ratio between the initial SWE (1h of sleep) during recuperation and baseline nights to assess SWE rebound. GLM analysis, including age and BMI, indicated that SWE rebound reached significant association with AD PRS when including all SNPs (**$\beta = -0.11$**), but significance did not reach stringent experiment-wise correction for multiple comparisons (**Figure 3A; Supplementary Table S4**). Sleep rebound is driven by sleep homeostasis which tightly regulates sleep duration and intensity based on prior sleep-wake history (34). Since we observe an association with AD PRS for a single p-value threshold at uncorrected p-value our findings suggest that, in our sample, AD PRS was not tightly associated with sleep homeostatic response. Interestingly though, Spearman's correlation indicated that SWE rebound was correlated to SWE during the recovery night ($r = 0.39$, $p < 10^{-14}$; **Figure 3C)**.

We then considered SWE during the extension night and PRS for AD in a GLM, including age, BMI and TST. Results indicated that extension night SWE was not significantly linked to

186 AD PRS. This may be because sleep timing for this particular night affects sleep quality (31, 34)
187 (**Figure 3A**). In contrast to baseline and recuperation sleep periods which were initiated at
188 habitual sleep time, sleep extension started 2 hours before habitual sleep time, covering the
189 end of a period known as the evening "wake-maintenance zone" corresponding to the time at
190 which the circadian system maximally promotes wakefulness (31). In addition, the circadian
191 system is known to affect the relative content in Non-REM and REM sleep as well as in
192 different EEG frequencies (31, 34). Therefore, the imposed 2h advance of sleep time during
193 the extension night affected sleep quality, which may have reduced the association between
194 SWE and AD PRS found with baseline and recovery nights.
195
196 ***Polygenic risk for AD is associated with increased subjective daytime sleepiness***
197 We next focused on the non-EEG sleep metrics of our protocol and explored their potential
198 association with AD PRS. Based on the 3 weeks of actigraphy with imposed regular habitual
199 sleep time at home, we computed the probability of transition from rest to activity during the
200 sleep period [kRA; (10)]. kRA is a proxy for sleep fragmentation and has been associated with
201 cognitive decline and the risk for developing AD in cognitively normal older adults [mean age
202 81.6 y (10)]. kRA showed a negative association (higher AD PRS is associated with less
203 fragmented sleep) with PRS for AD for two p-value thresholds, $p=5 \times 10^{-8}$ and $p = 10^{-8}$ (**Figure**
204 **4A; Supplementary Table S5**), but did not reach stringent experiment-wise correction for
205 multiple comparisons ($p < 0.002$); it will not be further discussed.
206 Two questionnaires assessed habitual subjective sleep quality and daytime sleepiness
207 before the start of the protocol. Subjective sleep quality was not significantly associated with
208 AD PRS. By contrast, subjective daytime sleepiness was significantly associated with PRS for
209 AD ($p < 0.05$; $\boldsymbol{\beta \geq 0.11}$) from thresholding at $p < 10^{-4}$ up to a threshold of $p < 1$ and at stringent

experiment-wise correction for multiple comparisons at p-value thresholds of $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.3$ (**$\beta \geq 0.16$**; **Figure 4A; Supplementary Table S5**). The association was positive indicating that higher habitual subjective daytime sleepiness was associated with higher AD PRS (**Figure 4B**). This shows that the association between AD PRS and sleep need, as assessed by electrophysiology, is not a mere effect of the protocol and is mirrored at the behavioural level during habitual daytime functioning (outside the experimental protocol). Importantly the vast majority of participants had no or mild levels of sleepiness with a minority (N = 28) reporting moderate level of daytime sleepiness; the association with daytime sleepiness is therefore not driven by extreme or clinically relevant sleepiness levels but rather by ordinary variability in healthy young individuals.

220 **Discussion**

221 We provide evidence that genetic liability for AD is related to sleep characteristics and daytime
222 sleepiness in young adults (aged 18 to 31 y), i.e. decades before typical onset age of clinical
223 AD symptoms and at an age at which current AD biomarkers are typically negative. Our sample
224 size is modest for the detection of small effect size associations, so the present results should
225 be considered as a proof-of-concept for linking AD liability and sleep in young adults. We
226 emphasize, however, that the unique deep phenotyping of our protocol in hundreds of
227 participants, based on gold standard electrophysiology and comprising different sleep
228 conditions, undoubtedly increased the sensitivity of our analyses so that we could find
229 associations that survived stringent correction for multiple comparisons. Importantly, our
230 protocol provides links between disease risk and sleep physiology in contrast to coarser
231 phenotyping based on sleep questionnaires or actimetry alone. The characteristics of our
232 sample renders our findings remarkable: to increase the genetic uniformity of the sample we
233 only included Caucasian men within a narrow age range; they were healthy and devoid of any
234 sleep disorders or sleep complaints and their prior sleep-wake history was recorded and
235 stable. In this carefully selected homogenous sample, higher PRS for AD was associated with
236 producing denser or larger slow waves during baseline and recovery night time sleep,
237 potentially with large slow wave sleep rebound following sleep deprivation, and with
238 reporting higher daytime sleepiness.

239 Larger and more abundant slow waves during habitual sleep in young and healthy
240 individuals can result from an increased sleep need due to insufficient prior sleep (33). This
241 appears unlikely: prior sleep-wake history was stringently controlled for 3 weeks prior to
242 entering the lab, ruling out undue sleep deprivation, sleep restriction or disrupted rhythmicity.
243 Moreover, throughout the protocol, participants followed their own sleep schedule, a regime

244 that should not expose them to important chronic sleep restriction. Finally, SWE during the
245 sleep extension night did not significantly correlate with subjective daytime sleepiness
246 (Spearman's correlation $r = 0.08$, $p = 0.11$), supporting the idea that, when given a longer sleep
247 opportunity, individuals with higher and yet normal daytime sleepiness did not sleep more
248 intensely to recover a putative prior sleep debt. Alternatively, increased slow wave density
249 and/or intensity could reflect a faster build-up of sleep need (35). Indeed, sleep homeostasis
250 is thought to result from molecular and cellular changes induced by waking brain function and
251 behaviour (36, 37). Synaptic potentiation and increased synaptic strength resulting from
252 waking experience are reflected in a progressive increased cortical excitability during
253 wakefulness (38, 39) and an increase in slow wave activity during subsequent sleep (36, 37).
254 Likewise, extracellular glutamate concentration and glutamatergic receptor density increase
255 with time awake and affect brain function (40, 41). Here, SWE rebound following sleep loss,
256 i.e. the ratio between baseline and recovery sleep, was only significantly associated with high
257 PRS for AD for one p-value threshold and at uncorrected significance threshold, but was
258 strongly associated with SWE during recovery sleep. We therefore find only partial evidence
259 for this second hypothesis, which will require more investigations.

260 How are these findings related to AD? The answer to this question remains speculative
261 because the time course of AD processes across lifespan is still poorly understood. In
262 transgenic mice, neuronal activity locally increases the level of Aβ in the interstitial fluid and
263 drives local Aβ aggregation (42). The progressive Aβ deposition ultimately disrupts local
264 functional connectivity and increases regional vulnerability to subsequent Aβ deposition (43).
265 We might thus hypothesize that individuals with more intense brain activity during
266 wakefulness (and therefore also during sleep) would also be exposed to larger Aβ extracellular
267 levels and a greater risk of developing Aβ deposits. This hypothesis appears unlikely for the

268 following reasons. First, post mortem examinations show that the earliest evidence of Aβ
269 deposits (stage 1 (44)) is not observed before 30 y (45). Second, Aβ oligomers might be
270 released and exert their detrimental effect on brain function at an earlier age. However, in
271 transgenic mice, sleep-wakefulness cycle and diurnal fluctuation in brain extracellular Aβ
272 remain normal until plaque formation (46).

273 By contrast, given the age range of our population sample, the reported topography of
274 pretangles at this age (15) and the power of PRS for AD to discriminate AD patients in case-
275 control samples (29), higher PRS in our young sample might reflect the influence of incipient
276 Tau aggregation onto sleep regulation through the LC (and other non-thalamic cortically-
277 projecting nuclei, as raphe nuclei) (15). Tau, an intracellular protein, is also detected in the
278 extracellular space. Over and above a low level constitutive tau secretion (47), neuronal
279 activity increases the release of tau in the extracellular space (48), thereby participating in
280 enhancing tau spread and tau pathology in vivo (49). Moreover, early electrophysiological
281 changes indicative of hyperexcitability are observed in intact neurons from transgenic tau
282 mice (50). In the cerebral cortex of tau transgenic mice, glutamatergic and GABAergic neurons
283 are in a hypermetabolic state, characterized by a relative increase in production of glutamate
284 (51). By contrast, decreasing tau in epilepsy-prone transgenic mice reduces neuronal
285 hyperexcitability (52). These findings would suggest that a strong cerebral activity during
286 wakefulness would result in a higher daily average in perceived sleepiness, a substantial tau
287 release and an enhanced sleep homeostasis processes, as indicated by denser and larger slow
288 waves.

289 The reasons for the vulnerability of LC to Tau aggregation are not established but might
290 reside in its constant recruitment for essential functions, its energy demanding and ubiquitous
291 brain connections, its high vascularization or its higher susceptibility to oxidative stress (14).

292 Although it tantalizing to hypothesize that tau is involved in the mechanisms linking slow wave
293 sleep and AD liability, one can also speculate that it is the LC intrinsic characteristics that are
294 related to tau vulnerability (subsequent) that associated with PRS for AD, meaning that the
295 association would not necessarily require the presence of tau to be detected.

296 On the other hand, in tau transgenic mice, misfolded and hyperphosphorylated tau
297 alters hippocampal synaptic plasticity (53), eventually induces a loss of hippocampal LTP and
298 causes reduction of synaptic proteins and dendritic spines (54) (55). These findings would
299 predict a lower sleep need in participants with high AD liability. However, it is possible that
300 these detrimental processes take place later on in the development of the disease or emerge
301 from an interaction between tau and Ab (56) (57). Accordingly, in older adults, significant
302 associations, opposite to the current findings, were observed between slow wave sleep and
303 risk for AD based on PET biomarkers (6, 7): higher Aβ (6) or tau (7) burdens were associated
304 with lower sleep slow wave EEG power. Our results suggest therefore that the association
305 between AD risk and sleep homeostasis changes with age: at an early stage, dense and large
306 slow waves would be associated with increased AD risk. Later on, the ability to generate slow
307 waves would play a protective role against AD risk. Deep sleep phenotyping across all ages
308 and/or in long term longitudinal studies will have to test this hypothesis.

309 We emphasize that the cross sectional nature of our study, precludes any causal
310 interpretation of the association we find between AD and sleep. We further stress that our
311 sample only include men and cannot therefore be extended to the entire population. Women
312 have been reported to have different sleep characteristics, including the production of more
313 numerous and intense slow waves during sleep (58). It is also worth mentioning that we
314 cannot isolate in our findings the specific contributions of the circadian timing system, which
315 is the second fundamental mechanism regulating sleep and wakefulness (34). Although we

316 find significant association between AD PRS and baseline/recovery SWE and daytime
317 sleepiness across similar p-value thresholds, more research is also required to determine how
318 many SNPs one has to include, i.e. what SNP selection strategy should be used to best predict
319 AD. Previous studies support that using a lenient p-value thresholds is successful in doing so
320 (23, 29), thus we are confident that our finding are related to AD liability. Our PRS calculation
321 was stringently controlled for the weight of chromosome 19 (see methods) to avoid excessive
322 contribution from Apolipoprotein E (APOE) genotype, which is the genetic trait most
323 associated with sporadic AD. When comparing APOE ε4 carriers genotype vs. non-carriers, no
324 significant difference in baseline night SWE and daytime sleepiness was observed
325 **(Supplementary Figure S4)**, in line with our findings that a large number of SNPs is required
326 to find an association between SWE and PRS for AD.

327 The specificity of our findings for a given EEG frequency band and/or for NREM remains
328 to be fully established. As many previous studies on linking sleep and AD risk [e.g. (6, 7)], we
329 only focussed on a limited set of sleep metrics, and included a single power measure over a
330 given frequency band. Although not the focus of the present paper, we computed SWE,
331 relative SWE (i.e. ratio between SWE and overnight total NREM power), overnight cumulated
332 total power during NREM sleep and overnight cumulated power in the 2 to 6 Hz band during
333 REM sleep of the baseline night in individuals among the higher and lower AD PRS quartile
334 **(Supplementary Figure S5)**. This simple analyses indicates that individuals with 25% highest
335 AD PRS had higher power than individuals with 25% lowest AD PRS for all three absolute
336 measures (t-test; $p \leq 0.01$ but not for relative SWE ($p = 0.14$), suggesting that our findings may
337 not be specific to NREM sleep and SWE. We emphasize, however, that, given our modest
338 sample size, our analyses was not planned to address such question. This first preliminary
339 analysis warrants future studies with larger sample size ensuring sufficient power when using

340 a larger set of sleep metrics. Since we also find that daytime sleepiness, a wakefulness trait, is
341 associated with PRS for AD, and because of the link between tau protein and cortical
342 excitability (52), neuronal activity synchrony during wakefulness should be associated with the
343 risk for developing AD to assess whether isolated links are specific to sleep.

344 In conclusion, we find that denser and/or more intense sleep slow waves during
345 baseline and recovery sleep and daytime sleepiness are associated with the genetic liability
346 for AD in young and healthy young men. This finding supports that sleep slow wave and
347 sleepiness measures may help early detection of an increased risk for AD and reinforce the
348 idea that sleep may be an efficient intervention target for AD. Similarly to most studies
349 associating PRS to phenotypes of interest [e.g. (21–24)], the effects we isolated constitute
350 relatively small effects ($r < 0.2$), however, recalling that sleep must be envisaged within the
351 multifactorial aspect of a complex disease such as AD (4).

352

Methods

Participants

Three hundred and sixty-four young healthy men (aged 18-31 years) were enrolled for the study after giving their written informed consent, and received a financial compensation. Exclusion criteria were as follows: Body Mass Index (BMI) > 27; psychiatric history or severe brain trauma; addiction, chronic medication affecting the central nervous system; smoking, excessive alcohol (> 14 units/week) or caffeine (> 3 cups/day) consumption; shift work in the past year; transmeridian travel in the past three months; moderate to severe subjective depression as measured by the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)(59) (score > 19); poor sleep quality as assessed by the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) (60) (score > 7). Participants with sleep apnea (apnea hypopnea index > 15/hour; 2017 American Academy of Sleep Medicine criteria, version 2.4) were excluded based on an in-lab screening night of polysomnography. One participant, part of a twin pair, was excluded from the analyses so that the analysed sample included 363 participants (**Table 1**). EEG recordings were missing due to technical issues for three of the five participants per nights of sleep considered in this manuscript. No individual had more than one night of sleep missing so that all 363 individuals contributed to at least part of the analyses reported here. The Epworth Sleepiness Scale (61) was used to characterize daytime sleepiness but was not used for inclusion. While most participants scored normal values (≤ 11), 28 participants had scores ranging from 12 to 15, corresponding to moderate daytime sleepiness. Because of an initial error in automatic evaluation of computerized questionnaires, seven participants had PSQI scores higher than cut-off (scores of 8 or 9). No participants were, however, taking sleep medication. To avoid reducing sensitivity, these participants were included in all analyses but removing them did not change statistical outcomes.

377 Although available in our laboratory, Ab- and tau- PET scans were not conducted in
378 participants: it was felt unethical to expose them to an irradiation while results would
379 necessarily be normal.

380 **Experimental Protocol**

381 Individual sleep-wake history was strictly controlled: during the three weeks preceding the in-
382 lab experiment, participants were instructed to follow a regular sleep schedule according to
383 their habitual sleep timing (+/-30 min for the first 2 weeks; +/- 15 min for the last week).
384 Actigraphy data showed that included participants faithfully followed the assigned schedules.

385 **Figure 1** provides an overview of the protocol. On Day 1, a urine drug test was
386 performed (10-multipanel drug) before completing an adaptation night at habitual
387 sleep/wake schedule during which a full polysomnography was recorded in order to screen
388 for sleep related breathing disorders or periodic limb movements. On Day 2, participants left
389 the lab with the instruction not to nap (checked with actigraphy). They returned to the
390 laboratory at the end of Day 2, completed a baseline night of sleep under EEG monitoring at
391 habitual sleep/wake schedule and remained in the laboratory until Day 7 under constant
392 CCTV. A 12h sleep extension night under EEG and centered around habitual sleep mid-point
393 was initiated on Day 3, in complete darkness with the instruction to try to sleep as much as
394 possible. Day 4 included a 4h afternoon nap under EEG recording (centred 1h after the mid-
395 point between morning wake-up time and evening sleep time) further dissipated any residual
396 sleep need. What we termed the "before" night was also initiated on Day 4. It consisted in 8h
397 sleep opportunity starting at habitual sleep time. During Day 5 and 6, participants remained
398 awake for 40 hours under constant routine (CR) conditions [dim light < 5 lux, semi-recumbent
399 position, 19°C ± 1, regular isocaloric food intake] before initiating a 12h recuperation night
400 from habitual sleep time until 4h after habitual wake time. Except during sleep (darkness – 0

401 lux) and constant routine protocol (dim light < 5 lux), participants were maintained in normal
402 room light levels oscillating between 50 and 1000 lux depending on location and gaze.
403 Analyses of "before" night, nap and sleep deprivation protocol will be reported elsewhere.
404 The current study focusses on baseline, extension and recovery nights of sleep.

405 **EEG acquisitions and analyses**

406 Sleep data were acquired using Vamp amplifiers (Brain Products, Germany). The electrode
407 montage consisted of 10 EEG channels (F3, Fz, F4, C3, Cz, C4, Pz, O1, O2, A1; reference to right
408 mastoid), 2 bipolar EOGs, 2 bipolar EMGs and 2 bipolar ECGs. Screening night of sleep also
409 included respiration belts, oximeter and nasal flow, 2 electrodes on one leg, but included only
410 Fz, C3, Cz, Pz, Oz and A1 channels. EEG data were re-referenced off-line to average mastoids.
411 Scoring of sleep stages was performed automatically in 30-s epochs using a validated
412 algorithm (ASEEGA, PHYSIP, Paris, France) (62) and according to 2017 American Academy of
413 Sleep Medicine criteria, version 2.4. An automatic artefact detection algorithm with adapting
414 thresholds (63) was further applied on scored data. Power spectrum was computed for each
415 channel using a Fourier transform on successive 4-s bins, overlapping by 2-s., resulting in a
416 0.25 Hz frequency resolution. The night was divided into 30 min periods, from sleep onset
417 until lights on. For each 30 min period, slow wave energy (SWE) was computed as the sum of
418 generated power in the delta band (0.5 – 4 Hz range) during all the NREM 2 (N2) and NREM 3
419 (N3) epochs of the given period, after adjusting for the number of N2 and N3 epochs to
420 account for artefacted data (64). As the frontal regions are most sensitive to sleep-wake
421 history (65), SWE was considered over the frontal electrodes (mean over F3, Fz, F4). To deal
422 with the multiple comparison issue, we did not consider SWE over the other parts of the scalp
423 (34). Additional analyses also considered cumulative power between 0.5 and 25 Hz during
424 NREM and cumulative power between 2 to 6 Hz power during REM sleep as well through

425 similar computation procedures.

426 **Genotyping and Imputation**

427 Blood sample were collected on Day 2 for DNA analyses. The genotyping was performed using
428 the Infinium OmniExpress-24 BeadChip (Illumina, San Diego, CA) based on Human Build 37
429 (GRCh37). Missingness of the SNP markers were below 20% in all individuals. Using PLINK
430 software (66), we excluded the SNPs with a minor allele frequency (MAF) below 0.01, or
431 Hardy-Weinberg disequilibrium (HWD) significance below 10^{-4}. Markers with ambiguous
432 alleles (A-T, T-A, G-C, C-G) were excluded as well. We finally ended with 511,729 SNPs. To
433 investigate the relatedness between the individuals, using PLINK --genome command, we
434 computed the identity by descent (IBD) estimates for all pairs of individuals. For 8 pairs, the
435 composite pi-hat score was between 0.15 and 0.56 suggesting the existence of at least 3rd
436 degree relatives in our cohort. However, we did not exclude any individuals at this level of
437 analysis. We merged our cohort with "1000 Genomes Project" (67)and employed principal
438 component analyses (PCA) on the merged samples to see if our cohort was located in the
439 European cluster (**Figure S1A**). We further assess allele frequencies coherence of our cohort
440 with the European subset of "1000 Genomes Project" (**Figure S1B**). Markers with allele
441 frequencies deviating more than 0.2 unit from European allele frequency were excluded
442 (**Figure S1C**). Genotype imputation was performed using "Sanger imputation server" by
443 choosing "Haplotype Reference Consortium (release 1.1)" (HRC) as Reference Panel and the
444 Pre-phasing algorithm EAGLE2. Post-imputation QC was then performed very similarly to the
445 one of above (MAF < 0.01, HWD < 10^{-4}, imputation quality score < 0.3). As a result of such
446 filters, 7,554,592 variants remained for the analysis. However, to avoid having markers with
447 allele frequencies deviating from European allele frequency, we computed the allele
448 frequencies for the samples in our cohort after imputation and cross checked them with the

449 European allele frequency (obtained from HRC Reference Consortium (release 1.1)) (**Figure**
450 **S1D**). The markers whose allele frequencies were deviating more than 0.2 unit from European
451 allele frequency were excluded.

452 **Predicting Height**

453 To validate common SNP assessments in our sample we predicted actual height based on
454 Polygenic Scores computed based on a meta-analysis of a recent GWAS study (68) on around
455 700,000 individuals. We used all the variants in the meta-analysis that were included in our
456 cohort [3121 SNPS out of 3290]. The procedure for calculating the Liability for height is the
457 same as the one described in the following section. **Figures S1E** visualize the Pearson
458 correlation results between the actual values for Height and estimated genetic Liability of
459 Height ($r = 0.46$, $p = 10^{-20}$). Explained variance is very close to that reported previously (68),
460 i.e. is 24.6% .

461 **Polygenic Risk Score (PRS)**

462 Polygenic risk score (PRS) is defined as the sum of multiple single-nucleotide polymorphism
463 alleles associated with the trait for an individual, weighted by the estimated effect sizes (18,
464 19). We used the estimated effect sizes from a GWAS by Marioni et al. including 388,324
465 individuals, with 67,614 cases - patients and self-report familial history of AD – and 320,710
466 controls (26). To generate a set of approximately independent SNPs in our sample, linkage
467 disequlibrium (LD) clumping was performed using PLINK (66) on window size of 1000-kb using
468 a pairwise r^2 cut-off of 0.2 and a predetermined significance thresholds (*p*-value < $5\ 10^{-8}$, 10^{-6},
469 10^{-4}, 0.001, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, and 1). Due to the effect of APOE in chromosome 19, we
470 used a more stringent criteria pairwise r^2 cut-off of 0.01 for this chromosome. In addition, we
471 also calculated the PRS using all the variants with no pruning, i.e. no correction for linkage

472 disequilibrium, thereby selecting all SNPs for PRS construction. This procedure yielded a
473 quantitative polygenic score, under each significance threshold, for each individual in our
474 cohort.

475 **Height as a negative control**

476 From the known and hypothesised biology, we did not expect any a priori association between
477 the sleep phenotypes and a genetic liability for height. Therefore, we included an analysis of
478 polygenic scores for height as a negative control, performing exactly the same association
479 analyses as we did for liability to AD.

480 **Actigraphy data collection and analysis**

481 Actigraphy data were collected with Actiwatch 4 devices (Cambridge Neurotechnology ltd, UK)
482 worn on the non-dominant arm. Data consisted in the sum of activity counts over 60-second
483 intervals. Data were analyzed with *pyActigraphy* (Version v0.1) (69) which implements the
484 computation of state transition probabilities from rest to activity (kRA) (10). In order to better
485 reflect sleep fragmentation, this probability was calculated only over sleep periods for each
486 study's participant. The sleep period is defined as the period comprised between the activity
487 offset and onset times, derived from the average 24h activity profile. In addition, to mitigate
488 the uncertainty on their exact timing, the offset and onset times were shifted by +15 min and
489 -15min, respectively.

490

491 **Statistical Analysis**

492 We employed general linear model (GLM) to test the associations between sleep metrics of
493 interests as a dependent variable and the estimated PRS as an independent variables and age,
494 BMI and TST as covariates. Prior to the analysis, we removed the outliers among the sleep
495 metrics by excluding the samples lying beyond 4 times the standard deviation (the final
496 number of individuals included in each analyses is reported below each dependent variable in
497 the supplementary tables). All analyses were performed in Python.

498 In this study, we analysed multiple traits and multiple polygenic risk scores (PRS) for
499 association. To control the experiment-wise false positive rate, we estimated the number of
500 independent tests that we performed, and set an experiment-wise p-value threshold
501 accordingly. Since the traits are phenotypically correlated with each other and the PRSs are
502 also correlated, we used the correlation structure to estimate the equivalent number of tests,
503 which is the number of independent tests that would result in the same overall observed
504 variation.

505 For each correlation matrix of traits and PRS, we performed a singular value
506 decomposition (SVD), ordered the resulting eigenvalues and calculated the sum of all
507 eigenvalues. We then calculated the minimum number of linear combination of the traits that
508 resulted in 99% of the variation. For the 5 EEG phenotypic sleep traits this estimate was 5,
509 showing that they are not highly correlated. Likewise, for the 3 non-EEG phenotypic sleep
510 traits this estimate was 3. For the 11 PRS for AD and height, the resulting number was 8 and
511 4, respectively, consistent with a higher correlation structure among the multiple height
512 predictors. Therefore, our analyses with the 5 EEG sleep metrics implies a total number of 40
513 and 20 tests when confronted to AD-PRS and height-PRS respectively. Hence, for any of our
514 trait-PRS combination to be statistically significant when taken multiple testing into account,

515 the p-value threshold are 0.00125 and 0.0025 for AD and height, respectively. Similarly, our
516 analyses with SWE in recovery and extension nights and with SWE rebound, each imply 8 tests
517 and a p-value threshold of p = 0.00625, while our analyses with 3 non-EEG sleep metrics 24
518 tests and a p-value threshold of p = 0.0021. Additional analyses compared lower and higher
519 PRS quartile (i.e. 90 individuals with lowest AD PRS and 90 individuals with highest PRS; cf. Fig.
520 S4) as well as APOE ε4 carriers vs. non carriers (cf. Fig. S5). For these analyses, groups were
521 compared through t-tests.

522 **Study approval**

523 This research was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Medicine at the
524 University of Liège, Belgium. All participants signed an informed consent prior to their
525 participation and received a financial compensation.

526

527

528 **Author contributions**

529 Study concept and design: V.M., S.N.A., M.G., D.J.D., P.M., P.M.V. and G.V. Data acquisition:
530 V.M., M.J., C.Me. Data analyses: V.M., E.K., P.G., C.B., M.B., W.C., N.A. and G.V. Interpretation:
531 V.M., E.K., P.G., D.J.D., P.M., P.M.V., G.V. Analyses support: E.S., A.L., C.P., L.Y., E.B., M.E., M.V.,
532 D.C., C.Mo., G.H., C.D., F.C., M.G., C.S. Manuscript draft: V.M., E.K., P.G., D.J.D., P.M., P.M.V.,
533 G.V. Revised manuscript: all authors.

534 **Acknowledgments**

535 We thank E. Balteau, C. Borsu, N. Cai, A. Claes, G. Gaggioni, A. Gobalek, B. Herbillon, P.
536 Hawotte, E. Lambot, B. Lauricella, M. Lennertz, J.Q.L. Ly, M. Micho, G. Salmon and A. Shaffii-
537 Le Bourdiec for their help in different steps of the study.

538 **Funding**

539 P.G., M.V., C.S., F.C., C.P. and G.V. are supported by the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique -
540 FNRS-Belgium. The study was supported by the Wallonia-Brussels Federation (Actions de
541 Recherche Concertées - ARC - 09/14-03), WELBIO/Walloon Excellence in Life Sciences and
542 Biotechnology Grant (WELBIO-CR-2010-06E), FNRS-Belgium (FRS-FNRS, F.4513.17 &
543 T.0242.19 & 3.4516.11), University of Liège (ULiège), Fondation Simone et Pierre Clerdent,
544 European Regional Development Fund (Radiomed project), Fonds Léon Fredericq. DJD is
545 supported by the UK Dementia Research Institute (DRI).

546 **Competing interests**

547 All authors declare no competing interests.

548
549
550

551 **References**

552 1. Musiek ES, Holtzman DM. Three dimensions of the amyloid hypothesis: Time, space and
553 "wingmen" [Internet]. *Nat. Neurosci.* 2015;18(6):800–806.
554 2. Jack CR et al. NIA-AA Research Framework: Toward a biological definition of Alzheimer's disease
555 [Internet]. *Alzheimer's Dement.* 2018;14(4):535–562.
556 3. Scheltens P et al. Alzheimer's disease [Internet]. *Lancet* 2016;388(10043):505–517.
557 4. Norton S, Matthews FE, Barnes DE, Yaffe K, Brayne C. Potential for primary prevention of
558 Alzheimer's disease: An analysis of population-based data [Internet]. *Lancet Neurol.*
559 2014;13(8):788–794.
560 5. Van Egroo M et al. Sleep–wake regulation and the hallmarks of the pathogenesis of Alzheimer's
561 disease [Internet]. *Sleep* 2019;42(4). doi:10.1093/sleep/zsz017
562 6. Mander BA et al. β-amyloid disrupts human NREM slow waves and related hippocampus-
563 dependent memory consolidation [Internet]. *Nat. Neurosci.* 2015;18(7):1051–1057.
564 7. Lucey BP et al. Reduced non–rapid eye movement sleep is associated with tau pathology in early
565 Alzheimer's disease [Internet]. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 2019;11(474):eaau6550.
566 8. Branger P et al. Relationships between sleep quality and brain volume, metabolism, and amyloid
567 deposition in late adulthood. *Neurobiol. Aging* 2016;41:107–114.
568 9. Pase MP et al. Sleep architecture and the risk of incident dementia in the community [Internet].
569 *Neurology* 2017;89(12):10.1212/WNL.0000000000004373.
570 10. Lim ASP, Kowgier M, Yu L, Buchman AS, Bennett DA. Sleep Fragmentation and the Risk of Incident
571 Alzheimer's Disease and Cognitive Decline in Older Persons. [Internet]. *Sleep* 2013;36(7):1027–
572 1032.
573 11. Holth JK et al. The sleep-wake cycle regulates brain interstitial fluid tau in mice and CSF tau in
574 humans [Internet]. *Science (80-.).* 2019;eaav2546.
575 12. Ooms S et al. Effect of 1 Night of Total Sleep Deprivation on Cerebrospinal Fluid β-Amyloid 42 in
576 Healthy Middle-Aged Men: A Randomized Clinical Trial. [Internet]. *JAMA Neurol.* 2014;71(8):971–
577 977.
578 13. Ju Y-ES et al. Slow wave sleep disruption increases cerebrospinal fluid amyloid-β levels [Internet].
579 *Brain* 2017;140(8):2104–2111.
580 14. Mather M, Harley CW. The Locus Coeruleus: Essential for Maintaining Cognitive Function and the
581 Aging Brain. [Internet]. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 2016;20(3):214–26.
582 15. Braak H, Del Tredici K. The pathological process underlying Alzheimer's disease in individuals
583 under thirty [Internet]. *Acta Neuropathol.* 2011;121(2):171–181.
584 16. Gatz M et al. Role of genes and environments for explaining Alzheimer disease [Internet]. *Arch.*

585 *Gen. Psychiatry* 2006;63(2):168–174.
586 17. Ertekin-Taner N. Genetics of Alzheimer disease in the pre- and post-GWAS era [Internet].
587 *Alzheimer's Res. Ther.* 2010;2(1):3.
588 18. Euesden J, Lewis CM, O'Reilly PF. PRSice: Polygenic Risk Score software. [Internet]. *Bioinformatics*
589 2015;31(9):1466–8.
590 19. Ge T, Chen C-Y, Ni Y, Feng Y-CA, Smoller JW. Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and
591 continuous shrinkage priors. [Internet]. *Nat. Commun.* 2019;10(1):1776.
592 20. Martiskainen H et al. Effects of Alzheimer's disease-associated risk loci on cerebrospinal fluid
593 biomarkers and disease progression: A polygenic risk score approach [Internet]. *J. Alzheimer's Dis.*
594 2015;43(2):565–573.
595 21. Sabuncu MR et al. The association between a polygenic Alzheimer score and cortical thickness in
596 clinically normal subjects [Internet]. *Cereb. Cortex* 2012;22(11):2653–2661.
597 22. Marden JR et al. Using an Alzheimer disease polygenic risk score to predict memory decline in
598 black and white Americans over 14 years of follow-up [Internet]. *Alzheimer Dis. Assoc. Disord.*
599 2016;30(3):195–202.
600 23. Mormino EC et al. Polygenic risk of Alzheimer disease is associated with early- and late-life
601 processes [Internet]. *Neurology* 2016;87(5):481–488.
602 24. Santoro ML et al. Polygenic risk score analyses of symptoms and treatment response in an
603 antipsychotic-naive first episode of psychosis cohort. [Internet]. *Transl. Psychiatry* 2018;8(1):174.
604 25. Dudbridge F. Power and Predictive Accuracy of Polygenic Risk Scores [Internet]. *PLoS Genet.*
605 2013;9(3):e1003348.
606 26. Marioni RE et al. GWAS on family history of Alzheimer's disease [Internet]. *Transl. Psychiatry*
607 2018;8(1):99.
608 27. Ettore E et al. Relationships between objectives sleep parameters and brain amyloid load in
609 subjects at risk to Alzheimer's disease: the INSIGHT-preAD Study [Internet]. *Sleep* [published
610 online ahead of print: July 2, 2019]; doi:10.1093/sleep/zsz137
611 28. Sleegers K et al. A 22-single nucleotide polymorphism Alzheimer's disease risk score correlates
612 with family history, onset age, and cerebrospinal fluid Aβ42. [Internet]. *Alzheimers. Dement.*
613 2015;11(12):1452–60.
614 29. Escott-Price V et al. Common polygenic variation enhances risk prediction for Alzheimer's disease
615 [Internet]. *Brain* 2015;138(12):3673–3684.
616 30. Carrier J et al. Sleep slow wave changes during the middle years of life. *Eur. J. Neurosci.*
617 2011;33(4):758–766.
618 31. Dijk DJ, Czeisler C a. Contribution of the circadian pacemaker and the sleep homeostat to sleep
619 propensity, sleep structure, electroencephalographic slow waves, and sleep spindle activity in

620 humans. [Internet]. *J. Neurosci.* 1995;15(5 Pt 1):3526–3538.
621 32. Steriade M, Amzica F. Slow sleep oscillation, rhythmic K-complexes, and their paroxysmal
622 developments [Internet]. *J. Sleep Res.* 1998;7(S1):30–35.
623 33. Klerman EB, Dijk DJ. Interindividual variation in sleep duration and its association with sleep debt
624 in young adults [Internet]. *Sleep* 2005;28(10):1253–1259.
625 34. Dijk D-J, Landolt H-P. Sleep Physiology, Circadian Rhythms, Waking Performance and the
626 Development of Sleep-Wake Therapeutics [Internet]. In: *Handbook of Experimental*
627 *Pharmacology*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg; 2019:1–41
628 35. Viola AU et al. PER3 Polymorphism Predicts Sleep Structure and Waking Performance. *Curr. Biol.*
629 2007;17(7):613–618.
630 36. Tononi G, Cirelli C. Sleep and the Price of Plasticity: From Synaptic and Cellular Homeostasis to
631 Memory Consolidation and Integration [Internet]. *Neuron* 2014;81(1):12–34.
632 37. Scammell TE, Arrigoni E, Lipton JO. Neural Circuitry of Wakefulness and Sleep [Internet]. *Neuron*
633 2017;93(4):747–765.
634 38. Huber R et al. Human cortical excitability increases with time awake [Internet]. *Cereb. Cortex*
635 2013;23(2):332–338.
636 39. Ly JQM et al. Circadian regulation of human cortical excitability [Internet]. *Nat Commun* 2016;In
637 Press:11828.
638 40. Dash MB, Douglas CL, Vyazovskiy V V., Cirelli C, Tononi G. Long-Term Homeostasis of Extracellular
639 Glutamate in the Rat Cerebral Cortex across Sleep and Waking States [Internet]. *J. Neurosci.*
640 2009;29(3):620–629.
641 41. Hefti K et al. Increased metabotropic glutamate receptor subtype 5 availability in human brain
642 after one night without sleep [Internet]. *Biol. Psychiatry* 2013;73(2):161–168.
643 42. Bero AW et al. Neuronal activity regulates the regional vulnerability to amyloid-ß deposition. *Nat.*
644 *Neurosci.* 2011;14(6):750–756.
645 43. Bero AW et al. Bidirectional relationship between functional connectivity and amyloid-β
646 deposition in mouse brain [Internet]. *J. Neurosci.* 2012;32(13):4334–4340.
647 44. Thal D, Rüb U, Orantes M, Braak H. Phases of A beta-deposition in the human brain and its
648 relevance for the development af AD. *Neurology* 2002;58:1791–1800.
649 45. Braak H, Del Tredici K. The preclinical phase of the pathological process underlying sporadic
650 Alzheimer's disease [Internet]. *Brain* 2015;138(10):2814–2833.
651 46. Roh JH et al. Disruption of the Sleep-Wake Cycle and Diurnal Fluctuation of β-Amyloid in Mice
652 with Alzheimer's Disease Pathology [Internet]. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 2012;4(150):150ra122-150ra122.
653 47. Chai X, Dage JL, Citron M. Constitutive secretion of tau protein by an unconventional mechanism.
654 *Neurobiol. Dis.* 2012;48(3):356–366.

655 48. Yamada K et al. Neuronal activity regulates extracellular tau in vivo. *J. Exp. Med.*
656 2014;211(3):387–393.
657 49. Schultz MK et al. Pharmacogenetic neuronal stimulation increases human tau pathology and
658 trans-synaptic spread of tau to distal brain regions in mice. *Neurobiol. Dis.* 2018;118(June):161–
659 176.
660 50. Crimins JL, Rocher AB, Luebke JI. Electrophysiological changes precede morphological changes to
661 frontal cortical pyramidal neurons in the rTg4510 mouse model of progressive tauopathy.
662 [Internet]. *Acta Neuropathol.* 2012;124(6):777–95.
663 51. Nilsen LH, Rae C, Ittner LM, Götz J, Sonnewald U. Glutamate metabolism is impaired in transgenic
664 mice with tau hyperphosphorylation.. *J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.* 2013;33(5):684–91.
665 52. Holth JK et al. Tau Loss Attenuates Neuronal Network Hyperexcitability in Mouse and Drosophila
666 Genetic Models of Epilepsy. *J. Neurosci.* 2013;33(4):1651–1659.
667 53. Polydoro M et al. Soluble pathological tau in the entorhinal cortex leads to presynaptic deficits in
668 an early Alzheimer's disease model. *Acta Neuropathol* 2014;127(2):257–270.
669 54. Van der Jeugd A et al. Cognitive defects are reversible in inducible mice expressing pro-aggregant
670 full-length human Tau.. *Acta Neuropathol.* 2012;123(6):787–805.
671 55. Sydow A et al. Tau-induced defects in synaptic plasticity, learning, and memory are reversible in
672 transgenic mice after switching off the toxic Tau mutant.. *J. Neurosci.* 2011;31(7):2511–25.
673 56. Oddo S et al. Triple-Transgenic Model of Alzheimer's Disease with Plaques and Tangles. *Neuron*
674 2003;39(3):409–421.
675 57. Fein JA et al. Co-localization of amyloid beta and tau pathology in Alzheimer's disease
676 synaptosomes.. *Am. J. Pathol.* 2008;172(6):1683–92.
677 58. Svetnik V et al. EEG spectral analysis of NREM sleep in a large sample of patients with insomnia
678 and good sleepers: effects of age, sex and part of the night. [Internet]. *J. Sleep Res.*
679 2017;26(1):92–104.
680 59. Beck AT, Steer RA, G. GM. Psychometric Properties of the Beck Depression Inventory: Twenty-five
681 years of evaluation. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* 1988;8:77–100.
682 60. Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF, Monk TH, Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The Pittsburgh sleep quality index: A
683 new instrument for psychiatric practice and research [Internet]. *Psychiatry Res.* 1989;28(2):193–
684 213.
685 61. Johns MW. A new method for measuring daytime sleepiness: The Epworth Sleepiness Scale
686 [Internet]. *Sleep* 1991;14(6):540–545.
687 62. Berthomier C et al. Exploring scoring methods for research studies : Accuracy and variability of
688 visual and automated sleep scoring2020;(August 2019):1–11.
689 63. Wallant DC t. et al. Automatic artifacts and arousals detection in whole-night sleep EEG

690 recordings [Internet]. *J. Neurosci. Methods* 2016;258:124–133.
691 64. Skorucak J, Arbon EL, Dijk D-J, Achermann P. Response to chronic sleep restriction, extension, and
692 total sleep deprivation in humans: adaptation or preserved sleep homeostasis? [Internet]. *Sleep*
693 2018;(May):1–27.
694 65. Schmidt C, Peigneux P, Cajochen C. Age-related changes in sleep and circadian rhythms: Impact
695 on cognitive performance and underlying neuroanatomical networks [Internet]. *Front. Neurol.*
696 2012;JUL:118.
697 66. Purcell S et al. PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage
698 analyses. [Internet]. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 2007;81(3):559–75.
699 67. Altshuler DL et al. A map of human genome variation from population-scale sequencing
700 [Internet]. *Nature* 2010;467(7319):1061–1073.
701 68. Yengo L et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies for height and body mass index
702 in ∼700000 individuals of European ancestry [Internet]. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* [published online
703 ahead of print: August 16, 2018]; doi:10.1093/hmg/ddy271
704 69. Hammad G, Reyt M. ghammad/pyActigraphy: Actigraphy made simple! [Internet][published
705 online ahead of print: January 11, 2019]; doi:10.5281/ZENODO.2537921
706 70. Horne JA, Ostberg O. A self-assessment questionnaire to determine morningness-eveningness in
707 human circadian rhythms. [Internet]. *Int. J. Chronobiol.* 1976;4(2):97–110.
708 71. John, Raven J. Raven Progressive Matrices [Internet]. In: *Handbook of Nonverbal Assessment*.
709 Boston, MA: Springer US; 2003:223–237
710

Figures and Tables



Figure 1: Overview of the protocol.

Following 3 weeks of regular sleep at habitual times, 363 healthy young men aged ~22 y complete a 7-day protocol (displayed for a participant sleeping from 11PM to 7PM). Adaptation/screening and baseline nights were scheduled at habitual sleep-wake times. Extension nights consisted of a 12h sleep opportunity centred around habitual sleep mid-point. Nap consisted of an afternoon 4h sleep opportunity. The “Before” (sleep deprivation) and recovery nights (from sleep deprivation) consisted of an 8h and 12h sleep opportunity respectively, all starting at habitual sleep time. Following the “before” night, volunteers completed a 40h sleep deprivation protocol under strictly controlled constant routine conditions in dim light. Sleep periods included in the current analyses are in bold and italic.



Figure 2: Associations between Polygenic Risk Score (PRS) for AD and baseline night sleep metrics.

A. Statistical outcomes of GLMs with five sleep metrics of interest vs. AD PRS from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) p-value threshold to using all SNPs (N=356). GLMs are corrected for age, BMI and total sleep time (TST). Negative log transformation of p-values of the associations are presented on the vertical axis. Horizontal lines in A and D indicate different p-values thresholds: light blue = .05 (uncorrected); orange= .01 (corrected for 5 sleep metrics); red = 0.00125 (experiment-wise correction; see methods).

SOL: sleep onset latency; WASO: wake time after sleep onset; DUR_REM: duration of REM sleep; arousal: hourly rate of micro-arousal during sleep; SWE: slow wave energy in NREM sleep (0.5-4Hz)

B. Positive association between SWE during baseline night and AD PRS including All SNPs (N=356). Spearman correlation r is reported for completeness (r = .12, p = .02), refer to main text Table S2 for statistical outputs of GLMs.

C. Negative association between SOL during baseline night and AD PRS for $p < 0.3$. Spearman correlation r is reported for completeness (r = -.11, p = .03), refer to main text Table S2 for statistical outputs of GLMs (N=356).

D. GLMs including SWE separated in the slower (SO-SWE; 0.5-1Hz) and faster (FO-SWE; 1.25-4Hz) frequency range from conservative p-value thresholds to using all SNPs (N=356). Horizontal blue line indicate p = 0.05 significance level. GLMs are corrected for age, BMI and TST. Refer to main text Table S3 for statistical outputs of GLMs.



Figure 3: Associations between Polygenic Risk Score (PRS) for AD and slow wave energy (SWE) during recovery and extension nights and with SWE rebound.

A. Statistical outcomes of GLMs with SWE (0.5-4Hz) in the recovery (REC; N=353) and extension (EXT; N=356) nights and with SWE rebound (REC/BAS; N=344) vs. AD PRS from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) to inclusive ($p < 1$) p-value level and using all SNPs. SWE rebound consist in the ratio between SWE in the first hour of sleep of recovery and baseline nights. GLMs are corrected for age and BMI, and TST for REC and EXT. Negative log transformation of p-values of the associations are presented on the vertical axis. Horizontal lines indicate different p-values thresholds: light blue = .05 (uncorrected); red = 0.00625 (experiment-wise correction; see methods).

B. Positive association between SWE during recovery night and AD PRS at $p < 1$. Spearman correlation r is reported for completeness ($r = .01$, $p = .06$), srefer to main text Table S4 for statistical outputs of GLMs (353).

C. Positive association between SWE during recovery and SWE rebound (SWE REC/BAS): Spearman correlation $r = .36$, $p < .001$ (N=344).



Figure 4: Associations between Polygenic Risk Score (PRS) for AD and non-EEG sleep metrics.

A. Statistical outcomes of GLMs with actimetry-assessed sleep fragmentation (kRA; N=361), subjective sleep quality (Sleep-qual; N=363) and subjective daytime sleepiness (Day-sleepiness; N=363) vs. AD PRS from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) to inclusive ($p < 1$) p-value thresholds and using all SNPs. GLMs are corrected for age and BMI. Negative log transformation of p-values of the associations are presented on the vertical axis. Horizontal lines indicate different p-values: light blue = .05 (uncorrected); orange= .016 (corrected for 3 sleep metrics); red = 0.002 (experiment-wise correction).
B. Positive association between subjective daytime sleepiness and AD PRS at $p < 0.05$ (N=363). Linear regression line shown for display purposes only; refer to main text and Table S5 for statistical outputs of GLMs.

Table 1. Sample characteristics (mean ± SD).

N	363
Sex	Men
Ethnicity	Caucasian
Age (y)	22.10 ± 2.73
Height (cm)	180.39 ± 6.70
Body mass index (BMI) (kg m^{-2})	22.15 ± 2.31
IQ	123.88 ± 11.14
Education (y)	13.33 ± 1.60
Mood	3.00 ± 3.48
Sleep quality	3.46 ± 1.76
Daytime sleepiness	5.94 ± 3.54
Chronotype	50.11 ± 8.25
Rest-activity Fragmentation (a.u.)	0.10 ± 0.03
Baseline sleep duration (min)	451 ± 41

Mood was estimated by the 21-item Beck Depression Inventory II (59), sleep quality by the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) (60); daytime sleepiness by the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS)(61); chronotype by the Horne-Östberg questionnaire (70). IQ was estimated using Raven Progressive Matrices (71). Rest fragmentation (arbitrary units, a.u.) was estimated as the probability of transition from rest to activity during estimated sleep based on actigraphy data from the 3 weeks of imposed regular sleep (10, 69).

ONLINE SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Alzheimer's disease genetic risk and sleep phenotypes: association with more slow-waves and daytime sleepiness

Short title: **Linking genetic risk for Alzheimer's to sleep physiology**

Vincenzo Muto[1,2#], Ekaterina Koshmanova[1#], Pouya Ghaemmaghami[1#], Mathieu Jaspar[1,2,3], Christelle Meyer[1,2], Mahmoud Elansary[4], Maxime Van Egroo[1], Daphne Chylinski[1], Christian Berthomier[5], Marie Brandewinder[5], Charlotte Mouraux[1], Christina Schmidt[1,2], Grégory Hammad[1], Wouter Coppieters[4], Naima Ahariz[4], Christian Degueldre[1], André Luxen[1], Eric Salmon[1,3,6], Christophe Phillips[1,7], Simon N. Archer[8], Loic Yengo[10], Enda Byrne[10], Fabienne Collette[1,3], Michel Georges[4], Derk-Jan Dijk[8,9], Pierre Maquet[1,2,6], Peter M. Visscher[10], Gilles Vandewalle[1]*

Affiliations:

[1] GIGA-Cyclotron Research Centre-In Vivo Imaging, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[2] Walloon Excellence in Life sciences and Biotechnology (WELBIO, Belgium).
[3] Psychology and Cognitive Neuroscience Research Unit, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[4] GIGA-Medical Genomics, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[5] Physip, Paris, France.
[6] Department of Neurology, University Hospital of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[7] GIGA-In Silico Medicine, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
[8] Sleep Research Centre University of Surrey, University of Surrey, Guildford.
[9] UK Dementia Research Institute.
[10] Institute for Molecular Bioscience, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

[#] These authors contributed equally to this work

* Correspondence to: Gilles Vandewalle, GIGA-Cyclotron Research Centre-In Vivo Imaging, Bâtiment B30, Allée du 6 Août, 8, 4000 Liège, Belgium, +3243662316, gilles.vandewalle@uliege.be



Figure S1: quality checks (QC) performed during genetic data processing
A. Principal component (PC) analysis of our data (after merging with genome 1k). PC1 vs. PC2 is displayed for our European (Caucasian) study sample (STUDY) and for other ethnicities provided by Haplotype Reference Consortium (HRC) Europe release 1.1. CEU: Utah Residents (CEPH) with Northern and Western European Ancestry; FIN: Finnish in Finland; GBR: British in England and Scotland; IBS: Iberia in Spain; TSI: Toscani in Italia. Our study sample clusters at the same position as Europeans.
B. To validate common SNP assessments in our sample, we predicted height of our volunteers based on a meta-analysis of height GWAS studies [75]. Predicted Liability for Height was significantly associated with the actual values in our sample ($r = 0.46$; $p < 10^{-20}$) with similar value as reported in Yengo et al. (2018) ($r = 0.49$).
C-D. Allele frequencies in our sample were compared to HRC Europe reference data and SNP deviating more than 0.2 unit from European allele frequency were excluded [**C.** Original data. **D.** Data after removal of deviant allele].



Figure S2: Controls for false positive for different significant associations
Statistical outcomes of GLMs with five sleep metrics of interest vs. polygenic prediction of individual height from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) p-value threshold to using all SNPs. Negative log transformation of p-values of the associations are presented on the vertical axis. Horizontal lines indicated different p-values thresholds: light blue = .05 (uncorrected); orange= .01 (corrected for 5 sleep metrics); red = 0.0025 (experiment-wise correction). As expected height prediction is not association with any of the sleep metrics further validating our main finding.



Figure S3: Associations between Polygenic Risk Score (PRS) for AD and SWE in the first hour of sleep for baseline (BAS), recovery (REC) and extension (EXT) nights.
Statistical outcomes of GLMs with SWE (0.5-4Hz) of each night type in the first hour of sleep (SWE(1h)) vs. AD PRS from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) p-value threshold to using all SNPs. GLMs are corrected for age and BMI. Negative log transformation of p-values of the associations are presented on the vertical axis. Horizontal lines indicate different p-values thresholds: light blue = .05 (uncorrected); red = 0.00625 (experiment-wise correction; see methods).



Figure S4: No difference in SWE and daytime sleepiness between APOE e4 carriers and non-carriers. Distribution of APOE e4 Carriers and Non Carriers for SWE during baseline night (**A**) and daytime sleepiness (**B**). T-tests between APOE e4 carriers (N = 100) and Non carriers (N = 263) show no significant difference in case of SWE (p = 0.84) and daytime sleepiness (p = 0.94).



Figure S5: Differences in SWE, relative_SWE, total NREM power and REM power during baseline sleep between lower and upper AD PRS quartiles.

Comparison of individual with 25% lowest (N = 90) and 25% highest (N = 90) PRS (using all SNPs) for SWE (**A**), relative SWE (**B**), cumulated total power between 0.5 and 25 Hz during NREM sleep (**C**) and cumulated power over the 2 to 6 Hz band during REM sleep (**D**). T-tests indicated higher power in higher quartile vs. lower quartile in all three absolute measures (**SWE: p = 0.008; total NREM: p = 0.008; REM: p = 0.01**) but not for **relative SWE (p = 0.14)**.

Relative power was computed as the individual ratio between SWE and cumulated total power between 0.5 and 25 Hz during NREM sleep.

Dots: individual values; boxes: interquartile interval; horizontal bar within boxes: median; error bars: 10 to 90% interval.

Table S1. Number of SNPs included in PRS computation as a function of p-value thresholding in reference GWAS summary statistic of [21].

P-value threshold	Number of SNPs included in PRS computation
P-value threshold 5 x 10^{-8} (and LD)	64
P-value threshold 10^{-6} (and LD)	108
P-value threshold 10^{-4} (and LD)	517
P-value threshold 10^{-3} (and LD)	2543
P-value threshold 0.01 (and LD)	15654
P-value threshold 0.05 (and LD)	58096
P-value threshold 0.1 (and LD)	101336
P-value threshold 0.3 (and LD)	233635
P-value threshold 0.5 (and LD)	329341
P-value threshold 1 (and LD)	466829
All SNPs (no LD)	7780254

LD: linkage disequilibrium pruning

Table S2. Statistical outcomes of GLMs with the five baseline night sleep metrics of interest vs. AD PRS from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) to inclusive ($p < 1$) p-value threshold and selecting all SNPs.

p-value threshold	*p=5 10^{-8}*	*p =10^{-6}*	*p =10^{-4}*	*p=.001*	*p=.01*	*p=.05*	*p=.1*	*p=.3*	*p=.5*	*p=1*	*All SNPs*
SOL (N = 356)	ns							$\beta = -0.11$ $p = 0.03$ Age $\beta = 0.13$ $p = .01$ TST $\beta = 0.13$ $p = 0.01$ BMI $\beta = -0.19$ $p < .0003$	$\beta = -0.11$ $p = 0.03$ Age $\beta = 0.13$ $p = .01$ TST $\beta = 0.13$ $p = 0.01$ BMI $\beta = -0.19$ $p = .0003$	$\beta = -0.11$ $p = 0.04$ Age $\beta = 0.13$ $p = .01$ TST $\beta = 0.13$ $p = 0.01$ BMI $\beta = -0.19$ $p = .0003$	ns
WASO (N = 356)	ns										
DUR_REM (N = 356)	ns			$\beta = 0.1$ $p = 0.03$ Age $\beta = 0.04$ $p = .04$ TST $\beta = 0.5$ $p =< 0.0001$	ns						
Arousals (N = 356)	ns										
SWE (N = 356)	ns					$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.019$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.019$ Age $\beta = -0.21$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.14$ $p = 0.008$ Age $\beta = -0.21$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.14$ $p = 0.007$ Age $\beta = -0.21$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.14$ $p = 0.005$ Age $\beta = -0.21$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\boldsymbol{\beta = 0.17}$ $\boldsymbol{p = 0.001}$* Age $\beta = -0.23$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.005$

GLMs included age, BMI and TST. Only uncorrected significant association p<.05 are reported. Partial effect sizes are provided for each significant association. ns: non-significant (p > 0.05). ***** association meeting study-wise correction for multiple comparison (p < 0.00125). SOL: sleep onset latency; WASO: wake time after sleep onset; DUR_REM: duration of REM sleep; arousal: hourly rate of micro-arousal during sleep; SWE: slow wave energy in NREM sleep (0.5-4Hz). The number of participants included in each GLM, following outlier removal and because of missing data, is reported below each dependent variable.

Table S3. Statistical outcomes of GLMs with SWE during the first hour of sleep (SWE 1h) in baseline (BAS) nights of sleep and when separating slow oscillation SWE (SO-SWE) and fast oscillation SWE (FO-SWE) from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) to inclusive ($p < 1$) p-value threshold and when selecting all SNPs.

p-value threshold	***p=5 10^{-8}***	***p =10^{-6}***	***p =10^{-4}***	***p=.001***	***p=.01***	***p=.05***	***p=.1***	***p=.3***	***p=.5***	***p=1***	***All SNPs***
SWE 1h BAS (N = 355)	ns					$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.02$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.17$ $p = 0.001$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.03$ Age $\beta = -0.21$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.17$ $p = 0.001$	$\beta = 0.14$ $p = 0.005$ Age $\beta = -0.20$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.17$ $p = 0.001$	$\beta = 0.14$ $p = 0.005$ Age $\beta = -0.21$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.17$ $p = 0.001$	$\beta = 0.15$ $p = 0.004$ Age $\beta = -0.21$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.17$ $p = 0.001$	$\beta = 0.17$ $p = 0.0007$ Age $\beta = -0.22$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.17$ $p = 0.0007$
SO-SWE (N = 357)	ns					$\beta = 0.11$ $p = 0.04$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0002$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.03$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.02$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.02$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.2$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.15$ $p = 0.003$ Age $\beta = -0.22$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$
FO-SWE (N = 357)	ns					$\beta = 0.11$ $p = 0.03$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0002$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.11$ $p = 0.04$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.02$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.02$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.13$ $p = 0.01$ Age $\beta = -0.2$ $p = .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$	$\beta = 0.15$ $p = 0.004$ Age $\beta = -0.21$ $p < .0001$ TST $\beta = -0.14$ $p = 0.007$

GLMs included age and BMI (and TST for SO-SWE and FO-SWE). Only uncorrected significant association p<.05 are reported. Partial effect sizes are provided for each significant association. ns: non-significant (p > 0.05). BMI was never significantly associated with AD PRS. SO-SWE: 0.5-1Hz; FO-SWE: 1.25-4Hz.

Table S4. Statistical outcomes of GLMs with SWE during recovery and extension and with SWE rebound vs. AD PRS from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) to inclusive ($p < 1$) p-value threshold and selecting all SNPs.

P-value threshold	*p=5 10^{-8}*	*p =10^{-6}*	*p =10^{-4}*	*p=.001*	*p=.01*	*p=.05*	*p=.1*	*p=.3*	*p=.5*	*p=1*	*All SNPs*
SWE – REC (N = 353)	ns						$\beta = 0.11$ $p = 0.04$ Age $\beta = -0.28$ $p < .0001$	$\beta = 0.13$ $p = 0.009$ Age $\beta = -0.28$ $p < .0001$	$\beta = 0.13$ $p = 0.009$ Age $\beta = -0.29$ $p < .0001$	$\beta = 0.14$ $\boldsymbol{p = 0.006}$* Age $\beta = -0.29$ $p.0001$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.03$ Age $\beta = -0.3$ $p < .0001$
SWE 1h REC (N = 355)	ns						$\beta = 0.11$ $p = 0.03$ Age $\beta = -0.27$ $p < .0001$	$\beta = 0.16$ $p = 0.002$ Age $\beta = -0.27$ $p < .0001$	$\beta = 0.16$ $p = 0.002$ Age $\beta = -0.27$ $p < .0001$	$\beta = 0.16$ $p = 0.002$ Age $\beta = -0.27$ $p < .0001$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.02$ Age $\beta = -0.28$ $p < .0001$
SWE – Rebound (N = 344)	ns										$\beta = -0.11$ $p = 0.047$
SWE – EXT (N = 356)	ns										

GLMs included age, BMI and total sleep time (TST). Only uncorrected significant association p<0.05 are reported (in bold). ***** association meeting study-wise correction for multiple comparison ($p < 0.00625$). SWE rebound consist in the difference between difference in the SWE in the first hour of sleep of recovery and baseline nights. Partial effect sizes are provide for each significant association. ns: non-significant ($p > 0.05$). The number of participants included in each GLM, following outlier removal and because of missing data, is reported below each dependent variable.

Table S5. Statistical outcomes of GLMs with non-EEG sleep metrics vs. AD PRS from conservative ($p < 5x10^{-8}$) to inclusive ($p < 1$) p-value threshold and selecting all SNPs.

p-value threshold	***p=5 10^{-8}***	***p =10^{-6}***	***p =10^{-4}***	***p=.001***	***p=.01***	***p=.05***	***p=.1***	***p=.3***	***p=.5***	***p=1***	***All SNPs***
kRA (N = 361)	$\beta = -0.11$ $p = 0.036$	$\beta = -0.13$ $p = 0.016$	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Sleep-qual (N = 363)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Day-sleepiness (N = 363)	ns	ns	$\beta = 0.11$ $p = 0.043$	$\beta = 0.12$ $p = 0.02$	$\beta = 0.13$ $p = 0.01$	$\boldsymbol{\beta = 0.17}$ $\boldsymbol{p = 0.001} *$	$\beta = 0.16$ $p = 0.003$	$\boldsymbol{\beta = 0.16}$ $\boldsymbol{p = 0.002} *$	$\beta = 0.16$ $p = 0.003$	$\beta = 0.15$ $p = 0.006$	ns

GLMs included age and BMI. Only uncorrected significant association p<.05 are reported (in bold). Partial effect sizes are provided for each significant association. ns: non-significant (p > 0.05) BMI and age were not significantly associated with the dependent variables. ***** associations meeting study-wise correction for multiple comparison (p < 0.002). The number of participants included in each GLM, following outlier removal and because of missing data, is reported below each dependent variable

1