Exome sequencing identifies rare damaging variants in the *ATP8B4* and *ABCA1* genes as novel risk factors for Alzheimer's Disease.

Authors:
Henne Holstege[1,2,3,*,#]; Marc Hulsman[1,2,3,*,#]; Camille Charbonnier[4,*]; Benjamin Grenier-Boley[5]; Olivier Quenez[4]; Detelina Grozeva[6]; Jeroen G.J. van Rooij[7,8]; Rebecca Sims[6]; Shahzad Ahmad[9,10]; Najaf Amin[9,11]; Penny J. Norsworthy[12]; Oriol Dols-Icardo[13,14]; Holger Hummerich[12]; Amit Kawalia[15]; Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database[16]; Philippe Amouyel[5]; Gary W. Beecham[17]; Claudine Berr[18]; Joshua C. Bis[19]; Anne Boland[20]; Paola Bossù[21]; Femke Bouwman[2]; Jose Bras[22,23]; Dominique Campion[4]; J. Nicholas Cochran[24]; Antonio Daniele[25]; Jean-François Dartigues[26]; Stéphanie Debette[26,27]; Jean-François Deleuze[20]; Nicola Denning[28]; Anita L DeStefano[29,30,31]; Lindsay A. Farrer[29,31,32,33]; Maria Victoria Fernandez[34,34,35]; Nick C. Fox[37]; Daniela Galimberti[38,39]; Emmanuelle Genin[40]; Hans Gille[41]; Yann Le Guen[42]; Rita Guerreiro[22,23]; Jonathan L. Haines[43]; Clive Holmes[44]; M. Arfan Ikram[9]; M. Kamran Ikram[9]; Iris Jansen[2,45]; Robert Kraaij[8]; Marc Lathrop[46]; Afina W. Lemstra[2]; Alberto Lleó[13,14]; Lauren Luckcuck[6]; Marcel M. A. M. Mannens[47]; Rachel Marshall[6]; Eden R Martin[17,48]; Carlo Masullo[49]; Richard Mayeux[50,51]; Patrizia Mecocci[52]; Alun Meggy[28]; Merel O. Mol[7]; Kevin Morgan[53]; Richard M. Myers[24]; Benedetta Nacmias[54,55]; Adam C Naj[56,57]; Valerio Napolioni[42,58]; Florence Pasquier[59]; Pau Pastor[60,61]; Margaret A. Pericak-Vance[17,48]; Rachel Raybould[28]; Richard Redon[62]; Marcel J.T. Reinders[3]; Anne-Claire Richard[4]; Steffi G Riedel-Heller[63]; Fernando Rivadeneira[8]; Stéphane Rousseau[4]; Natalie S. Ryan[37]; Salha Saad[6]; Pascual Sanchez-Juan[14,64]; Gerard D. Schellenberg[57]; Philip Scheltens[2]; Jonathan M. Schott[37]; Davide Seripa[65]; Sudha Seshadri[30,31,66]; Daoud Sie[41]; Erik Sistermans[41]; Sandro Sorbi[54,55]; Resie van Spaendonk[41]; Gianfranco Spalletta[67]; Niccólo Tesi[1,2,3]; Betty Tijms[2]; André G Uitterlinden[8]; Sven J. van der Lee[1,2,3]; Pieter Jelle de Visser[2]; Michael Wagner[68,69]; David Wallon[70]; Li-San Wang[57]; Aline Zarea[70]; Jordi Clarimon[13,14]; John C. van Swieten[7]; Michael Greicius[42]; Jennifer S. Yokoyama[72]; Carlos Cruchaga[34,34,35]; John Hardy[71]; Alfredo Ramirez[15,66,68,69,73]; Simon Mead[12]; Wiesje M. van der Flier[2]; Cornelia M van Duijn[9,11]; Julie Williams[6]; Gaël Nicolas[4,#]; Céline Bellenguez[5,*]; Jean-Charles Lambert[5,#]

*Authors contributed equally to this work

[#] To whom correspondence should be addressed
— Henne Holstege: h.holstege@amsterdamumc.nl
— Marc Hulsman: m.hulsman@amsterdamumc.nl
— Gael Nicolas: gaelnicolas@hotmail.com
— Jean-Charles Lambert: jean-charles.lambert@pasteur-lille.fr

Affiliations
1. Genomics of Neurodegenerative Diseases and Aging, Department of Human Genetics, Amsterdam University Medical Center (location VUmc), Neuroscience Campus Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
2. Alzheimer Center Amsterdam, Department of Neurology, Amsterdam Neuroscience, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
3. Delft Bioinformatics Lab, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands
4. Normandie Univ, UNIROUEN, Inserm U1245 and CHU Rouen, Department of Genetics and CNR-MAJ, F-76000 Rouen, France
5. Univ. Lille, Inserm, CHU Lille, Institut Pasteur de Lille, U1167-RID-AGE facteurs de risque et déterminants moléculaires des maladies liés au vieillissement, Lille, France
6. MRC Centre for Neuropsychiatric Genetics and Genomics, , Division of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neuroscience, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

7. Department of Neurology, Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
8. Department of Internal Medicine, Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
9. Department of Epidemiology, Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
10. LACDR, Leiden, The Netherlands
11. Nuffield Department of Population Health Oxford University
12. MRC Prion Unit , UCL Institute of Prion Diseases, London, UK
13. Department of Neurology, II B Sant Pau, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
14. CIBERNED, Network Center for Biomedical Research in Neurodegenerative Diseases, National Institute of Health Carlos III, Madrid, Spain
15. Division of Neurogenetics and Molecular Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Cologne, Medical Faculty, Cologne, Germany
16. ADNI consortium; see supplemental authors
17. The John P. Hussman Institute for Human Genomics, University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA
18. Univ. Montpellier, Inserm U1061, Neuropsychiatry: epidemiological and clinical research, PSNREC, Montpellier, France
19. Cardiovascular Health Research Unit, Department of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA.
20. Université Paris-Saclay, CEA, Centre National de Recherche en Génomique Humaine Evry, France
21. Experimental Neuro-psychobiology Laboratory, Department of Clinical and Behavioral Neurology, IRCCS Santa Lucia Foundation, Rome, Italy
22. Department of Neurodegenerative Science, Van Andel Institute, Grand Rapids, MI USA
23. Division of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine, Michigan State University College of Human Medicine, Grand Rapids, MI, USA.
24. HudsonAlpha Institute for Biotechnology, Huntsville, AL, USA
25. Department of Neuroscience, Catholic University of Sacred Heart, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy
26. University Bordeaux, Inserm, Bordeaux Population Health Research Center, France
27. Department of Neurology, Bordeaux University Hospital, Bordeaux, France
28. UKDRI@ Cardiff, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK
29. Department of Biostatistics, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA.
30. Framingham Heart Study, Framingham, MA, USA.
31. Department of Neurology, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA.
32. Department of Epidemiology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA
33. Department of Medicine (Biomedical Genetics), Boston University, Boston, MA, USA
34. Neurogenomics and Informatics Center, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, MO USA
35. Psychiatry Department, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, MO
36. Hope Center for Neurological Disorders, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, MO
37. Dementia Research Centre, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London, UK
38. Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Policlinico, Milan, Italy
39. University of Milan, Milan, Italy
40. Univ Brest, Inserm, EFS, CHU Brest, UMR 1078, GGB, F-29200, Brest, France
41. Genome Diagnostics, Department of Human Genetics, VU University, AmsterdamUMC (location VUmc), Van Der Boechorststraat 7, 1081 BT Amsterdam
42. Department of Neurology and Neurological Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA.
43. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, USA
44. Clinical and Experimental Science, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
45. Department of Complex Trait Genetics, Center for Neurogenomics and Cognitive Research, Amsterdam Neuroscience, Vrije University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
46. McGill University and Genome Quebec Innovation Centre, Montreal, QC, Canada
47. Department of Human Genetics, Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam Reproduction and Development Research Institute Amsterdam
48. Dr. John T. Macdonald Foundation Department of Human Genetics, University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA
49. Institute of Neurology, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart , Rome, Itlay
50. Taub Institute on Alzheimer's Disease and the Aging Brain, Department of Neurology, Columbia University, New York, New York, USA
51. Gertrude H. Sergievsky Center, Columbia University, New York, New York,
52. Institute of Gerontology and Geriatrics, Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy
53. Human Genetics, School of Life Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK
54. Department of Neuroscience, Psychology, Drug Research and Child Health University of Florence, Florence Italy
55. IRCCS Fondazione Don Carlo Gnocchi, Florence, Italy
56. Penn Neurodegeneration Genomics Center, Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Informatics; University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,
57. Penn Neurodegeneration Genomics Center, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,
58. Genomic And Molecular Epidemiology (GAME) Lab, School of Biosciences and Veterinary Medicine, University of Camerino (UNICAM) Camerino, 62032, Italy
59. Univ. Lille, Inserm, CHU Lille, UMR1172, Resources and Research Memory Center (MRRC) of Distalz, Licend, Lille France
60. Fundació Docència i Recerca MútuaTerrassa and Movement Disorders Unit, Department of Neurology, University Hospital MútuaTerrassa, Barcelona, Spain
61. Memory Disorders Unit, Department of Neurology, Hospital Universitari Mutua de Terrassa, Terrassa, Barcelona, Spain.
62. Université de Nantes, CHU Nantes, CNRS, INSERM, l'institut du thorax, Nantes, France
63. Institute of Social Medicine, Occupational Health and Public Health, University of Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany.
64. Neurology Service, Marqués de Valdecilla University Hospital (University of Cantabria and IDIVAL), Santander, Spain.
65. Laboratory for Advanced Hematological Diagnostics, Department of Hematology and Stem Cell Transplant, Lecce, Italy
66. Glenn Biggs Institute for Alzheimer's and Neurodegenerative Diseases, San Antonio, TX, USA
67. Laboratory of Neuropsychiatry, Department of Clinical and Behavioral Neurology, IRCCS Santa Lucia Foundation, Rome, Italy
68. Department of Neurodegeneration and Geriatric Psychiatry, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany.
69. German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE, Bonn), Bonn, Germany.
70. Normandie Univ, UNIROUEN, Inserm U1245 and CHU Rouen, Department of Neurology and CNR-MAJ, F-76000 Rouen, France
71. Reta Lila Weston Research Laboratories, Department of Molecular Neuroscience, UCL Institute of Neurology, London, UK.
72. Memory and Aging Center, Department of Neurology, University of California, San Francisco, CA USA
73. Excellence Cluster on Cellular Stress Responses in Aging-Associated Diseases (CECAD), University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

The genetic component of Alzheimer's disease (AD) has been mainly assessed using Genome Wide Association Studies (GWAS), which do not capture the risk contributed by rare variants. Here, we compared the gene-based burden of rare damaging variants in exome sequencing data from 32,558 individuals —16,036 AD cases and 16,522 controls— in a two-stage analysis. Next to known genes *TREM2*, *SORL1* and *ABCA7*, we observed a significant association of rare, predicted damaging variants in *ATP8B4* and *ABCA1* with AD risk, and a suggestive association in *ADAM10* and *SRC*. Next to these genes, our analysis highlighted *RIN3, CLU, ZCWPW1 and ACE* as potential causal genes in AD-GWAS loci. Rare damaging variants in these genes, and in particular loss-of-function variants, have a large effect on AD-risk, and they are enriched in early onset AD cases. The newly identified AD-associated genes provide additional evidence for a major role for APP-processing, Aβ aggregation and microglial function in AD.

AD is the leading cause of dementia and its impact will continue to grow with the increase in life expectancy[1]. Beyond autosomal dominant early onset AD (<1% of all AD cases, onset ≤65 years), the common complex form of AD has an estimated heritability of ~70%[2]. Using genome wide association studies (GWAS) based on DNA chips, 75 mostly common genetic risk factors/loci have been associated with AD-risk in populations with European ancestry, but individually these common variants have low effect sizes[3]. Using DNA-sequencing strategies, rare (allele frequency <1%) damaging missense or loss-of-function (LOF) variants in the *TREM2*, *SORL1* and *ABCA7* genes were identified to also contribute to the heritability of AD and they associate with a substantially higher increased risk of AD than individual GWAS-hits[4-8].

In order to detect additional genes for which rare variants associate with AD-risk, it is necessary to compare genetic sequencing data from thousands of AD cases and controls. In a large collaborative effort, we harmonized sequencing data from different studies from Europe and the United States (**Table S1**) and applied a multi-stage gene burden analysis (**Figure 1A**). We observed site-specific technical biases, since data were generated at multiple centers, using heterogeneous methods. To account for these batch effects, we designed and applied comprehensive quality control (QC) procedures (**Online methods, Tables S2-S3**).

After sample QC, we first compared gene-based rare-variant burdens between 12,652 AD cases and 8,693 controls in a Stage-1 analysis (**Table 1A**). We detected a total of 7,543,193 variants after sample- and variant-QC (**Table 1B**) and annotated LOF variants with LOFTEE and missense variants with the REVEL score, and selected variants with AF<1%. We defined four deleteriousness thresholds by incrementally including variants with lower levels of predicted deleteriousness: respectively LOF (n=57,543), LOF+REVEL≥75 (n=111,755), LOF+REVEL≥50 (n=211,665), and LOF+REVEL≥25 (n=409,733). Of the 19,822 autosomal protein coding genes, we analyzed the 13,222 genes that had a cumulative minor allele count (cMAC) ≥10 for the lowest deleterious threshold LOF+REVEL≥25 (**see Methods**); 9,168 genes for the LOF+REVEL≥50 threshold; 5,694 for the LOF+REVEL≥75 threshold and 3,120 genes for the LOF-only threshold (**Figure 1B**). In total, 31,204 tests were performed across 13,222 genes in Stage-1 (single genes were tested with up to four thresholds). There was negligible statistical inflation of significant test results (λ=1.046, **Figure 1C**). Of all burden tests performed, 18 tests, covering 11 genes indicated a suggestive differential variant burden between AD cases and controls (FDR<0.2): *SORL1*, *TREM2*, *ABCA7*, *ATP8B4*, *ADAM10*, ABCA1, CBX3, *MTO1*, *PRSS3*, *B3GNT4* and *SRC* **(Table 2A)**.

To confirm these signals, we applied an analysis model consistent with Stage-1 to an independent Stage-2 dataset, which after QC, comprised 3,384 cases and 7,829 controls (**Table 1A**). The effect direction observed in stage 1 was tested (one-sided test). The genes *SORL1*, *TREM2*, *ABCA7*, *ATP8B4, ABCA1*, *ADAM10* reached p<0.05 while *SRC* reached p=0.07 (**Table 2A, Stage-2**). Effects for these genes on AD-risk were concordant with those observed in Stage-1. We then meta-analyzed Stage-1 + Stage-2 across the 18 tests using a fixed-effect inverse variance method and corrected for the 31,204 tests performed in Stage-1 (Holm-Bonferroni) (**Table 2A**). This confirmed the AD-association of rare damaging variants in the *SORL1*, *TREM2*, *ABCA7*, *ATP8B4* and *ABCA1* genes. While our data support

the AD-association in the *ADAM10* and *SRC* genes, variants in these genes are extremely few and rare such that the signal can only be confirmed in larger datasets.

Strikingly, most of these genes also map to GWAS loci (*SORL1*, *TREM2*, *ABCA7*, *ABCA1* and *ADAM10)*. This led us to perform a focused analysis on GWAS loci, aiming to identify potential culprit genes. To maximize statistical power, we merged the full exomes from the Stage-1 and Stage-2 samples into one mega-sample (**Table 1**). We interrogated genes that were previously prioritized to drive the AD association in the 75 loci identified in the most recent GWAS[3] (**Table S4, Online Methods**). In 67 genes, we observed sufficient carriers of rare variants to test the burden signal in at least one deleteriousness category (a total of 187 tests). We identified 4 additional genes that were suggestively associated with increased AD risk (FDR<0.05): *RIN3, CLU, ZCWPW1,* and *ACE* (**Table 2B, Table S5**). These associations will have to be further confirmed in a larger dataset. Nevertheless, the AD associations in these genes persisted when focusing on the burden of only the very rare variants (MAF<0.001), suggesting that the rare variant burden is not in linkage with, and thus independent from the GWAS sentinel variant.

Together, the newly associated genes provide additional evidence for a central role for *APP*-processing, lipid metabolism, Aβ aggregation and microglia – neuroinflammatory processes in AD pathophysiology. *ATP8B4* is a phospholipid transporter uniquely expressed in microglia in the brain. Rare variants in this gene have been associated with the risk of developing systemic sclerosis, an autoimmune disease[9]. Interestingly, *ATP8B4* suggestively associated with AD in GWAS[3] mainly through the same rare variant that was most recurrent in our study (G395S). ABCA1 lipidates APOE in the CNS[10], and poor ABCA1-dependent lipidation of APOE-containing lipoprotein particles increase Aβ deposition and fibrillogenesis[11]. The α-secretase ADAM10 plays a major role in non-amyloidogenic APP metabolism[12]. SRC is a non-receptor protein tyrosine kinase that binds and activates Pyk2, an AD genetic risk factor[13]. SRC has been described to potentially modulate APP trafficking/metabolism[14], but also Tau phosphorylation[15]. *RIN3* has been associated with endosomal dysfunction and APP trafficking/metabolism[16,17]. *CLU* (also known as *APOJ*) has been found to affect Aβ aggregation and clearance[18] and *ACE* is suggested to have a role in Aβ degradation[19]. The role of the histone methylation reader *ZCWPW1* remains unclear.

To better comprehend how these genes associate with AD, we analyzed the characteristics of rare damaging variants that contributed to the burden using the mega-sample (**Tables SG1-11, Figure 2, 'Detailed gene discussion' in the Supplement**). For damaging variants in most genes, we observed increased carrier frequencies and larger effect sizes for younger cases (**Table S10**), yet the variants also contributed to an increased risk of late-onset AD (**Figures 2A-B, Table 3**). The largest effect sizes were measured for LOF variants in *SORL1, ADAM10*, *CLU* and *ZCWPW1,* and carriers of such variants had the lowest median age at onset (**Table 3**), implying a key role for these genes in AD etiology. Moderate variant-effect sizes were observed for LOF variants in *TREM2*, *ABCA1* and *RIN3*, while the smallest variant-effects were observed in *ABCA7*, *ATP8B4* and *ACE (***Figure 3, Table 3**). For *SRC*, the low number of carriers with LOF variants did not allow us to assess their effect size. Next, we observed that in *SORL1*, the variants with the lowest variant frequencies had the largest effect sizes. Moreover, damaging variants in *ADAM10*, *CLU* and *ZCWPW1* were all extremely rare (**Figures 2C,D**). Conversely, we observed that rare but recurrent variants contributed to the AD-association of *TREM2*, *ABCA7*, *ATP8B4* and *RIN3* (**Figure 2D**). When combining all discovered genes, we observed at least one damaging variant in up to 18% and 14% of respectively EOAD and LOAD cases (**Table S7**), and up to 10% and 5% of our samples could respectively be attributed to these variants (**Table 3**).

An age-matched sensitivity analysis supported a role in AD across all 11 genes identified to associate with AD, however for the *ACE* gene we cannot exclude possible influence by other age-related conditions (**Figure S2**). We did not observe an interaction-effect between the rare-variant AD-association and APOE-ε4 dosage for any of the genes (**Table S8, Online Methods**). Also, the rare-

variant burden-association was not confounded by somatic mutations due to age-related clonal hematopoiesis (**Table S9**).

Together, we report *ATP8B4* and *ABCA1* as novel AD risk factors with exome-wide significance and we report suggestive evidence for the association of rare variants in the *ADAM10* and *SRC* genes with AD risk. Furthermore, we identified *RIN3*, *CLU*, *ZCWPW1* and *ACE* as potential culprit genes in GWAS loci, illustrating how studies of rare protein-modifying variants can solve this important drawback of GWAS studies. However, larger datasets will be required to further confirm these signals. We found that the effect sizes of rare, coding variant-burdens were large compared to the effect sizes of the GWAS sentinel variants (**Table S5**). Extremely rare variants make up a large part of the burden signal in genes with large effect sizes, and these variants also have the largest impact on age at onset. Furthermore, we observe an increased burden of rare damaging genetic variants for individuals with an earlier age at onset. Nevertheless, damaging variants (including APOE-E4/E4) were observed in only 31.6% of the EOAD cases (**Table S7**), suggesting that additional damaging variants remain to be discovered. **Error! Bookmark not defined.Error! Bookmark not defined.**The associated genes strengthen our current understanding of AD pathophysiology. When treatment options become available in the future, identification of damaging variants in these genes will be of interest to clinical practice.

Table 1A: Sample Quality Control

Sample	**nr. of samples**		
Samples processed	**Stage-1**	**Stage-2**	**Mega**
Samples included in study	25,982	26,379	52,361
Samples retained after QC (**Table S3A**)	21,345	11,213	31,905
Sample totals (of which exome-extracts of targeted genes)			
EOAD	4,060	1,627 (446)	5,643 (446)
LOAD	8,592	1,757 (385)	10,165 (385)
Controls	8,693	7,829 (1,347)	16,097 (1,347)

Table 1B: Variant Quality Control

			Targeted genes	
Variant QC		**Stage-1**	**Stage-2**	**Mega**
Variants called (bi-allelic)		12,938,556	10,199	18,940
Variants retained after QC (**Table S3B-C**)		7,543,193	6,442	11,361
Variant selection				
1. In protein coding autosomal genes (Gencode V19/V29)		6,883,630	6,442	11,361
Missense variants	2. Missense variants	1,486,559	1,094	2,265
	3. REVEL > 25	540,934	689	1,474
	4. MAF < 1% / dosage > 0.5	530,072	637	1,437
	5. Missingness (< 20% + no differential missingness)	353,913	489	1,111
LOF variants	2. Loss-of-function variants (nonsense, frameshift, splice acceptor/donor)	144,429	130	320
	3. Loftee HC + VEP high impact	109,550	104	267
	4. MAF < 1% / dosage > 0.5	108,016	98	264
	5. Missingness (< 20% + no differential missingness)	57,543	67	187
Variant Categories	REVEL 25-50	198,068	193	421
	REVEL 75-100	99,910	160	371
	REVEL 50-75	54,212	133	306
	LOF	57,543	67	187
Variant Thresholds	LOF+REVEL≥25	409,733	553	1,285
	LOF+REVEL≥50	211,665	360	864
	LOF+REVEL≥75	111,755	200	493
	LOF	57,543	67	187

Table 1: Quality Control Steps

A. Sample QC: Samples were primarily excluded due to non-European ancestry or close family relations, for details see **Table S3A**. Exome-extract samples (between parenthesis) only contain reads that cover the 11 genes discovered in Stage-1. In Stage-2, samples were removed that were duplicated w.r.t. Stage-1. In the mega-analysis, a merged sample QC removed all family relations to the third degree between Stage-1 and Stage-2 (i.e. the size of the mega-sample does not equal the sum of the Stage-1 and Stage-2 samples). **B. Variant QC:** Stage-1 consists of all variants in the union of the exome capture kits. The targeted Stage-2 and Mega analysis regards only the 11 genes identified in Stage-1 . Variant QC from the non-targeted Stage-2 and mega-analysis can be found in **Table S3B**. For each gene, we considered in our variant selection 4 different selection thresholds. MAF: minor allele frequency. See supplement for in-depth QC methods.

Table 2A. Burden tests Stage-1, Stage-2 and Meta-analysis.

		Stage-1				Stage-2			meta			
gene	Variant damagingness threshold	P value	FDR	#variants / #carriers	case / control	P value[1]	#variants / #carriers	case / control OR (95% CI)	P value	h-bonf	case / control OR (95% CI)	pvalue heterog.
SORL1	LOF+REVEL≥25	4.8E-06	**1.7%**	242 / 917	1.3 (1.1-1.5)	**1.3E-06**	122 / 478	1.5 (1.2-1.9)	1.5E-10	**4.7E-06**	1.4 (1.2-1.5)	1.6E-01
	LOF+REVEL≥50	4.0E-18	**<<0.01%**	167 / 290	2.6 (2.0-3.2)	**1.4E-09**	79 / 137	2.4 (1.7-3.5)	8.1E-26	**2.5E-21**	2.5 (2.1-3.1)	9.8E-01
	LOF+REVEL≥75	1.1E-14	**<<0.01%**	96 / 164	3.3 (2.4-4.6)	**5.2E-10**	45 / 82	3.9 (2.3-6.6)	1.1E-22	**3.4E-18**	3.5 (2.7-4.6)	4.3E-01
	LOF	4.7E-15	**<<0.01%**	37 / 48	15.6 (3.7-37.3)	**1.6E-06**	16 / 20	16.3 (3.8-35.0)	3.3E-18	**1.0E-13**	16.0 (9.5-27.0)	9.4E-01
TREM2	LOF+REVEL≥25	2.6E-16	**<<0.01%**	17 / 291	3.6 (2.9-4.6)	**1.6E-07**	12 / 155	2.4 (1.6-3.4)	5.2E-22	**1.6E-17**	3.2 (2.6-3.9)	6.5E-01
ABCA7	LOF+REVEL≥25	9.5E-08	**0.1%**	265 / 959	1.4 (1.2-1.6)	**9.8E-08**	170 / 502	1.6 (1.3-2.0)	4.1E-13	**1.3E-08**	1.4 (1.3-1.6)	6.5E-02
	LOF+REVEL≥75	4.6E-06	**1.7%**	93 / 297	1.6 (1.3-2.1)	**4.8E-04**	54 / 167	1.8 (1.3-2.6)	7.3E-09	**2.3E-04**	1.7 (1.4-2.1)	9.1E-01
ATP8B4	LOF+REVEL≥25	7.2E-06	**2.0%**	72 / 575	1.5 (1.3-1.8)	**3.3E-03**	40 / 286	1.4 (1.0-1.8)	9.6E-09	**3.0E-04**	1.5 (1.3-1.7)	9.7E-01
	LOF+REVEL≥50	2.8E-05	**6.8%**	61 / 521	1.5 (1.3-1.9)	**1.6E-02**	34 / 265	1.3 (1.0-1.7)	2.8E-06	**8.7E-02**	1.5 (1.3-1.7)	6.6E-01
	LOF+REVEL≥75	3.2E-06	**1.4%**	38 / 490	1.7 (1.4-2.0)	**2.4E-02**	22 / 243	1.3 (1.0-1.8)	5.7E-07	**1.8E-02**	1.5 (1.3-1.8)	4.2E-01
ABCA1	LOF+REVEL≥75	6.1E-06	**1.9%**	93 / 280	1.7 (1.3-2.2)	**6.6E-03**	48 / 159	1.6 (1.1-2.3)	2.6E-07	**8.0E-03**	1.7 (1.4-2.1)	6.3E-01
ADAM10	LOF+REVEL≥50	2.0E-05	**5.1%**	15 / 17	3.2 (1.3-8.1)	**4.0E-02**	4 / 4	8.1 (0.6-42.6)	2.8E-05	8.7E-01	3.6 (1.5-8.5)	5.5E-01
	LOF+REVEL≥75	2.7E-06	**1.4%**	11 / 12	7.5 (1.4-46.8)	1.5E-01	3 / 3	5.6 (0.3-41.8)	4.4E-04	1.0E+00	7.1 (2.6-19.3)	1.1E-01
SRC	LOF+REVEL≥50	1.1E-04	**18%**	15 / 27	3.3 (1.5-7.3)	*7.0E-02*	9 / 18	2.1 (0.8-6.0)	1.2E-04	1.0E+00	2.8 (1.5-5.3)	1.2E-01
MTO1	LOF+REVEL≥25	6.9E-05	**14%**	58 / 262	0.6 (0.5-0.8)	7.0E-01	30 / 145	1.0 (0.6-1.4)	3.1E-04	1.0E+00	0.7 (0.6-0.9)	1.0E-01
PRSS3	LOF+REVEL≥25	7.9E-05	**15%**	21 / 111	0.5 (0.3-0.7)	3.9E-01	21 / 76	1.0 (0.6-1.7)	1.0E-03	1.0E+00	0.6 (0.5-0.9)	**3.7E-02**
B3GNT4	LOF+REVEL≥25	9.4E-05	**17%**	22 / 29	8.3 (2.4-31.5)	7.3E-01	10 / 15	0.8 (0.2-2.6)	2.9E-03	1.0E+00	4.2 (2.2-8.0)	**1.6E-02**
CBX3	LOF+REVEL≥25	6.0E-05	**13%**	1 / 30	0.2 (0.1-0.4)	5.6E-01	2 / 27	0.9 (0.4-2.2)	1.3E-02	1.0E+00	0.3 (0.2-0.6)	**7.1E-03**

Table 2B. GWAS-targeted analysis on mega-dataset without exome-extracts

		Burden test (variant MAF <1%)					Burden test (variant MAF < 0.1%)			
Locus *sentinal GWAS SNP*	gene	Variant damagingness threshold	P value	FDR	#variant / #carriers	case / control OR (95% CI)	pvalue	#variant / #carriers	fraction very rare	case / control OR (95% CI)
**SORL1, TREM2, ABCA7* (see Table 2A and S5)										
SLC24A4/RIN3 *rs7401792* *rs12590654*	RIN3	LOF+REVEL≥25	1.6E-05	0.03%	44 / 622	1.4 (1.2-1.6)	3.4E-02	42 / 129	21%	1.4 (1.0-2.1)
		LOF+REVEL≥50	1.0E-05	0.02%	23 / 583	1.4 (1.2-1.7)	1.5E-02	21 / 89	15%	1.8 (1.2-2.8)
**ADAM10, ABCA1* (see Table 2A and S5)										
PTK2B/CLU *rs73223431* *rs11787077*	CLU	LOF+REVEL≥25	5.0E-04	0.52%	24 / 26	3.6 (1.6-8.3)	5.0E-04	24 / 26	100%	3.6 (1.6-8.3)
		LOF+REVEL≥50	1.1E-03	0.97%	14 / 15	5.4 (1.6-28.6)	1.1E-03	14 / 15	100%	5.3 (1.6-30.1)
		LOF+REVEL≥75	5.0E-04	0.52%	12 / 12	9.9 (1.6-44.0)	5.0E-04	12 / 12	100%	9.8 (1.6-43.0)
		LOF	2.6E-03	2.0%	10 / 10	7.3 (1.3-43.5)	2.6E-03	10 / 10	100%	7.3 (1.3-44.1)
SPDYE3 *rs7384878*	ZCWPW1	LOF+REVEL≥25	6.1E-03	4.2%	22 / 77	1.8 (1.2-2.9)	5.0E-03	21 / 76	99%	1.8 (1.2-2.9)
		LOF+REVEL≥50	3.1E-03	2.2%	16 / 70	1.9 (1.2-3.1)	3.1E-03	16 / 70	100%	1.9 (1.2-3.1)
		LOF+REVEL≥75	1.1E-03	0.97%	11 / 15	5.0 (1.7-30.3)	7.7E-04	11 / 15	100%	5.0 (1.7-29.8)
		LOF	7.8E-04	0.76%	11 / 15	5.0 (1.7-28.7)	7.9E-04	11 / 15	100%	5.0 (1.7-30.5)
ACE *rs4277405*	ACE	LOF+REVEL≥75	9.0E-04	0.84%	38 / 99	2.0 (1.3-2.9)	9.3E-04	38 / 99	100%	2.0 (1.3-2.9)

Table 2. A. Stage-1, Stage-2 and Meta-analysis. Multiple testing correction for Stage-1 was performed using the Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate (FDR) (<20%) over 31,204 tests/variant categories. [1]In Stage-2, we considered only the direction of the AD-association observed in Stage-1. The meta-analysis indicates the combined significance from Stages 1 and 2 (data was combined using the fixed-effect inverse variance method); multiple testing correction for the meta-analysis was performed across all 31,204 tests using the Holm-Bonferroni correction (<0.05). Bold black text: significant p-values; Italics: p-values with suggestive significance. Grey text: *MTO1*, *PRSS3*, *B3GNT4* and *CBX3*, with an FDR of 14%, 15%, 17% and 13%, in Stage-1 did not attain a p <0.05 in Stage-2. Bold grey text: p-values <0.05 indicate significant heterogeneity between effect sizes in Stage-1 and Stage-2. **B. GWAS-targeted analysis in mega-dataset without exome extracts.** Genes in all loci were prioritized as described in the Online Methods, (Table S4). *These genes also included the *SORL1*, *TREM2*, *ABCA7*, *ADAM10*, and *ABCA1* genes, which were also identified in the rare variant burden analysis (shown in A) and therefore not shown here. These genes are listed in the context of this analysis in Table S5. For both tables the p values were determined using ordinal logistic regression, and a case/control OR was computed for reference. As a sensitivity analysis we calculated significance on the mega-analysis dataset for the most significant association, for the missense and LOF variants separately.

	Mega-analysis			Carrier frequency	Odds ratio (95% CI)			median age at onset (IQR)	Attr. fraction
	gene	group	#variant / #carriers	EOAD / LOAD / controls	case / control	EOAD / control	LOAD / control		EOAD / LOAD
Table 3a: primary analysis	**SORL1**	LOF+REVEL≥50	212 / 418	2.75% / 1.51% / 0.68%	2.5 (2.0-3.0)	3.3 (2.6-4.1)	2.0 (1.6-2.5)	65 (59-73)	1.91% / 0.75%
		- REVEL 50-100	161 / 354	2.02% / 1.31% / 0.66%	2.1 (1.7-2.5)	2.5 (2.0-3.2)	1.8 (1.4-2.3)	67 (59-74)	1.22% / 0.58%
		- LOF	51 / 68	0.78% / 0.21% / 0.02%	19.8 (11.9-32.7)	40.7 (12.5-133)	11.3 (3.3-38.3)	62 (56-69)	0.76% / 0.19%
	TREM2	LOF+REVEL≥25	26 / 441	2.27% / 1.90% / 0.75%	2.8 (2.3-3.5)	3.3 (2.6-4.3)	2.6 (2.1-3.3)	69 (62-75)	1.58% / 1.17%
		LOF+REVEL≥25 [refined]	25 / 404	2.22% / 1.77% / 0.62%	3.1 (2.6-3.8)	3.8 (2.9-4.9)	2.8 (2.2-3.6)	68 (62-75)	1.63% / 1.15%
		- REVEL 25-100	14 / 377	2.06% / 1.63% / 0.59%	3.0 (2.5-3.8)	3.7 (2.8-4.9)	2.7 (2.1-3.6)	68 (62-75)	1.50% / 1.04%
		- LOF	12 / 66	0.21% / 0.29% / 0.16%	2.1 (1.2-3.4)	1.7 (0.8-3.5)	2.2 (1.3-3.9)	71 (63-76)	0.09% / 0.16%
		- LOF [refined]	11 / 29	0.16% / 0.16% / 0.02%	5.6 (2.6-12.1)	5.8 (1.7-19)	5.4 (1.8-16.8)	71 (63-74)	0.13% / 0.13%
	ABCA7	LOF+REVEL≥25	351 / 1489	6.18% / 5.04% / 3.90%	1.4 (1.3-1.6)	1.6 (1.4-1.9)	1.3 (1.2-1.5)	69 (61-78)	2.40% / 1.29%
		- REVEL 25-100	302 / 1372	5.58% / 4.65% / 3.63%	1.4 (1.3-1.6)	1.6 (1.4-1.8)	1.3 (1.2-1.5)	69 (62-78)	2.06% / 1.18%
		- LOF	49 / 119	0.62% / 0.39% / 0.27%	1.7 (1.1-2.4)	2.2 (1.4-3.5)	1.4 (0.9-2.1)	67 (57-74)	0.34% / 0.11%
	ATP8B4	LOF+REVEL≥25	94 / 850	3.56% / 3.08% / 2.09%	1.4 (1.2-1.6)	1.5 (1.3-1.8)	1.4 (1.2-1.6)	70 (61-78)	1.24% / 0.84%
		- REVEL 25-100	74 / 797	3.35% / 2.93% / 1.93%	1.5 (1.3-1.7)	1.6 (1.3-1.9)	1.4 (1.2-1.7)	70 (62-78)	1.20% / 0.84%
		- LOF	20 / 54	0.21% / 0.16% / 0.16%	1.1 (0.6-1.9)	1.2 (0.6-2.4)	1.0 (0.5-1.8)	70 (59-78)	0.03% / -0.01%
	ABCA1	LOF+REVEL≥75	122 / 442	1.91% / 1.50% / 1.13%	1.6 (1.3-2.0)	1.9 (1.5-2.5)	1.5 (1.2-1.9)	70 (60-76)	0.91% / 0.48%
		LOF+REVEL≥75 [refined]	120 / 282	1.52% / 1.10% / 0.52%	2.4 (1.9-3.1)	2.9 (2.2-4.0)	2.2 (1.6-2.9)	70 (59-76)	1.01% / 0.60%
		- REVEL 75-100	95 / 395	1.63% / 1.32% / 1.05%	1.5 (1.2-1.8)	1.7 (1.3-2.2)	1.4 (1.1-1.8)	70 (61-76)	0.68% / 0.37%
		- REVEL 75-100 [refined]	93 / 235	1.24% / 0.92% / 0.44%	2.3 (1.7-3.0)	2.7 (1.9-3.8)	2.1 (1.5-2.8)	70 (59-76)	0.78% / 0.48%
		- LOF	27 / 47	0.28% / 0.18% / 0.08%	3.5 (1.9-6.4)	4.7 (2.2-10.3)	2.8 (1.3-6.1)	67 (59-77)	0.22% / 0.11%
	ADAM10	LOF+REVEL≥50	19 / 22	0.23% / 0.05% / 0.02%	4.7 (2.0-10.8)	9.0 (2.9-28)	2.2 (0.5-8.2)	63 (60-68)	0.20% / 0.03%
	SRC	LOF+REVEL≥50	22 / 43	0.28% / 0.15% / 0.07%	2.3 (1.3-4.1)	3.4 (1.6-7.0)	1.7 (0.8-3.6)	65 (58-80)	0.20% / 0.06%
Table 3b: GWAS-targeted analysis	RIN3	LOF+REVEL≥50	23 / 583	2.67% / 2.10% / 1.62%	1.4 (1.2-1.7)	1.6 (1.3-2.0)	1.3 (1.1-1.6)	70 (59-79)	1.04% / 0.46%
		- REVEL 50-100	17 / 577	2.62% / 2.08% / 1.61%	1.4 (1.2-1.7)	1.6 (1.3-2.0)	1.3 (1.1-1.6)	70 (59-79)	1.01% / 0.45%
		- LOF	6 / 8	0.06% / 0.03% / 0.01%	2.1 (0.5-9.3)	2.9 (0.6-32.0)	1.7 (0.4-18.6)	69 (57-86)	0.04% / 0.01%
	CLU	LOF+REVEL≥25	24 / 26	0.23% / 0.09% / 0.03%	3.6 (1.6-8.3)	5.8 (2.0-17.1)	2.5 (0.8-7.6)	63 (58-73)	0.19% / 0.05%
		- REVEL 25-100	14 / 16	0.12% / 0.06% / 0.03%	2.6 (0.9-7.5)	3.6 (0.9-13.6)	2.1 (0.6-8.0)	68 (58-76)	0.08% / 0.03%
		- LOF	10 / 10	0.12% / 0.03% / 0.01%	7.3 (1.9-27.2)	14.2 (2.9-470.4)	3.8 (0.6-122.4)	63 (59-68)	0.11% / 0.02%
	ZCWPW1	LOF	11 / 15	0.15% / 0.05% / 0.01%	5.0 (1.7-28.7)	9.1 (3.1-90.1)	2.9 (0.8-27.4)	63 (58-81)	0.14% / 0.03%
	ACE	LOF+REVEL≥75	38 / 99	0.60% / 0.39% / 0.20%	2.0 (1.3-2.9)	2.4 (1.5-4.1)	1.7 (1.0-2.7)	67 (60-75)	0.35% / 0.16%
		- REVEL 75-100	10 / 49	0.33% / 0.22% / 0.07%	3.2 (1.7-5.7)	3.9 (1.8-8.8)	2.7 (1.3-5.9)	66 (61-72)	0.24% / 0.14%
		- LOF	28 / 50	0.27% / 0.16% / 0.14%	1.4 (0.8-2.4)	1.7 (0.9-3.4)	1.2 (0.6-2.2)	70 (55-76)	0.11% / 0.02%

Table 3. **Mega Analysis; effect sizes and p values.** Per gene, the characteristics are shown for the variant deleteriousness threshold with the most evidence for AD association. For genes with sufficient carriers, signals are shown for LOF and missense variants separately. Variants contributing to the burden were validated in a multi-stage analysis (**Table S6**, Online Methods), which resulted in the construction of a *refined* burden for *TREM2* (1 variant removed) and *ABCA1* (2 variants removed). The attributable fraction of a gene is an estimate of the fraction of EOAD and LOAD cases in this sample that have become part of this dataset due to carrying a rare damaging variant in that gene (Online methods). Note that several variants were excluded from this analysis (i.e., due to differential missingness) that would otherwise have included in the burden; for variants considered in the analysis see **Tables SG1-SG11**.

A


discovery
Stage-1
12,652 AD cases and 8,693 controls
Potential hits
Significant genes
confirmation
Stage-2
3,384 cases and 7,829 controls
(including exome-extracts)
meta-analysis
Stage-1 + Stage-2
variant characterization
Mega-sample
15,808 AD cases and 16,097 controls
(Stage-1+Stage-2, controlled for IBD)
GWAS-genes burden-analysis
& variant characterization
Mega-sample
without exome-extracts
14,977 cases x 14,750
(Excluding exome-extracts)

B


Number of genes tested in Stage-1
LOF
LOF + REVEL>75
LOF + REVEL>50
LOF + REVEL>25
>= 50 cMAC
>= 25 cMAC
>= 10 cMAC
Max. nr. of tested genes (13222)
Total number of autosomal protein-coding genes (build 37)
0
2500
5000
7500
10000
12500
15000
17500
20000
Number of genes

C


LOF
LOF + REVEL ≥ 75
LOF + REVEL ≥ 50
LOF + REVEL ≥ 25
Damaging
Protective
SORL1
TREM2
ABCA7
ADAM10
ATP8B4
ABCA1
CBX3
MTO1
PRSS3
B3GNT4
SRC
FDR < 0.2
inflation: 1.046
Observed p-values (−log10)
Expected p-values (−log10)
0.0
2.5
5.0
7.5
10.0
12.5
15.0
17.5
0
1
2
3
4

Fig 1. Study set-up, and power: A: Schematic of study set-up; The AD-association of genes identified in Stage-1 was confirmed in Stage-2, and combined significance was determined in a meta-analysis. To accurately estimate variant effect sizes for variant-categories/age at onset bins, even those with very low variant counts for which the normal-distribution approximation fails, we analyzed variant characteristics in a mega-sample instead of through meta-analysis. This mega-sample was also used for the GWAS gene burden analysis (without exome-extracts). **B.** Variants with MAF<1% were selected according to four deleteriousness thresholds, and genes with at least 10 deleterious alleles (cMAC) appertaining to a specific deleteriousness threshold were analyzed. cMAC: cumulative minor allele count; **C.** P-value Q-Q plot of Stage-1 discovery-analysis. Gene-names were indicated in grey when the deleteriousness threshold was not the most significant burden test in that gene.



Fig. 2: Characterization of gene specific variant features based on the mega-sample. We considered the deleteriousness threshold that provides the most evidence for AD-association (**Table 3,** refined burden). **A. Carrier frequency by age at onset.** A carrier is an individual who carries at least one damaging variant in the considered gene. **B. Odds ratios by age at onset.** The effect size significantly decreased with age at onset for *SORL1, TREM2, ABCA7, ABCA1, ADAM10* (after multiple testing correction, **Table S10**). **C. Odds ratios by variant frequency.** The rareness of variants in *SORL1* significantly associated with the effect size (**Table S11**). **D. Cumulative minor allele count by variant frequency**: the total number of cases (dark) and controls (light) that carry gene-variants with allele frequencies as observed in the mega-sample. Numbers above the bars indicate the number of contributing variants. Whiskers: 95% CI.



Fig 3. Summary Figure: Odds ratio by age at onset and variant pathogenicity. Odds ratio's for LOF (red) and missense (yellow) variants. Case/control OR (square, 95% CI), EOAD OR (triangle pointing upwards), LOAD OR (triangle pointing downwards). Missense variants in the considered gene appertained to the variant-deleteriousness threshold that provides the most evidence for its AD-association (**Table 3, refined**). The LOF burden effect size was significantly larger than the missense burden effect size in the *SORL1* and suggestively larger in *ABCA7* and *ABCA1* (**Table S11**, Supplementary Methods). Of note: missense variants in *ZCWPW1* did not contribute to the most significant burden but were shown here for reference purposes (REVEL>25).

Online methods

In-depth descriptions of all methods are described in the Supplemental Methods.

Sample processing, genotype calling and quality control (QC)

We collected the exome, WGS or exome-extract sequencing data of a total of 52,361 individuals, brought together by the Alzheimer Disease European Sequencing consortium (ADES), the Alzheimer's Disease Sequencing Project (ADSP)[1] and several independent study-cohorts (**Table S1**). Exome-extract samples only contained the raw reads that cover the 11 genes identified in Stage-1. Across all cohorts, AD cases were defined according to NIAA criteria[2] for possible or probable AD or according to NINCDS-ADRDA criteria[3] depending on the date of diagnosis. When possible, supportive evidence for an AD pathophysiological process was sought (including CSF biomarkers) or the diagnosis was confirmed by neuropathological examination (**Table S1**). AD cases were annotated with the age at onset or age at diagnosis (2014 samples), otherwise, samples were classified as late onset AD (366 samples). Controls were not diagnosed with AD. All contributing datasets were sequenced using a paired-end Illumina platform, different exome capture kits were used, and a subset of the sample was sequenced using whole genome sequencing (**Table S2**).

A uniform pipeline was used to process both the Stage-1 and Stage-2 datasets. Raw sequencing data from all studies were processed relative to the GRCh37 reference genome, read alignments of possible chimeric origin were filtered, and a GATK-based pipeline was used to call variants, while correcting for estimated sample contamination percentages. Samples were included in the datasets after they passed a stringent quality control pipeline: samples were removed when they had high missingness, high contamination, a discordant genetic sex annotation, non-European ancestry, high numbers of novel variants (w.r.t. to DBSNP v150), deviating heterozygous/homozygous or transition/transversion ratios. Further, we removed family members up to the 3rd degree, and individuals who carried a pathogenic variant in *PSEN1*, *PSEN2*, *APP* or in other genes causative for Mendelian dementia diseases (Stage-1 only), or when there was clinical information suggestive of non-AD dementia. Variants considered in the analysis also passed a stringent quality control pipeline: multi-allelic variants were split into bi-allelic variants, variants that were in complete linkage and near each other were merged. Further, we removed variants that had indications of an oxo-G artifact, were located in Short Tandem Repeat (STR) and/or Low Copy Repeat (LCR) regions, had a discordant balance between reads covering the reference and alternate allele, had a low depth for alternate alleles, deviated significantly from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium, were considered false positive based on GATK VQSR, or were estimated to have a batch effect. Variants with >20% genotype missingness (read depth <6) and differential missingness between the EOAD,

LOAD and control groups were removed. To account for uncertainties resulting from variable read coverage between samples, we analyzed variants according to genotype posterior likelihoods, i.e., the likelihood for being homozygous for the reference allele, heterozygous or homozygous for the alternate allele. The burden test was performed multiple times with independently sampled genotypes, to account for genotype uncertainty.

Variant prioritization and thresholds

We selected variants in autosomal protein-coding genes that were part of the Ensembl basic set of protein coding transcripts (Gencode v19/v29[4], see Supplement) and that were annotated by the Variant Effect Predictor (VEP) (version 94.542) [5]. Only protein coding missense and loss-of-function (LOF) variants were considered (LOF: nonsense, splice acceptor/donor or frameshifts). Missense and LOF variants were required to have respectively a 'moderate' and 'high' VEP impact classification. Then, missense variants were prioritized using REVEL (Rare Exome Variant Ensemble Learner[6], annotation obtained from DBNSFP4.1a [7] and LOF variants were prioritized using LOFTEE (version 1.0.2) [8]. For the analysis we considered only missense variants with a REVEL score ≥ 25 (score range 0 – 100) and LOF variants annotated 'high-confidence' by LOFTEE. Variants were required to have at least one carrier (i.e. at least one one sample with a posterior dosage of >0.5), and a minor allele frequency (MAF) of <1%, both in the considered dataset and the gnomAD v2.1 populations (non-neuro set).

Gene burden testing

The burden analysis was based on *four deleteriousness thresholds* by incrementally including variants from categories with lower levels of predicted variant deleteriousness: respectively LOF, LOF + REVEL≥75, LOF + REVEL≥50, and LOF + REVEL≥25. This allowed us to identify the variant-threshold providing maximum evidence for a differential burden-signal. To infer any dependable signal for a specific deleterious threshold, a minimum of 10 damaging alleles appertaining to this deleteriousness threshold was required: i.e., a cumulative minor allele count (cMAC) ≥10. Multiple testing correction was performed across all performed tests (up to 4 per gene). Burden testing was implemented using ordinal logistic regression. This enabled the burden testing to particularly weight EOAD cases, as previous findings indicated that high-impact variants are enriched in early onset (EOAD) cases relative to late onset (LOAD) cases[9]. This implies that the burden of high-impact deleterious genetic variants is ordered according to: $burden_{EOAD} > burden_{LOAD} > burden_{control}$. Ordinal logistic regression enabled optimal identification of such signals, while also allowing the detection of EOAD-specific burdens ($burden_{EOAD} > burden_{LOAD} \sim burden_{control}$) and regular case-control signals ($burden_{EOAD} \sim burden_{LOAD} > burden_{control}$). For protective burden signals, the order of the signals is reversed,

such that $burden_{EOAD} < burden_{LOAD} < burden_{control}$. We considered an additive model, while correcting for 6 population covariates, estimated after removal of population outliers. P-values were estimated using a likelihood-ratio test. Genes were considered suggestively associated with AD in Stage-1 if the False Discovery Rate was <20% (FDR<0.2) (Benjamini-Hochberg procedure[10]). For the GWAS targeted analysis, a more stringent threshold was used (FDR<0.05) due to the absence of a separate confirmation stage. For the meta-analysis, genes were considered significantly associated with AD when the corrected P was <0.05 after family-wise correction using the Holm-Bonferroni procedure[11]. The signal was considered 'suggestive' when p value <0.1 in Stage-2, and the heterogeneity p value between the two stages >0.05. Effect sizes (odds ratios, ORs) of the ordinal logistic regression can be interpreted as weighted averages of the OR of being an AD case versus control, and the OR of being an early-onset AD case or not. To aid interpretation, we additionally estimated 'standard' case/control ORs across all samples, per age category (EOAD versus controls and LOAD versus controls), and for age-at-onset categories ≤65 (EOAD), (65-70], (70-80] and >80 using multinomial logistic regression, while correcting for 6 PCA covariates.

GWAS culprit gene identification

For the 75 loci identified in the most recent GWAS[12], genes were selected for burden testing based on earlier published gene prioritizations. First, gene prioritizations were obtained from Schwarzentruber et al.[13] for 33 known loci. For 28 remaining loci, we obtained the Tier 1 prioritization from Bellenguez et al.[12], and for the loci without prioritization candidates (14 loci), we selected the nearest gene. In total, 81 protein-coding genes were selected (**Table S4**), of which 67 genes had sufficient damaging allele carriers to be tested for at least one variant selection threshold. Gene burden testing was performed as described above, and multiple testing correction to identify potential culprit genes was performed using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure, with a cutoff of 5%.

Validation of variant selection

We validated the REVEL variant impact prediction for missense and the LOFTEE impact prediction for LOF variants, for all variants with a MAF < 1%, for which there were at least 15 damaging allele carriers. For variants that were not in the most significant burden selection of a gene due to a low predicted impact, we checked whether, nevertheless, they did show a significant AD-association (based on a case/control analysis using logistic regression). Vice versa, for variants that were in the burden selection, we checked whether their effect size was

significantly reduced or oppositely directed from other missense or LOF variants in the burden selection (Fisher exact test). Individual variant-effects were analyzed in the Stage-1 dataset, followed by a confirmation analysis in the Stage-2 dataset. Multiple testing correction was performed per gene, with FDR<20% used as threshold for Stage-1 and Holm-Bonferroni (P<0.05) for Stage-2.

Descriptive measures

A variant-carrier was defined as an individual for whom the summed dosage of *all* the variants in the considered variant category is ≥0.5 (Supplementary methods). Carrier frequencies (CFs) were determined as #carriers / #total samples. . Attributable fraction for cases in an age group was estimated as the probability of a case with an age-at-onset in age window *i* being exposed to a specific gene burden$\left(CF_{case,gene,i}\right)$, multiplied by an estimate of the attributable fraction among the exposed for these cases: $\left(\frac{OR_{gene,i}-1}{OR_{gene,i}}\right)$ (with the odds ratio being an approximation of the relative risk)[14,15]. For large effect sizes, this estimate approaches the difference in carrier frequency between cases and controls: $\left(CF_{case,gene,i}\right) - \left(CF_{control,gene}\right)$.

Sensitivity analyses

We determined if observed effects could be explained by age differences between cases and controls. We constructed an age-matched sample, dividing samples in strata based on age/age-at-onset, with each stratum covering 2.5 years. Case/control ratios in all strata were kept between 0.1 and 10 by down sampling respectively controls or cases. Subsequently, samples were weighted using the propensity weighting within strata method proposed by Posner and Ash[16]. Finally, a case-control logistic regression was performed both on the unweighted and weighted case-control labels, and estimated odds ratios and confidence intervals were compared (**Figure S2**). Also, we determined if somatic mutations due to age-related clonal hematopoiesis could have confounded the results. We calculated for all heterozygous calls in the burden selection the balance between reference and alternate reads, and compared these to reference values (**Table S9**). While APOE was not included as a confounder, we performed a separate APOE interaction analysis (**Table S8**), through a likelihood ratio test between a model: $\text{label} \sim \text{gene_burden_score} + \text{apoe_e4_dosage}$ and an interaction model: $\text{label} \sim \text{gene_burden_score} + \text{apoe_e4_dosage} + \text{apoe_e4_dosage} * \text{gene_burden_score}$. This test was performed on a reduced dataset, from which datasets in which APOE status was used as selection criterion were removed.

1. Bis, J.C. *et al.* Whole exome sequencing study identifies novel rare and common Alzheimer's-Associated variants involved in immune response and transcriptional regulation. *Molecular Psychiatry* **25**, 1859-1875 (2018).
2. McKhann, G.M. *et al.* The diagnosis of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **7**, 263-269 (2011).
3. McKhann, G. *et al.* Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: Report of the NINCDS-ADRDA Work Group* under the auspices of Department of Health and Human Services Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease. *Neurology* **34**, 939-939 (1984).
4. Frankish, A. *et al.* GENCODE reference annotation for the human and mouse genomes. *Nucleic Acids Research* **47**, D766-D773 (2019).
5. McLaren, W. *et al.* The Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor. *Genome Biology* **17**(2016).
6. Ioannidis, N.M. *et al.* REVEL: An Ensemble Method for Predicting the Pathogenicity of Rare Missense Variants. *The American Journal of Human Genetics* **99**, 877-885 (2016).
7. Liu, X., Li, C., Mou, C., Dong, Y. & Tu, Y. dbNSFP v4: a comprehensive database of transcript-specific functional predictions and annotations for human nonsynonymous and splice-site SNVs. *Genome Medicine* **12**(2020).
8. Karczewski, K.J. *et al.* The mutational constraint spectrum quantified from variation in 141,456 humans. *Nature* **581**, 434-443 (2020).
9. Bellenguez, C. *et al.* Contribution to Alzheimer's disease risk of rare variants in TREM2, SORL1, and ABCA7 in 1779 cases and 1273 controls. *Neurobiol Aging* **59**, 220 e1-220 e9 (2017).
10. Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **57**, 289-300 (1995).
11. Holm, S. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **6**, 65-70 (1979).
12. Bellenguez, C. *et al.* New insights on the genetic etiology of Alzheimer's and related dementia. (2020).
13. Schwartzentruber, J. *et al.* Genome-wide meta-analysis, fine-mapping and integrative prioritization implicate new Alzheimer's disease risk genes. *Nature Genetics* **53**, 392-402 (2021).
14. Cole, P. & MacMahon, B. Attributable risk percent in case-control studies. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* **25**, 242-244 (1971).
15. LaMorte, W.W. Measuring Association in Case-Control Studies. in *Measures of Association* (Boston University School of Public Health, 2018).
16. Posner, M. & Ash, A. Comparing weighting methods in propensity score analysis. http://www.stat.columbia.edu/~gelman/stuff_for_blog/posner.pdf. *Unpublished working paper, Columbia University* (2012).