Brain Structural Mapping of Multi-factorial Aging Mechanism Using 35,035 UK Biobank Subjects

Running title:
Elucidating Synergistic Effects of Gene-by-Environment Interactions on Human Brain Structure

Jie Chen[1†], Tengfei Li[2,3†], Bingxin Zhao[4], Hui Chen[5], Changzheng Yuan[5,6], Gwenn A. Gardern[7], Guorong Wu[8,9,10,11*], and Hongtu Zhu[1,3,9,12*]

[1]Department of Biostatistics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[2]Department of Radiology, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[3]Biomedical Research Imaging Center, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[4]Department of Statistics and Data Science, the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA
[5]School of Public Health, Zhejiang University School of Medicine, Hangzhou, China
[6]Department of Nutrition, Harvard T H Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
[7]Department of Neurology, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[8]Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[9]Departments of Statistics and Computer Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[10]UNC Neuroscience Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[11]Carolina Insititute for Developmental Disabilities, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[12]Departments of Genetics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

[†] *These authors contributed equally*
[*] *Corresponding authors*
grwu@med.unc.edu
htzhu@email.unc.edu

Abstract

Mounting evidence shows that the complex interaction between genes and environmental exposures is one of the major reasons for the diverse trajectories of micro- and macro-structural alterations across individuals. However, it is largely elusive how the multi-factorial mechanism, through which the gene-by-environment interaction exerts pathogenetic effects, contributes to brain structure differentially in male and female groups, in different age groups, and under different socioeconomic status (SES). To answer these important neuroscience questions, we performed a large-scale association analysis of brain structural measures and a set of risk factors of interest by using 35,035 subjects from UK Biobank (UKB), where each subject has 101 regional brain volumes, 110 white matter integrity measures, Apolipoprotein E (*APOE*) genotypes, 15 polygenic risk scores, demographic information, lifestyle factors, and socioeconomic status (SES). We found over 200 significant pairs of brain-wide associations (p <

2.37x10-4) regarding both the main and interaction effects by using exclusively white British UKB subjects, while validating most of them in an independent dataset of non-British UKB ancestry subjects. For example, a positive age-*APOE-ε*2 interaction effect on the amygdala volume was identified, suggesting its protective role of *APOE-ε*2 against brain aging specifically at the amygdala. Our findings allow us to establish an in-depth understanding of health disparities that may ensure that health care is accessible and equal for all, regardless of sex, race, ethnicity, geography, and socioeconomic status.

Introduction

Aging is a complex and sophisticated biological process involving multiple alterations at molecular, metabolism, and biological pathways [1]–[3]. Together with diverse demographic and environmental exposures, the individual's aging trajectories manifest massive heterogeneities in terms of cognitive function, behavior, brain structure, brain function, and presence/absence of specific symptoms [4]–[6]. Since many modifiable exposome variables are often the root cause of the health disparities, it is of high demand to identify risk factors associated with aging and fully understand the synergistic effect of these risk factors on the aging mechanism. Multiple lines of evidence show that the effect of biological factors and environmental variables on the aging process is mediated by brain structure, including regional morphometrics and the wiring patterns of white matter tracts [7]–[10]. Many factors, such as age [11], genetics [12]–[14], lifestyle factors [15]–[18], socioeconomic status (SES) [19], [20], and sex [21]–[23], may contribute to an individual's changes in brain structure in a comprehensive way. In this context, examining their association with changes in brain structure has a great potential to understand the pathophysiological mechanism of many brain-related diseases (e.g., Alzheimer's disease), thus providing insights on preventing and slowing the progression of neurodegenerative diseases. However, most of the current studies only focus on the main effect of a few risk factors at a time, lacking a holistic understanding of how changes in brain structure are regulated by various risk factors, such as age, genetics, lifestyle factors, and SES.

Aging is nonstopable, making it the most important non-modifiable factor that affects brain regional measures and white matter integrity. Decreasing brain regional volumes and expanding ventricles can be observed even in the normal aging process accompanied with cognitive decline [24]. Among them, frontal and temporal cortex, putamen, thalamus and accumbens are reported to be more susceptible to aging [25]. The loss of white matter microstructural integrity is also observed in the elderly population, while accounting for a portion of cognitive decline [26].

Besides age-specific effects, the sex and Apolipoprotein E (*APOE*) genotypes are another two major non-modifiable risk factors widely investigated in aging studies. In this context, we carry on a fine-grained brain-wide association study to elucidate the synergistic effects between age, sex and *APOE*. Specifically, we stratify the *APOE* genotype into several subtypes based on the mutation on the second (*APOE*-ε2), third (*APOE*-ε3), and fourth allele (*APOE*-ε4) of *APOE*. Following this stratification on *APOE*, we examine the age-specific and sex-specific effect of *APOE* genotyepes on brain structure. Regarding the general aging population, we found *APOE*-ε2 allele manifest protective effects while *APOE*-ε4 is akin to the increased risk of developing AD and related dementia. However, *APOE*-related effects express a clear pattern of

age-dependent and sex-dependent associations, supporting the evidence [23], [27], [28] that sex difference does exists and exerts dynamic effect on brain structures in the aging process.

Since the aging process often accompanies various brain diseases, we further use polygenic risk scores (PRS) underlying brain diseases and behavioral factors to investigate whether their genetic risks are associated with brain volumes and white matter microstructure. Risk variants for many highly heritable brain-related diseases may affect brain structure. Nine examples of such diseases include Alzheimer's disease (AD) [29], attention deficit hyper-activity disorder (ADHD) [30], anxiety disorder [31], Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) [32], bipolar disorder [33], major depression disorder (MDD) [34], obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) [35], Panic disorder (PD) [36], schizophrenia (SCH) [37], and Tourette syndrome (TS) [38]. For instance, the entorhinal cortex, subiculum, and hippocampus were reported to be engaged in the development of AD [39]. Substantial brain volume alterations can be observed in affected individuals of many neurodegenerative diseases as well as healthy controls, who carry the risk alleles [14]. For instance, structural deficits of the frontal and temporal lobes are observed in both the schizophrenia patients and their healthy siblings [40]. Through PRS, we may locate brain subregions that are involved in the pathology of brain diseases.

Besides the non-modifiable factors discussed above, there are many modified factors, including lifestyle factors and SES, for brain diseases and brain structure. For instance, healthy lifestyle factors, such as not smoking and a healthy diet, were related to reduced risk of cardiovascular and neurodegenerative diseases [41]–[43]. In the *2020 report of the Lancet Commission on dementia prevention, intervention, and care*, it has been reported that 40% of dementia could be prevented or delayed if 12 major risk factors were modified. Moreover, the effect of genetic risk factors on brain structure can potentially be modified by modified factors. For instance, recent studies have identified associations between dietary intake of long-chain omega-3 fatty acid, eicosapentaenoic and docosahexaenoic acids [44], [45] and gray matter volume. Heavy alcohol consumption was reported to be associated with loss of white matter integrity and brain disorder [18]. Moreover, accelerated brain volume loss with aging was observed in chronic alcoholics [46], suggesting that alcohol abuse may have a more severe effect on brain structure in older adults. However, little has ever been done on how changes in brain structure are jointly regulated by a large set of both modifiable and non-modifiable risk factors.

Identifying brain structure associated with both non-modifiable risk factors and modifiable life-course factors is an urgent priority in aging research with huge potential economic benefits. The purpose of this study is to perform a comprehensive association analysis of genetic, lifestyle factors, social economic status, age and sex with brain structure. The overall study design was illustrated in **Fig. 1**. To measure brain structure, we generated 101 brain regional volumes and 110 diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) measures of white matter integrity based on the Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) data of more than 35,035 UK Biobank (UKB) subjects. We also extracted all possible risk factors of interest including *APOE* genotypes, 15 polygenic risk scores, demographic information, lifestyle factors, and socioeconomic status (SES) from these UKB subjects. The unprecedented large sample size of UKB enables our large-scale association analysis of brain structure and these life course risk factors with high statistical power and replicability of the findings in this work. Our findings provide a new window to disentangle the nature and timing of dementia risks underlying various health disparity conditions.

Methods

Study Population

UK Biobanks (UKB) released a dataset of a total 500,000 participants. More than 40,000 participants have MRI data, which is valuable for studying brain structure. After data processing, we obtained DTI phenotype data of 37,123 subjects from UKB phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3 with both the genetic and lifestyle information. We restricted our white matter analysis to 35,035 unrelated individuals with DTI phenotypes, genetic and lifestyle information available. The main discovery was based on the 32,320 white British UKB subjects and we validated our results on the remaining 2,715 non-British ancestry subjects. For the study of brain structure, we have the volumetric phenotypes data for 39,216 UKB samples. We restricted our brain structure analysis to 36,969 independent individuals with volumes for regions of interest (ROIs), genetic and lifestyle information available. The main discovery was based on the 34,097 white British subjects and we validated our results on the remaining 2,872 non-British ancestry subjects.

Imaging Data Processing

The T1 MRI and diffusion-weighted MRI datasets were processed following the same procedures as in [13] and [47], respectively. Details about image acquisition, preprocessing, and phenotype generation can be found in **Supplementary Text**. The 101 regional and overall brain volumetric phenotypes of 39,216 UKB individuals were generated, including the whole brain volume (WBV), white matter (WM), gray matter (GM), and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF). The 110 DTI phenotypes of 37,123 UKB individuals were generated, including the fractional anisotropy (FA), mode of diffusivity (MD), axial diffusivity (AD), radial diffusivity (RD), and mode of diffusivity (MO) for 21 white matter tracts. For each imaging phenotype, values greater than five times the median absolute deviation from the median value were identified as outliers and removed from the regression analyses.

APOE Genotyping

The ε4 allele of the *APOE* gene is a known risk factor of AD. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) rs429358 and rs7412 are two variants in the *APOE*-ε4 locus. The combination of these two SNPs corresponds to 3 different *APOE* alleles (*APOE*-ε2, *APOE*-ε3 and *APOE*-ε4) and generates six genotypes, *APOE*-ε3/ *APOE*-ε3, *APOE*-ε3/ *APOE*-ε4, *APOE*-ε2/ *APOE*-ε3, *APOE*-ε4/ *APOE*-ε4, *APOE*-ε2/ *APOE*-ε4 and *APOE*-ε2/ *APOE*-ε2 [48]. Unlike the *APOE*-ε4, the *APOE*-ε2 can reduce the risk of developing AD risk and is the least common in the population, while the *APOE*-ε3 is the most common and considered risk-neutral [49]. The *APOE* genotyping information was extracted from the imputed SNP data from the UKB resources. For the 35,035 unrelated subjects used in the main discovery and verification of 110 DTI phenotypes, *APOE* genotypes were distributed as follows: 770 subjects (2.2%) are *APOE*-ε4 homozygote with 420 male and 350 female, 202 subjects (0.58%) are *APOE*-ε2 homozygote with 93 male and 109 female, 20770 subjects (59.3%) are APOE-ε3 homozygote with 9929 male and 10841 female, 4330 subjects (12.4%) are *APOE*-ε2/ *APOE*-ε3 with 2032 male and 2298 female, 833 subjects (2.4%) are *APOE*-ε2/ *APOE*-ε4 with 374 male and 459 female and 8130 subjects (23.2%) are *APOE*-ε3/ *APOE*-ε4 with 3737 male and 4393 female. The allele frequencies of ε2, ε3 and ε4 are 7.9% , 77.1% and 15.0%, respectively. See **Table 1** for demographic information of each genotype.

To account for the additive effect of APOE-ε4 allele, we included the number of APOE-ε4 allele as a covariate in our models. According to the summary statistics derived from the UKB questionnaire, *APOE*-ε2 homozygote has a lower maternal history of dementia rate compared with *APOE*-ε3 homozygote. Therefore, we included the number of ε2 alleles as a covariate to our model. In some studies, *APOE*-ε4 are categorized into two categories (*APOE*-ε4 homozygotes and all others), *APOE*-ε2 homozygote and *APOE*-ε2/*APOE*-ε3 are considered *APOE*-ε2 carriers and the remaining 4 genotypes are all in the control group. We will only consider linear models with the number of *APOE*-ε4 and *APOE*-ε2 as covariates in this paper. The results of models with *APOE*-ε4 and *APOE*-ε2 categorized into two categories are displayed in the **Supplement material**.

Polygenic Risk Score (PRS)

A wide range of heritable brain diseases and behavioral factors are associated with brain structure [50]–[52]. We will focus on 9 diseases from the UNC PGC [53], including AD, ADHD, anxiety disorder, ASD, bipolar disorder, MDD, OCD, PD, SCH and TS, as well as 6 behavioral factors, including alcohol dependence, cognitive performance, education, opioid dependence, self-employment and smoking. Common genetic variants associated with these disorders and behaviors have been identified by large-scale genome-wide association studies (GWAS) meta-analysis [54]–[68] and the combinations of these risk alleles are estimated as PRSs. A PRS represents an individual's genetic level risk. We included these PRSs in our models to investigate how the genetic variations affect brain structure. Details of the description and steps for generating PRSs for each of the above clinical factors can be found in the **Supplementary Text**.

Lifestyle and SES factors

The lifestyle variables we used in our analysis are mostly reproduced from the healthy lifestyle and dementia study [69]. Not being a current smoker, regular physical activity, and a healthy diet are well-established healthy lifestyle factors that are associated with the brain. We categorized alcohol assumption into abstinence, moderate consumption and excessive consumption due to contradicting evidence on moderate alcohol consumption [18], [70]. The above four healthy lifestyle variables were collected by UKB touchscreen questionnaires at the baseline. Smoking status is dichotomized into current smoking and not current smoking. Following the American Heart Association (AHA) recommendations, at least 150 minutes or at least 5 days of moderate activity or 75 minutes or at least 1 day of vigorous activity are considered doing regular physical activity. The maximum threshold of moderate alcohol consumption is 14g/d for women and 28g/d for men. Abstinence includes people not currently drinking or drinking only on special occasions with total alcohol consumption equal to 0 units per day. Healthy diet is defined as meeting adequate intake of at least 4 out of 7 dietary recommendations for cardiometabolic health (vegetables, fruits, fish, unprocessed meat, processed meat, whole grains and refined grains) [41]. Short and long sleep duration (sleeping less than 6 hours or longer than 8 hours) is also a risk factor for developing dementia [71]. Besides the above lifestyle factors, we also included the education and social deprivation factors in our analysis. Education level is categorized into having a college/university degree or above and not having a college/university degree or above. Social deprivation is measured by the Townsend deprivation index which corresponds to the postcode of each participant's location. It was dichotomized into two groups, above the Townsend deprivation index median and below the median. Details of how we generated these lifestyle and SES factors are provided in **Table S1 and Supplementary Text.**

Covariates

In all the models, we adjusted for the participants' marriage status (categorized into participants live with their partner or not), study phase (categorized into phase 1, phase 2 and phase3), age at the baseline, sex, and sex and age interaction. We also included the WBV as a covariate for all ROI volumes except WBV.

Statistical Analysis

Missing value imputations for covariates and imaging traits were included in the **Supplementary Text**. Afterwards, we carried out four levels of multivariate linear regression models on the white British UKB subjects to answer the following questions: 1) Does the *APOE* genotype and age interaction effect on DTI phenotypes and ROI volumes vary for males and females? 2) Does the interaction between *APOE* genotype and sex have a significant effect on the DTI phenotype measurements and ROI volumes? 3) Are there associations between DTI phenotypes/ROI volumes and *APOE* genotype, healthy lifestyle factors, SES, and PRSs? 4) Are there the *APOE* genotype and environmental factor interaction effects on DTI phenotypes and ROI volumes?

To answer these questions 1)-3), we used the standardized 110 DTI measurements and 101 ROI volumes as the dependent variable and *APOE*-ε2, *APOE*-ε4 count, sex, age, PRSs, lifestyle factors, UKB study phase, marriage status, sex and age as the predictor variables. The P-values and effect sizes of *APOE* genotype, lifestyle risk factors and PRSs were retrieved from the multivariate linear regression. We used Bonferroni correction for the p-values to adjust for multiple testing. The threshold of significance for 211 independent testing after Bonferroni adjustment is approximately 2.37x10-4 (0.05/211). To investigate the effect of *APOE* genotype and sex interaction on DTI phenotypes and ROI volumes, we added these two-way interaction terms to our models. For identifying the difference of *APOE* genotype and sex interaction effect on DTI phenotypes and ROI volumes in different age groups, the 3-way interaction term of age, sex and *APOE*, and three 2-way interaction terms between age, sex and *APOE* were included in the regression models and the full set of covariates was used. To address question 4), the *APOE*-environmental interactions and the age-environmental interaction were considered, respectively. Specific statistical models we considered for the association between the main, two-way and three-way interactions and brain structure were shown in **Supplementary text**.

We verified our discovery on an independent set of non-British ancestry UKB subjects. The same association analysis was carried out using a confidence level of 0.05 as cutoff. Because the sample size of the validation set is relatively small, we reported and discussed all the associations that passed the Bonferroni p-value threshold in our main discovery. The validation results are only used to show the robustness of our findings. Throughout the paper, we report only significant results among the white British population that can be verified by the non-British ancestry population, unless otherwise clarified. Subsequent analyses were carried out in male and female groups separately. We keep the same set of covariates but removing sex and all the interaction terms with sex.

Results

Participant Characteristics

In the 35,035 participants used in the DTI phenotype analysis, 16,515 (47%) are male and 18,520 (53%) are female, 9,191 carry 1 *APOE*-ε4 allele, 792 carry 2 *APOE*-ε4 alleles, and 25,940 carry no *APOE*-ε4 allele. There are 7 people identified as having Dementia. The range of age is from 45 to 81. And the 6 healthy lifestyle factors have low correlation (< 0.1). The demographic information of the 35,035 individuals used in the DTI phenotype association study were included in **Table 1**. The correlation plots between genetic and lifestyle factors, between 101 ROI phenotypes, and between 110 DTI traits were demonstrated in **Figs. S1-S3**, respectively. The 15 PRS scores used as covariates in our models are assumed normally distributed (see **Fig. S4** for histograms).

Overall summary

No significant *APOE*-lifestyle interaction effects on either brain volumes and or white matter integrity was identified, except the *APOE*-ε4-moderate alcohol interaction on the AxD of the superior fronto-occipital fasciculus (SFO) (**Fig. S20**). In contrast, no *APOE*-ε4-excessive alcohol interaction effect was observed. This is generally consistent with [72], in which no gene-environmental interactions were discovered on cognitive ability. In total, we identified 331 and 395 significant associations of age, sex, genetic, lifestyle, SES, age-sex, age-lifestyle, age-SES, sex-*APOE* and age-sex-*APOE* interactions with brain volume and white matter diffusion parameters in the British population, respectively. The identified effects (standardized coefficients) were highly reproducible, with correlation 0.87 (**Fig. S15**) and 0.96 (**Fig. S16)** between British and non-British populations, respectively. It was shown that education, alcohol and smoking are the top three factors among the genetic, lifestyle and SES factors that influence most regions on brain structure (**Figs. S17 and S18**).

APOE, Disease PRS and Age-sex Interaction Associated with Brain Structural Architecture

We examined the *APOE* gene, PRS, and age-sex interactions associated with brain structure with several interesting findings. First, *APOE*-*ε*4 was negatively associated with the volumes of thalamus and basal forebrain and the fractional anisotropy (FA) of cingulum hippocampus (CGH) and posterior thalamic radiation (PTR), while it was positively associated with the radial diffusivity (RD) of CGH and PTR, axial diffusivity (AxD) of superior corona radiata (SCR) and the mean diffusivity (MD) of PTR and cingulum cingulate (CGC) (**Figs. 2A, 2B** and **2C**). The reduced FA and increased RD and AxD in the *APOE*-*ε*4+ group for normal control subjects were consistent with [73], indicating the disruption of the myelin sheath. The reduced volume of thalamus with *APOE*-*ε*4+ was in accordance with [74] for mild cognitive impairment patients.

Second, three-way age-sex-*APOE*-*ε*4 interaction effects were identified on the left cerebellum exterior volume (*p = 1.9E-04*), supporting that among *APOE*-*ε*4 carriers, the volume of left cerebellum exterior decrease slower in males than in females (**Figs. 2B** and **S11**). This supports that female *APOE*-ε4 carriers have a large extent of AD risk [27]. Moreover, significant negative age-sex interactions were found on white matter volume, grey matter volume and most of the cortical and subcortical regional volumes (**Fig. S7**), suggesting that volumes of those regions decrease faster among males than females. It may indicate that the sex difference can differ between normal controls and *APOE*-*ε*4 carriers. Findings on normal aging was consistent with those in [22], [23], [75]–[77], in which a protective influence for female sex hormones on the aging process of brain volumes were found among the normal controls, whereas findings among *APOE*-*ε*4 carriers was validated in [78], which interpreted that female *APOE*-ε4 carriers show greater hypometabolism and atrophy than male carriers. Our results capture such sex differences.

Third, a positive age-*APOE*-*ε*2 interaction effect on the left amygdala volume ($p = 4.84E-06$) was identified and three-way age-sex-*APOE*-*ε*2 interaction effects were identified ($p < 0.01$) on volumes of the right pars opercularis, left hippocampus, left inferior lateral ventricle and caudate even though they did not pass the *2.37E-4* significance level (**Figs. 2B, 2C and S12**), suggesting the protective role of *APOE*-*ε*2 against volume reduction with aging, especially among females. Further evidence came from the post hoc analyses among females and males separately, showing that positive effect of age-*APOE*-*ε*2 interaction on left amygdala among females but not among males (**Fig. S5**).

Fourth, 15 PRSs were found to be associated with brain structure (**Figs. 2A, 2B** and **2D**). Specifically, for the larger AD PRS, we observed increased ventricular volume (inferior lateral ventricle, $p = 1.1E-4$) and reduced cortical (entorhinal, $p = 4.8E-5$) volume. For the larger schizophrenia PRS, we observed the reduced FA of the anterior corona radiata (ACR) ($p = 2.0E-5$) and the increased superior parietal volume ($p = 1.6E-4$). For the higher ADHD PRS, we observed the reduced WBV ($p = 3.5E-8$). For the higher bipolar PRS, we observed increased right transverse temporal volume ($p = 7.8E-7$). For the higher opioid dependence PRS, we observed the increased FA of the IFO ($p = 3.8E-5$). For the higher OCD PRS, we observed larger medial accumbens volume ($p = 5.7E-5$). For the higher MDD PRS, we observed the increased superior frontal volume ($p = 4.2E-5$) and the decreased medial orbitofrontal volume ($p = 9.9E-5$). For the higher ASD PRS, we observed the decreased AxD on the posterior corona radiata (PCR) ($p = 1.9E-5$) and superior corona radiata (SCR) ($p = 5.1E-6$).

Smoking Effects on Brain Structure

We investigated the potential associations of smoking with brain structure, leading to three findings. First, for the overall brain metrics, smoking has a negative effect on overall gray matter volumes ($p = 2.6E-22$), a decreased average FA ($p = 4.5E-9$) and an elevated average RD ($p = 7.5E-11$) and MD ($p = 2.0E-8$) among the white British UKB people.

Second, we identified the associations between harmful smoking and brain structure including 4 subcortical regions (the thalamus, amygdala, putamen, and ventral DC), three ventricular regions (the third ventricle, lateral ventricle, and inferior lateral ventricle), and 16 white matter tracts (**Fig. 4B**). Except decreased AxD on the corticospinal tract (CST) and fornix-stria terminalis (FXST), directions of the other smoking effects on the above identified regions or tracts were highly consistent: reduced subcortical volume, inflated ventricular volume, decreased FA, and increased AxD, RD, and MD on the white matter tracts (**Figs. 3, 4A,** and **4B**). Those results validated previous literature of [79] regarding volumes of gray matter, thalamus [15] and cerebellum [80], enlarged putamen [81] and lateral ventricle volumes [82], and diffusivity parameters for corpus callosum (CC), anterior limb of internal capsule (ALIC), superior longitudinal fasciculus (SLF) and uncinate Fasciculus (UNC) [83]–[86], respectively. The decreased FA and increased AxD, RD and MD matched well the accelerating brain aging process among heavy smokers [87]. Studies on causal pathways of nicotine dependence [10] using 23,624 subjects from UKB revealed that 272 SNP effects on smoking status were mediated by the FA, particularly at the right ALIC, suggesting this association can be genetically driven.

Third, we observed consistent directions of those smoking effects across races (white British and non-British ancestry) and brain regions. Directions of the identified signals are 100% (10 out

of 10) consistent on volume and 93% (53 out of 57) consistent on white matter diffusivity based on the non-British ancestry population.

Alcohol Consumption

We investigated the potential associations of alcohol consumption with brain structure, leading to five findings. First, for the overall brain metrics, excessive alcohol consumption was significantly associated with the reduced whole brain volume ($p = 9.3E\text{-}15$) and the increased average AxD ($p = 7.8E\text{-}7$).

Second, we identified the associations between harmful alcohol consumption and brain structure including the volumes of 6 cortical (superior parietal, precentral, caudal middle frontal, rostral middle frontal, and pars triangularis), 3 subcortical and 3 ventricular regions (**Fig. 4C**) and diffusivity parameters on 11 white matter tracts (**Fig. 4D**). Except the FA, RD and MD of the corticospinal tract (CST) and AxD of CGC, directions of the other heavy alcohol effects on the above identified regions or tracts were highly consistent: reduced cortical volume, inflated ventricular volume, decreased FA, and increased AxD, RD, and MD on those 11 white matter tracts (**Figs. 3, 4C,** and **4D**). Specifically, heavy alcohol consumptions has an inflated ventricular volume, reduced gray matter volume over the premotor cortex (caudal middle frontal), the sensorimotor cortex (superior parietal and precentral), language (Rostral middle frontal) region, reduced volume of subcortical regions accumbens and thalamus, and the decreased FA, and increased AD, RD, and MD on CC, corona radiata (CR), FSXT, fornix (FX), SLF and UNC. Those above findings were validated on the volume of ventricle, frontal, parietal, accumbens and thalamus [18], [88]–[90], and CC, ACR, PCR, CGC, FX, ALIC, PLIC and SLF [91]–[93]. The effects of excessive alcohol on CST were different from other tracts, with increased FA ($p = 1.3E\text{-}9$) and decreased RD ($p = 3.5E\text{-}8$) and MD ($p = 1.8E\text{-}7$). Similar complex differential impairment patterns on the CST were also reported in [94], showing that MD and RD were decreased in the inferior segment of the CST.

Third, we observed ($p < 0.01$) a positive age-excessive alcohol interaction effect on lateral ventricle, negative age-alcohol interaction effects on inferior temporal and precentral (for excessive alcohol) and caudate (for moderate alcohol) regions (**Fig. 5C**), and positive age-excessive alcohol interaction on AD, RD, or MD on the corpus callosum and corona radiata (**Fig. 4F**). Although they did not pass the 2.37E-4 significance level, they all matched well the directions with main results: the detrimental effects, in particular, the reduced cortical volume, inflated ventricular volume, decreased FA, and increased AxD, RD, and MD, which were more prominent among older adults.

Fourth, we observed generally consistent directions of those effects across races (white British and non-British ancestry) and brain regions. For excessive alcohol, the directions of all identified signals are, respectively, 52.3% (11 out of 21) and 97% (30 out of 31) consistent on brain structure across races; the directions of the age-alcohol interaction effects ($p < 0.01$) were 100% (6 out of 6) consistent on volume across races.

Fifth, we observed consistent directions of associations between moderate and excessive alcohols with brain structure. For example, with more moderate alcohol, a larger FA at the CST was observed. This was consistent with the association of FA at CST with excessive alcohol. For all the other brain regions or tracts, although not significant, the directions of age-moderate alcohol effects were consistent with age-excessive alcohol interactions for both the volume and diffusivity over the majority of brain regions (**Figs. S7** and **S8**), in that the directions of age

interactions with moderate alcohol and excessive alcohol were 81.2% consistent for volume and 82.7% consistent for white matter diffusion parameters.

In conclusion, by comparing alcohol and smoking, differences of their associations with brain structure can be summarized in three aspects. 1) More cortical regions were identified for alcohol, whose directions of association were consistent across white British and non-British ancestry populations. In contrast, no cortical signals were found for smoking. 2) The detrimental effects of alcohol were more prominent among older people, whereas no age interaction effect was detected for smoking, suggesting relatively consistent smoking effects in this age range. 3) More white matter tracts were identified for smoking than alcohol for significant associations.

Physical Activity, Diet, and Sleep

We investigated the potential association of physical activity, diet, and sleep with brain structure with three findings. First, beneficial effects of physical activity include (**Figs. 3A and 4E**) positive associations with regional volume of the temporal (middle temporal, $p = 2.3E\text{-}4$; entorhinal, $p = 7.2E\text{-}7$), subcortical (amygdala, accumens and pallium) and negative association with the volume of CSF ($p = 1.6E\text{-}4$). Consistent results in previous literature can be found for the entorhinal region [95], nucleus accumbens [96], and CSF [97].

Second, for the higher healthy diet, we observed larger overall brain volume ($p = 9.3E\text{-}15$), and such positive associations could be more prominent among younger adults. Specifically, negative associations between the age-diet interaction and brain regional volume implied that the increase of frontal (pars opercularis, $p = 4.5E\text{-}3$) and visual region (pericalcarine, $p = 1.5E\text{-}3$; cuneus, $p = 1.9E\text{-}3$) volume and the reduction of ventricular volume (lateral ventricle, $p = 3.6E\text{-}3$) may be more prominent among younger instead of the older adults (**Figs. 3A and 5C**). Directions of the identified age-diet interactions based on $p < 0.01$ on both the volume and white matter diffusivity were 100% consistent across races, although they did not pass the 2.37E-4 significance level. As the healthy diet was defined by categories of fruits, vegetables, whole grains, refined grains, fish, unprocessed meat, and processed meat, further investigations as future work were required to identify specific food categories that led to age interaction patterns.

Lastly, beneficial effects of sleep include positive associations with brain volume of frontal (pars triangularis, $p = 1.7E\text{-}4$) and parietal (postcentral, $p = 1.1E\text{-}5$) regions (**Fig. 3A**). However, directions of those signals for sleep were inconsistent among white British and non-British ancestry subjects. Such conclusions require additional validations from further investigations.

SES (Education, Social Deprivation and Self-employment)

We investigated the potential effects of SES on brain structure with five findings. First, for the overall brain measures, subjects with higher education tend to have larger overall brain volume ($p = 1.7E\text{-}61$), a smaller white matter volume ($p = 1.6E\text{-}12$), and an increased FA ($p = 2.0E\text{-}9$) and AxD ($p = 2.2E\text{-}6$); both the overall brain volume ($p = 1.9E\text{-}30$) and the gray matter volume ($p = 5.8E\text{-}5$) were validated from the education PRS effects, indicating these can be genetically driven.

Second, we identified 4 cortical (pars orbitalis, isthmus cingulate, entorhinal, inferior temporal), 2 ventricular (CSF), 1 subcortical (ventral DC), brainstem and cerebellum regions and 15 white matter tracts with significant associations of brain volume and white matter diffusivity, respectively. See **Figs. 5A** and **5B** for more details. All associations, except the volume of isthmus cingulate and RD of FX, consistently matched the following patterns: increased cortical,

ventricular, subcortical and cerebellar volumes, increased FA and AD, and decreased RD and increased MO with higher education levels. These patterns were different from smoking and alcohol for its decreased AxD values but also can be considered as indications of decreased white matter integrity [98]. Those findings were validated by previous literature with reduced FA in fiber tracts of parietal, temporal, occipital lobes, increased ventricular enlargement among AD patients [99] and increased CSF volume [99], [100]. Such associations between education and CSF and ventricular volume are likely more complex, possibly confounded by innate intelligence or other environmental factors, such as their parents' educational background and available schooling.

Third, we observed generally consistent directions of the above associations across races (white British and non-British ancestry) and brain regions. Specifically, the directions of above identified associations were, respectively, 77.3% (17 out of 22) and 79.5% (35 out of 44) on volume and white matter diffusivity across races. However, this is not the case for age-education interactions on volume: the directions of all identified age-interactions effects were, respectively, 20.0% (1 out of 5) and 75.0% (6 out of 8) consistent on volume and white matter diffusivity across races (**Figs. S7** and **S8**). This may imply the race-dependent age-education interaction associations with brain volume, or insufficiency of the sample size for the non-British ancestry subjects.

Fourth, we observed generally consistent directions of associations between the education PRS and brain structure with the education phenotype: increased volume of amygdala, fusiform and 4th ventricle, increased FA and AD, decreased RD and increased MO (**Figs. 5A** and **5B**), suggesting the brain structure difference may be genetically driven.

Fifth, for higher social deprivation index, we observed decreased AxD, RD and MD at the CST (**Fig. 5B**). Previous results were reported on decreased surface area and cortical thickness in language and executive regions [101] and cognitive decline [102] associated with higher SoDep index but neither considered the CST diffusivity. The increased AD, RD and MD among low SoDep subjects at the CST are more complex to interpret. It was pointed out [103] that some long-term sensorimotor practices such as electrical stimulations may induce plastic changes in the axonal membrane of the CST; meanwhile, electrical devices can be more equipped among higher-education subjects. The self-employment PRS was positively associated with middle ($p = 8.2E\text{-}5$) and inferior ($p = 3.0E\text{-}6$) temporal volumes (**Fig. 5A**).

In summary, there were three major differences for associations of education compared with smoking and alcohol: decreased AxD connected with higher education; the race-inconsistent age-education interaction effects on brain volume; and more genetically driven with more signals identified from the education PRS.

Discussion

In this study, we performed a comprehensive multi-factorial brain structural mapping association analysis of brain structure and a large set of risk factors of interest using 101 brain regions volumes and 110 DTI measures from 34,097 and 32,320 white British UKB subjects, respectively, with three sets of important findings regarding genetics, environment exposures, and socioeconomic status.

A fine-grained underpinning of APOE effect on aging brains. We investigated the associations of genetics, sex, and age with brain structure. First, our work is the first study to investigate the direct effect of *APOE*-*ε*2 on brain structure under the presence of many confounders for over 35K subjects. Current findings on *APOE*-*ε*2 are often limited by sample size, which lead to controversial conclusions. For example, *APOE*-*ε*2 has been shown to be protective against the AD while *APOE*-*ε*2 is also associated with the increased risks of other neurological disorders, such as post-traumatic stress disorder and argyrophilic grain disease (AGD) [104]–[108]. In this work, the massive amount of imaging phenotypes allow us to localize the effect of *APOE*-*ε*2 to brain structures with great replicability. For example, we have identified *APOE*-*ε*2 exhibits protective effects on the amygdala volume across 34,097 aging brains. In contrast, the *APOE*-*ε*4+ group exhibits an increased average AD, RD and MD of the overall white matter, a reduced FA and increased RD at CGH and PTR, an increased MD at PTR and CGC and a reduced thalamus volume, some of which were consistent with the findings in [73] and [109]. Second, our study is the first one to systematically investigate the three-way age-sex-*APOE*-*ε*2 and age-sex-*APOE*-*ε*4 interaction effects on brain structure. We identified that the protective and detrimental effects of *APOE*-*ε*2 and *APOE*-*ε*4 can be stronger in females for some brain regions, which may suggest different patterns of sex difference between AD and normal aging. Third, we showed that the *APOE*-*ε*4 may not directly modify the association between lifestyle factors and brain structure. Similar results reported that there were no *APOE*-ε4-lifestyle interactions on cognitive abilities [72], [110]. Fourth, conditioning on *APOE*, we investigated the direct effects of 10 disease PRSs on brain structure, even though their effects on the disease progression have been studied [111]. We showed that the AD PRS genetic information other than *APOE* significantly contributed to the brain structural changes, in particular, through the volume changes of inferior lateral ventricle and entorhinal volume.

Environmental factors are deeply associated with brain structure changes. Our results showed strong evidence that smoking, alcohol and education had the most significant and robust signals among all genetic, lifestyle and SES factors we studied across the white British and non-British ancestry populations. First, inspecting **Figs. 3-5** reveals different association patterns of smoking, alcohol, and education on brain structure with the subcortical and ventricle regions for smoking, the frontal, parietal, subcortical, and ventricle regions for alcohol, and the temporal, visual, subcortical and ventricle for education. Second, low alcohol and smoking share similar association direction patterns including increased cortical/subcortical volume and FA, decreased ventricular volume and AxD, RD and MD, whereas education has positive effects on AxD and ventricular volume, implying the higher complexity of the education. Moreover, alcohol is more cortical-specific and more age-dependent, whereas smoking is more subcortical-specific and relatively robust across ages. Third, the age-diet and age-alcohol interactions were in different patterns. A healthy diet may benefit brain volume more in younger adults, while heavy alcohol may destruct brain structure more severely in older adults. Fourth, CST as a white matter tract has complex associations with lifestyle and SES factors including the decreased AxD along with heavy smoking, the increased FA and decreased RD and MD with excessive alcohol, and the decreased AD, RD and MD with higher social deprivation index. It may suggest possibly increased white matter integrity at CST with heavy smoking, alcohol and higher SoDep index, which were in the opposite directions from other white matter tracts. These results may suggest the special role of CST due to the neural plasticity of the membrane at CST [103]. Fifth, despite the above differences, our results demonstrated that both heavy smoking and alcohol can accelerate the aging process in the brain by causing shrunk subcortical and enlarged ventricular/CSF volumes and degraded white matter integrity accompanied by axonal damage or disrupted myelin integrity. Moreover, regular physical activity and good education benefit the subcortical volumes and regional white matter integrities. The stronger effects of healthy diet

among younger rather than older adults require further investigations from other datasets in future studies.

Joint effect of lifestyle and SES factors on brain structure is highly diverse. Our findings validated three findings in [88] based on 25,378 UKB subjects. Specifically, alcohol was highly associated with gray matter volume than many other modifiable risk factors (smoking, BMI, blood pressure and non-HDL cholesterol considered). Subcortical regions including thalamus, putamen and hippocampus were associated with alcohol consumption. For white matter microstructure, corpus callosum was identified as a particularly vulnerable region for alcohol. Our findings were also consistent with [18] based on 36,678 UKB subjects. Specifically, alcohol intake was related to consistent associations with reduced gray matter volumes marked at frontal, parietal and brainstem and lower FA and higher MD on 13 white matter tract regions, especially the CC, CR and FX. Our findings were consistent with another study [112] on smoking based on 19615 UKB subjects on gray matter volume and 17760 UKB subjects on white matter microstructure. Specifically, ever-smoking was associated with reduced gray matter volume, volumes of the right cerebellum and reduced FA and increased MD at the PTR. Previous study on physical activity discovered an association with the increase of gray matter volume among older adults (> 60 years old) [16] based on the 5272 participants of UK Biobank. Studies on causal pathways of nicotine dependence [10] using 23,624 subjects from UK Biobank revealed that 272 SNP effects on smoking status were mediated by the FA, particularly at the right ALIC, suggesting this association can be genetically driven. Another literature [9] recognized the causal relationship between heavy alcohol use and smoking and the reduced subcortical volume. For education, it was found that each year of education was associated with an increase in peripheral CSF volume among normal controls [100], and AD patients with higher education had increased ventricular enlargement compared to lower education after controlling for dementia severity [113]. Our results corroborate those findings with larger sample size.

In addition, our work has two major methodological differences with similar studies in the existing literature. First, we include a large set of modifiable and non-modifiable risk factors and investigate their joint and conditional effects on brain structure and their interactions. For instance, lifestyle factors and SES are a complex biological system and may confound with each other, but little has been ever done about their direct and joint effects on brain structure. Second, we use the independent non-British ancestry population as the test set to validate our findings from the white British population instead of the sensitivity analyses based on a single dataset. Our findings presented here are not only robust against outliers and sample size, but also robustness across races.

There are several limitations in our current work. First, we observed some inconsistent effects across the white British and non-British ancestry populations. It may be caused by several reasons including race, the sample size of non-British ancestry subjects, and outliers. It is unrealistic to further split the non-British ancestry subjects into subgroups (e.g., Asian, African, or Hispanic) due to its limited sample size. Second, the mediation analyses or causal analyses would further unravel the underlying causal mechanisms of the direct and indirect effects for all risk factors considered here, which will be propagated into our future work. Third, there can be measurement errors in some risk factors since all questionnaire variables were measured only once. Fourth, since the UKB is volunteer-based the participants should be healthier than the general population, it may cause some inconsistent conclusions compared with previous community-based studies.

References:

[1] F. B. Johnson, D. A. Sinclair, and L. Guarente, “Molecular Biology of Aging,” *Cell*, vol. 96, no. 2, pp. 291–302, Jan. 1999, doi: 10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80567-X.

[2] L. Ferrucci *et al.*, “Measuring biological aging in humans: A quest,” *Aging Cell*, vol. 19, no. 2, p. e13080, 2020, doi: 10.1111/acel.13080.

[3] C. E. Finch and D. M. Cohen, “Aging, Metabolism, and Alzheimer Disease: Review and Hypotheses,” *Exp. Neurol.*, vol. 143, no. 1, pp. 82–102, Jan. 1997, doi: 10.1006/exnr.1996.6339.

[4] G. Hueluer and H. Dodge, “New developments in cognitive aging research,” *Innov. Aging*, vol. 2, no. suppl_1, p. 382, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.1093/geroni/igy023.1422.

[5] F. Tang, “Successful Aging: Multiple Trajectories and Population Heterogeneity,” *Int. J. Soc. Sci. Stud.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 12–22, 2014.

[6] N. Raz, P. Ghisletta, K. M. Rodrigue, K. M. Kennedy, and U. Lindenberger, “Trajectories of brain aging in middle-aged and older adults: Regional and individual differences,” *NeuroImage*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 501–511, Jun. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.03.020.

[7] T. A. D. Jolly *et al.*, “Microstructural white matter changes mediate age-related cognitive decline on the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA),” *Psychophysiology*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 258–267, 2016, doi: 10.1111/psyp.12565.

[8] F. Gomez-Pinilla, S. Vaynman, and Z. Ying, “Brain-derived neurotrophic factor functions as a metabotrophin to mediate the effects of exercise on cognition,” *Eur. J. Neurosci.*, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. 2278–2287, 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2008.06524.x.

[9] E. Logtenberg *et al.*, “Investigating the causal nature of the relationship of subcortical brain volume with smoking and alcohol use,” *Br. J. Psychiatry J. Ment. Sci.*, pp. 1–9, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1192/bjp.2021.81.

[10] Z. Ye *et al.*, “White Matter Integrity and Nicotine Dependence: Evaluating Vertical and Horizontal Pleiotropy,” *Front. Neurosci.*, vol. 15, p. 738037, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.3389/fnins.2021.738037.

[11] R. a. I. Bethlehem *et al.*, “Brain charts for the human lifespan,” *Nature*, vol. 604, no. 7906, Art. no. 7906, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.1038/s41586-022-04554-y.

[12] L. T. Elliott *et al.*, “Genome-wide association studies of brain imaging phenotypes in UK Biobank,” *Nature*, vol. 562, no. 7726, Art. no. 7726, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41586-018-0571-7.

[13] B. Zhao *et al.*, “Genome-wide association analysis of 19,629 individuals identifies variants influencing regional brain volumes and refines their genetic co-architecture with cognitive and mental health traits,” *Nat. Genet.*, vol. 51, no. 11, Art. no. 11, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41588-019-0516-6.

[14] P. M. Thompson *et al.*, “Genetic influences on brain structure,” *Nat. Neurosci.*, vol. 4, no. 12, Art. no. 12, Dec. 2001, doi: 10.1038/nn758.

[15] J. Gallinat *et al.*, “Smoking and structural brain deficits: a volumetric MR investigation,” *Eur. J. Neurosci.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 1744–1750, 2006, doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2006.05050.x.

[16] M. Hamer, N. Sharma, and G. D. Batty, “Association of objectively measured physical activity with brain structure: UK Biobank study,” *J. Intern. Med.*, vol. 284, no. 4, pp. 439–443, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1111/joim.12772.

[17] D. E. A. Jensen, V. Leoni, M. C. Klein-Flügge, K. P. Ebmeier, and S. Suri, “Associations of dietary markers with brain volume and connectivity: A systematic review of MRI studies,” *Ageing Res. Rev.*, vol. 70, p. 101360, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.arr.2021.101360.

[18] R. Daviet *et al.*, “Associations between alcohol consumption and gray and white matter volumes in the UK Biobank,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Mar. 2022, doi:

10.1038/s41467-022-28735-5.
[19] L. Nyberg *et al.*, “Educational attainment does not influence brain aging,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 118, no. 18, p. e2101644118, May 2021, doi: 10.1073/pnas.2101644118.
[20] H. Kweon *et al.*, “Human brain anatomy reflects separable genetic and environmental components of socioeconomic status,” *Sci. Adv.*, vol. 8, no. 20, p. eabm2923, May 2022, doi: 10.1126/sciadv.abm2923.
[21] M. Ingalhalikar *et al.*, “Sex differences in the structural connectome of the human brain,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 823–828, Jan. 2014, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1316909110.
[22] D. G. Murphy *et al.*, “Sex differences in human brain morphometry and metabolism: an in vivo quantitative magnetic resonance imaging and positron emission tomography study on the effect of aging,” *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, vol. 53, no. 7, pp. 585–594, Jul. 1996, doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1996.01830070031007.
[23] P. E. Cowell, B. I. Turetsky, R. C. Gur, R. I. Grossman, D. L. Shtasel, and R. E. Gur, “Sex differences in aging of the human frontal and temporal lobes,” *J. Neurosci.*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 4748–4755, Aug. 1994, doi: 10.1523/jneurosci.14-08-04748.1994.
[24] E. Fletcher *et al.*, “Brain volume change and cognitive trajectories in aging.,” *Neuropsychology*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 436–449, May 2018, doi: 10.1037/neu0000447.
[25] A. M. Fjell and K. B. Walhovd, “Structural brain changes in aging: courses, causes and cognitive consequences,” *Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 187–221, 2010, doi: 10.1515/revneuro.2010.21.3.187.
[26] M. W. Vernooij *et al.*, “White matter microstructural integrity and cognitive function in a general elderly population,” *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 545–553, May 2009, doi: 10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2009.5.
[27] A. Altmann, L. Tian, V. W. Henderson, M. D. Greicius, and Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative Investigators, “Sex modifies the APOE-related risk of developing Alzheimer disease,” *Ann. Neurol.*, vol. 75, no. 4, pp. 563–573, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.1002/ana.24135.
[28] C. E. Coffey *et al.*, “Sex differences in brain aging: a quantitative magnetic resonance imaging study,” *Arch. Neurol.*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 169–179, Feb. 1998, doi: 10.1001/archneur.55.2.169.
[29] M. N. Braskie *et al.*, “Common Alzheimer’s Disease Risk Variant Within the CLU Gene Affects White Matter Microstructure in Young Adults,” *J. Neurosci.*, vol. 31, no. 18, pp. 6764–6770, May 2011, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5794-10.2011.
[30] A. L. Krain and F. X. Castellanos, “Brain development and ADHD,” *Clin. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 433–444, Aug. 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2006.01.005.
[31] W. Wang *et al.*, “Reduced white matter integrity and its correlation with clinical symptom in first-episode, treatment-naive generalized anxiety disorder,” *Behav. Brain Res.*, vol. 314, pp. 159–164, Nov. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2016.08.017.
[32] D. K. Shukla, B. Keehn, and R.-A. Müller, “Tract-specific analyses of diffusion tensor imaging show widespread white matter compromise in autism spectrum disorder,” *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 286–295, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02342.x.
[33] S. M. Strakowski *et al.*, “Brain Magnetic Resonance Imaging of Structural Abnormalities in Bipolar Disorder,” *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, vol. 56, no. 3, p. 254, Mar. 1999, doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.56.3.254.
[34] N. Vasic *et al.*, “Baseline brain perfusion and brain structure in patients with major depression: a multimodal magnetic resonance imaging study,” *J. Psychiatry Neurosci.*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 412–421, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1503/jpn.140246.
[35] J. Pujol *et al.*, “Mapping Structural Brain Alterations in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder,” *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, vol. 61, no. 7, p. 720, Jul. 2004, doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.61.7.720.

[36] D. H. Han *et al.*, “Altered cingulate white matter connectivity in panic disorder patients,” *J. Psychiatr. Res.*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 399–407, Apr. 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2007.03.002.
[37] K. L. Davis *et al.*, “White Matter Changes in Schizophrenia: Evidence for Myelin-Related Dysfunction,” *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, vol. 60, no. 5, p. 443, May 2003, doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.60.5.443.
[38] K. A. Fredericksen *et al.*, “Disproportionate increases of white matter in right frontal lobe in Tourette syndrome,” *Neurology*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 85–89, Jan. 2002, doi: 10.1212/WNL.58.1.85.
[39] D. P. Devanand, R. Bansal, J. Liu, X. Hao, G. Pradhaban, and B. S. Peterson, “MRI hippocampal and entorhinal cortex mapping in predicting conversion to Alzheimer’s disease,” *Neuroimage*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 1622–1629, Apr. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.01.075.
[40] T. D. Cannon *et al.*, “Regional Gray Matter, White Matter, and Cerebrospinal Fluid Distributions in Schizophrenic Patients, Their Siblings, and Controls,” *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 1084–1091, Dec. 1998, doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.55.12.1084.
[41] D. Mozaffarian, “Dietary and Policy Priorities for Cardiovascular Disease, Diabetes, and Obesity,” *Circulation*, vol. 133, no. 2, pp. 187–225, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.018585.
[42] G. Zhong, Y. Wang, Y. Zhang, J. J. Guo, and Y. Zhao, “Smoking Is Associated with an Increased Risk of Dementia: A Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies with Investigation of Potential Effect Modifiers,” *PLOS ONE*, vol. 10, no. 3, p. e0118333, Mar. 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0118333.
[43] H. van Ewijk *et al.*, “Smoking and the developing brain: Altered white matter microstructure in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and healthy controls: Smoking and White Matter Microstructure,” *Hum. Brain Mapp.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 1180–1189, Mar. 2015, doi: 10.1002/hbm.22695.
[44] S. M. Conklin *et al.*, “Long-chain omega-3 fatty acid intake is associated positively with corticolimbic gray matter volume in healthy adults,” *Neurosci. Lett.*, vol. 421, no. 3, pp. 209–212, Jun. 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2007.04.086.
[45] O. E. Titova *et al.*, “Dietary intake of eicosapentaenoic and docosahexaenoic acids is linked to gray matter volume and cognitive function in elderly,” *Age Dordr. Neth.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 1495–1505, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.1007/s11357-012-9453-3.
[46] A. Pfefferbaum *et al.*, “Brain Gray and White Matter Volume Loss Accelerates with Aging in Chronic Alcoholics: A Quantitative MRI Study,” *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1078–1089, 1992, doi: 10.1111/j.1530-0277.1992.tb00702.x.
[47] B. Zhao *et al.*, “Common genetic variation influencing human white matter microstructure,” *Science*, vol. 372, no. 6548, p. eabf3736, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1126/science.abf3736.
[48] L. Zhong *et al.*, “A rapid and cost-effective method for genotyping apolipoprotein E gene polymorphism,” *Mol. Neurodegener.*, vol. 11, p. 2, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1186/s13024-016-0069-4.
[49] A. Ward *et al.*, “Prevalence of apolipoprotein E4 genotype and homozygotes (APOE e4/4) among patients diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” *Neuroepidemiology*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2012, doi: 10.1159/000334607.
[50] S. Ranlund *et al.*, “Associations between polygenic risk scores for four psychiatric illnesses and brain structure using multivariate pattern recognition,” *NeuroImage Clin.*, vol. 20, pp. 1026–1036, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.nicl.2018.10.008.
[51] T. Kaufmann *et al.*, “Common brain disorders are associated with heritable patterns of apparent aging of the brain,” *Nat. Neurosci.*, vol. 22, no. 10, Art. no. 10, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41593-019-0471-7.
[52] N. Bittner *et al.*, “Combining lifestyle risks to disentangle brain structure and functional

connectivity differences in older adults," *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 10, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41467-019-08500-x.
[53] "Summary Statistics – PGC -UNC." https://pgc.unc.edu/for-researchers/download-results/ (accessed Oct. 10, 2022).
[54] T. Otowa *et al.*, "Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies of anxiety disorders," *Mol. Psychiatry*, vol. 21, no. 10, Art. no. 10, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.1038/mp.2015.197.
[55] E. A. Stahl *et al.*, "Genome-wide association study identifies 30 loci associated with bipolar disorder," *Nat. Genet.*, vol. 51, no. 5, Art. no. 5, May 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41588-019-0397-8.
[56] B. W. Kunkle *et al.*, "Genetic meta-analysis of diagnosed Alzheimer's disease identifies new risk loci and implicates Aβ, tau, immunity and lipid processing," *Nat. Genet.*, vol. 51, no. 3, Art. no. 3, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41588-019-0358-2.
[57] D. Demontis *et al.*, "Discovery of the first genome-wide significant risk loci for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder," *Nat. Genet.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 63–75, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0269-7.
[58] J. Grove *et al.*, "Identification of common genetic risk variants for autism spectrum disorder," *Nat. Genet.*, vol. 51, no. 3, Art. no. 3, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41588-019-0344-8.
[59] International Obsessive Compulsive Disorder Foundation Genetics Collaborative (IOCDF-GC) and OCD Collaborative Genetics Association Studies (OCGAS), "Revealing the complex genetic architecture of obsessive-compulsive disorder using meta-analysis," *Mol. Psychiatry*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 1181–1188, May 2018, doi: 10.1038/mp.2017.154.
[60] A. J. Forstner *et al.*, "Genome-wide association study of panic disorder reveals genetic overlap with neuroticism and depression," *Mol. Psychiatry*, vol. 26, no. 8, Art. no. 8, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1038/s41380-019-0590-2.
[61] S. Ripke *et al.*, "Biological insights from 108 schizophrenia-associated genetic loci," *Nature*, vol. 511, no. 7510, Art. no. 7510, Jul. 2014, doi: 10.1038/nature13595.
[62] D. Yu *et al.*, "Interrogating the Genetic Determinants of Tourette's Syndrome and Other Tic Disorders Through Genome-Wide Association Studies," *Am. J. Psychiatry*, vol. 176, no. 3, pp. 217–227, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.18070857.
[63] R. K. Walters *et al.*, "Transancestral GWAS of alcohol dependence reveals common genetic underpinnings with psychiatric disorders," *Nat. Neurosci.*, vol. 21, no. 12, Art. no. 12, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41593-018-0275-1.
[64] B. Benyamin *et al.*, "Childhood intelligence is heritable, highly polygenic and associated with FNBP1L," *Mol. Psychiatry*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 253–258, Feb. 2014, doi: 10.1038/mp.2012.184.
[65] J. J. Lee *et al.*, "Gene discovery and polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1.1 million individuals," *Nat. Genet.*, vol. 50, no. 8, Art. no. 8, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0147-3.
[66] R. Polimanti *et al.*, "Leveraging genome-wide data to investigate differences between opioid use vs. opioid dependence in 41,176 individuals from the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium," *Mol. Psychiatry*, vol. 25, no. 8, Art. no. 8, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41380-020-0677-9.
[67] M. J. H. M. van der Loos *et al.*, "The Molecular Genetic Architecture of Self-Employment," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. e60542, Apr. 2013, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0060542.
[68] M. Liu *et al.*, "Association studies of up to 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol use," *Nat. Genet.*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 237–244, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0307-5.
[69] I. Lourida *et al.*, "Association of Lifestyle and Genetic Risk With Incidence of Dementia," *JAMA*, vol. 322, no. 5, p. 430, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.9879.
[70] S. Sabia *et al.*, "Alcohol consumption and risk of dementia: 23 year follow-up of Whitehall II cohort study," *BMJ*, vol. 362, p. k2927, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1136/bmj.k2927.
[71] E. Palpatzis, N. Bass, R. Jones, and N. Mukadam, "Longitudinal association of

apolipoprotein E and sleep with incident dementia," *Alzheimers Dement. J. Alzheimers Assoc.*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 888–898, May 2022, doi: 10.1002/alz.12439.
[72] D. M. Lyall *et al.*, "Assessing for interaction between APOE ε4, sex, and lifestyle on cognitive abilities," *Neurology*, vol. 92, no. 23, pp. e2691–e2698, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000007551.
[73] G. Operto *et al.*, "White matter microstructure is altered in cognitively normal middle-aged APOE-ε4 homozygotes," *Alzheimers Res. Ther.*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 48, May 2018, doi: 10.1186/s13195-018-0375-x.
[74] F. Novellino, M. E. López, M. G. Vaccaro, Y. Miguel, M. L. Delgado, and F. Maestu, "Association Between Hippocampus, Thalamus, and Caudate in Mild Cognitive Impairment APOEε4 Carriers: A Structural Covariance MRI Study," *Front. Neurol.*, vol. 10, 2019, Accessed: Jun. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fneur.2019.01303
[75] R. C. Gur *et al.*, "Gender differences in age effect on brain atrophy measured by magnetic resonance imaging.," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 88, no. 7, pp. 2845–2849, Apr. 1991, doi: 10.1073/pnas.88.7.2845.
[76] J. Golomb, M. J. de Leon, A. Kluger, A. E. George, C. Tarshish, and S. H. Ferris, "Hippocampal Atrophy in Normal Aging: An Association With Recent Memory Impairment," *Arch. Neurol.*, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 967–973, Sep. 1993, doi: 10.1001/archneur.1993.00540090066012.
[77] N. Raz *et al.*, "Selective aging of the human cerebral cortex observed in vivo: differential vulnerability of the prefrontal gray matter.," *Cereb. Cortex*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 268–282, Apr. 1997, doi: 10.1093/cercor/7.3.268.
[78] F. Sampedro *et al.*, "APOE-by-sex interactions on brain structure and metabolism in healthy elderly controls," *Oncotarget*, vol. 6, no. 29, pp. 26663–26674, Sep. 2015.
[79] M. Vňuková, R. Ptáček, J. Raboch, and G. B. Stefano, "Decreased Central Nervous System Grey Matter Volume (GMV) in Smokers Affects Cognitive Abilities: A Systematic Review," *Med. Sci. Monit. Int. Med. J. Exp. Clin. Res.*, vol. 23, pp. 1907–1915, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.12659/MSM.901870.
[80] M. T. Sutherland *et al.*, "Chronic cigarette smoking is linked with structural alterations in brain regions showing acute nicotinic drug-induced functional modulations," *Behav. Brain Funct.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 16, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1186/s12993-016-0100-5.
[81] D. Das, N. Cherbuin, K. J. Anstey, P. S. Sachdev, and S. Easteal, "Lifetime cigarette smoking is associated with striatal volume measures," *Addict. Biol.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 817–825, 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1369-1600.2010.00301.x.
[82] R. Zivadinov *et al.*, "Smoking is associated with increased lesion volumes and brain atrophy in multiple sclerosis," *Neurology*, vol. 73, no. 7, pp. 504–510, Aug. 2009, doi: 10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181b2a706.
[83] F. Lin, G. Wu, L. Zhu, and H. Lei, "Heavy smokers show abnormal microstructural integrity in the anterior corpus callosum: a diffusion tensor imaging study with tract-based spatial statistics," *Drug Alcohol Depend.*, vol. 129, no. 1–2, pp. 82–87, Apr. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2012.09.013.
[84] W. Umene-Nakano *et al.*, "Abnormal White Matter Integrity in the Corpus Callosum among Smokers: Tract-Based Spatial Statistics," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. e87890, Feb. 2014, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0087890.
[85] T. D. Kristensen *et al.*, "Changes in negative symptoms are linked to white matter changes in superior longitudinal fasciculus in individuals at ultra-high risk for psychosis," *Schizophr. Res.*, vol. 237, pp. 192–201, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2021.09.014.
[86] R. R. Savjani *et al.*, "Characterizing white matter changes in cigarette smokers via diffusion tensor imaging," *Drug Alcohol Depend.*, vol. 145, pp. 134–142, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2014.10.006.

[87] C. E. Sexton *et al.*, “Accelerated Changes in White Matter Microstructure during Aging: A Longitudinal Diffusion Tensor Imaging Study,” *J. Neurosci.*, vol. 34, no. 46, pp. 15425–15436, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0203-14.2014.
[88] A. Topiwala, K. Ebmeier, T. Maullin-Sapey, and T. Nichols, “No safe level of alcohol consumption for brain health: observational cohort study of 25,378 UK Biobank participant.” 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.05.10.21256931.
[89] D. Tomasi *et al.*, “Accelerated Aging of the Amygdala in Alcohol Use Disorders: Relevance to the Dark Side of Addiction,” *Cereb. Cortex*, vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 3254–3265, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhab006.
[90] G. Fein, R. Shimotsu, R. Chu, and J. Barakos, “Parietal gray matter volume loss is related to spatial processing deficits in long-term abstinent alcoholic men,” *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.*, vol. 33, no. 10, pp. 1806–1814, Oct. 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1530-0277.2009.01019.x.
[91] A. Topiwala *et al.*, “Moderate alcohol consumption as risk factor for adverse brain outcomes and cognitive decline: longitudinal cohort study,” *BMJ*, vol. 357, p. j2353, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1136/bmj.j2353.
[92] M. A. Monnig *et al.*, “White matter integrity is associated with alcohol cue reactivity in heavy drinkers,” *Brain Behav.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 158–170, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.1002/brb3.204.
[93] P.-H. Yeh, K. Simpson, T. C. Durazzo, S. Gazdzinski, and D. J. Meyerhoff, “Tract-based spatial statistics (TBSS) of diffusion tensor imaging data in alcohol dependence: abnormalities of the motivational neurocircuitry,” *Psychiatry Res.*, vol. 173, no. 1, pp. 22–30, Jul. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.pscychresns.2008.07.012.
[94] C. Zhang *et al.*, “Differential impairment patterns of the corticospinal tract segments in alcohol dependence,” *Int. J. Psychiatry Clin. Pract.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 225–230, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.1080/13651501.2019.1588328.
[95] A. S. Whiteman, D. E. Young, A. E. Budson, C. E. Stern, and K. Schon, “Entorhinal volume, aerobic fitness, and recognition memory in healthy young adults: A voxel-based morphometry study,” *NeuroImage*, vol. 126, pp. 229–238, Feb. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.11.049.
[96] M. Yamamoto *et al.*, “Association between exercise habits and subcortical gray matter volumes in healthy elderly people: A population-based study in Japan,” *eNeurologicalSci*, vol. 7, pp. 1–6, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ensci.2017.03.002.
[97] T. W. Scheewe *et al.*, “Exercise therapy improves mental and physical health in schizophrenia: a randomised controlled trial,” *Acta Psychiatr. Scand.*, vol. 127, no. 6, pp. 464–473, Jun. 2013, doi: 10.1111/acps.12029.
[98] A. K. Roy, E. Ferrara, R. Keesey, and K. Davis, “3.04 - fMRI and Other Neuroimaging Methods,” in *Comprehensive Clinical Psychology (Second Edition)*, G. J. G. Asmundson, Ed. Oxford: Elsevier, 2022, pp. 62–82. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-818697-8.00215-6.
[99] S. J. Teipel *et al.*, “White matter microstructure in relation to education in aging and Alzheimer’s disease,” *J. Alzheimers Dis. JAD*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 571–583, 2009, doi: 10.3233/JAD-2009-1077.
[100] C. E. Coffey, J. A. Saxton, G. Ratcliff, R. N. Bryan, and J. F. Lucke, “Relation of education to brain size in normal aging: implications for the reserve hypothesis,” *Neurology*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 189–196, Jul. 1999, doi: 10.1212/wnl.53.1.189.
[101] R. Krishnadas *et al.*, “Socioeconomic deprivation and cortical morphology: psychological, social, and biological determinants of ill health study,” *Psychosom. Med.*, vol. 75, no. 7, pp. 616–623, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e3182a151a7.
[102] L. M. Hofbauer and F. S. Rodriguez, “Validation of a social deprivation index and association with cognitive function and decline in older adults,” *Int. Psychogeriatr.*, vol. 33, no. 12, pp. 1309–1320, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1017/S1041610221000995.
[103] A. Imfeld, M. S. Oechslin, M. Meyer, T. Loenneker, and L. Jancke, “White matter plasticity in the corticospinal tract of musicians: A diffusion tensor imaging study,”

NeuroImage, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 600–607, Jul. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.02.025.
[104] T. Y. Kim *et al.*, “Apolipoprotein E Gene Polymorphism, Alcohol Use, and Their Interactions in Combat-Related Posttraumatic Stress Disorder,” *Depress. Anxiety*, vol. 30, no. 12, pp. 1194–1201, 2013, doi: 10.1002/da.22138.
[105] G. J. McKay *et al.*, “Evidence of association of APOE with age-related macular degeneration - a pooled analysis of 15 studies,” *Hum. Mutat.*, vol. 32, no. 12, pp. 1407–1416, 2011, doi: 10.1002/humu.21577.
[106] Z. Li, F. Shue, N. Zhao, M. Shinohara, and G. Bu, “APOE2: protective mechanism and therapeutic implications for Alzheimer’s disease,” *Mol. Neurodegener.*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 63, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s13024-020-00413-4.
[107] N. Zhao *et al.*, “APOE ε2 is associated with increased tau pathology in primary tauopathy,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 9, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-06783-0.
[108] E. Ghebremedhin *et al.*, “Argyrophilic grain disease is associated with apolipoprotein E ε2 allele,” *Acta Neuropathol. (Berl.)*, vol. 96, no. 3, pp. 222–224, Aug. 1998, doi: 10.1007/s004010050886.
[109] F. Agosta *et al.*, “White Matter Damage in Alzheimer Disease and Its Relationship to Gray Matter Atrophy,” *Radiology*, vol. 258, no. 3, pp. 853–863, Mar. 2011, doi: 10.1148/radiol.10101284.
[110] F. S. Rodriguez *et al.*, “APOE e4-genotype and lifestyle interaction on cognitive performance: Results of the LIFE-Adult-study,” *Health Psychol. Off. J. Div. Health Psychol. Am. Psychol. Assoc.*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 194–205, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1037/hea0000515.
[111] J.-M. Pyun *et al.*, “Predictability of polygenic risk score for progression to dementia and its interaction with APOE ε4 in mild cognitive impairment,” *Transl. Neurodegener.*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 32, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s40035-021-00259-w.
[112] J. C. Gray, M. Thompson, C. Bachman, M. M. Owens, M. Murphy, and R. Palmer, “Associations of cigarette smoking with gray and white matter in the UK Biobank,” *Neuropsychopharmacology*, vol. 45, no. 7, Art. no. 7, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41386-020-0630-2.
[113] D. Kidron *et al.*, “Quantitative MR volumetry in Alzheimer’s disease. Topographic markers and the effects of sex and education,” *Neurology*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 1504–1512, Dec. 1997, doi: 10.1212/wnl.49.6.1504.

Table 1. Demographic information, lifestyle factors and polygenic risk scores of the UKB subjects used in the association studies on DTI phenotypes.

	Number(%)						
Characteristic	**APOE4 homozygote (n=770)**	**APOE3 homozygote (n=20770)**	**APOE2 homozygote (n=202)**	**APOE4/APOE3 (n=8130)**	**APOE2/APOE3 (n=4330)**	**APOE4/APOE2 (n=833)**	**Total (n=35035)**
Age, mean(Range)	54.23(40,69)	54.92(40,70)	54.70(40,69)	54.46(40,70)	54.97(40,70)	54.84(40,70)	54.80(40,70)
Ethnicity							
British	725(94.16)	19082(91.87)	187(92.57)	7535(92.68)	4002(92.42)	789(94.72)	32320(92.25)
Others	45(5.84)	1688(8.13)	15(7.43)	595(7.32)	328(7.58)	44(5.28)	2715(7.75)
Sex							
Male	420(54.55)	9929(47.8)	93(46.04)	3737(45.97)	2032(46.93)	374(44.9)	16515(47.14)
Female	350(45.45)	10841(52.2)	109(53.96)	4393(54.03)	2298(53.07)	459(55.1)	18520(52.86)
Disease status							
Dementia	0(0)	1(0)	1(0.5)	2(0.02)	2(0.05)	0(0)	6(0.02)
Not dementia	770(100)	20769(100)	201(99.5)	8128(99.98)	4328(99.95)	833(100)	35029(99.98)
Family illness							
Father has AD	128(16.62)	1764(8.49)	19(9.41)	1023(12.58)	365(8.43)	103(12.36)	3402(9.71)
Mother has AD	223(28.96)	3329(16.03)	25(12.38)	1855(22.82)	655(15.13)	189(22.69)	31633(90.29)
Sibling has AD	27(3.51)	261(1.26)	1(0.5)	191(2.35)	51(1.18)	20(2.4)	
Marriage status							
Living with a partner	611(79.35)	16077(77.4)	158(78.22)	6295(77.43)	3336(77.04)	624(74.91)	27101(77.35)
Not living with a partner	65(8.44)	1521(7.32)	16(7.92)	629(7.74)	310(7.16)	74(8.88)	2615(7.46)
Education							
College/university degree or above	375(48.7)	9656(46.49)	88(43.56)	3750(46.13)	1978(45.68)	398(47.78)	16245(46.37)
No college/university degree or above	350(45.45)	9636(46.39)	98(48.51)	3855(47.42)	2036(47.02)	374(44.9)	16349(46.66)
Social Deprivation							
Above the Townsend deprivation index median	307(39.87)	8750(42.13)	79(39.11)	3426(42.14)	1755(40.53)	334(40.1)	14651(41.82)
Below the Townsend deprivation index median	463(60.13)	12001(57.78)	123(60.89)	4697(57.77)	2568(59.31)	499(59.9)	20351(58.09)
Lifestyle factors							
Smoking status							
Not current smoking	732(95.06)	19433(93.56)	192(95.05)	7603(93.52)	4061(93.79)	784(94.12)	32805(93.63)
Current Smoking	38(4.94)	1293(6.23)	10(4.95)	510(6.27)	263(6.07)	47(5.64)	2161(6.17)
Doing regular physical activity							
Yes	586(76.1)	15593(75.07)	153(75.74)	6075(74.72)	3265(75.4)	603(72.39)	26275(75)
No	182(23.64)	5043(24.28)	49(24.26)	1997(24.56)	1043(24.09)	224(26.89)	8538(24.37)
Healthy diet							
Yes	408(52.99)	10133(48.79)	90(44.55)	4019(49.43)	2063(47.64)	398(47.78)	17111(48.84)
No	362(47.01)	10628(51.17)	112(55.45)	4105(50.49)	2265(52.31)	435(52.22)	17907(51.11)
Alcohol consumption							
Excessive alcohol consumption	203(26.36)	5842(28.13)	58(28.71)	2346(28.86)	1245(28.75)	216(25.93)	9910(28.29)
Moderate alcohol consumption	485(62.99)	12666(60.98)	115(56.93)	4876(59.98)	2610(60.28)	529(63.51)	21281(60.74)
Not current drinking	82(10.65)	2251(10.84)	29(14.36)	907(11.16)	474(10.95)	88(10.56)	3831(10.93)
Sleeping between 6 hours and 8 hours							
Yes	342(44.42)	9017(43.41)	89(44.06)	3645(44.83)	1810(41.8)	380(45.62)	15283(43.62)
No	426(55.32)	11706(56.36)	113(55.94)	4473(55.02)	2507(57.9)	451(54.14)	19676(56.16)

*: Percentiles do not add to 1 is due to missingness.



Figure 1. The study design. **(A)** Multi-omics data in the UKB. **(B)** Identified brain regions with structural changes associated with APOE, alcohol, smoking, physical activity (Phy. Act.), and socioeconomic status (SES). **(C)** The causal graph among the genetics, demographics, lifestyle and SES factors and the brain structural traits (imaging traits).



Figure 2. Results on age-gene interaction effects, in particular, heatmap to show standardized genetic (APOE, PRS) and age-sex-genetic interaction effects on white matter diffusivity **(A)** and volume **(B)** and the identified brain regions and signals on volume (shown with "V") and diffusivity (shown with "F", "A", "M", "R" and "O" for FA, AxD, MD, RD and MO, respectively) from APOE-related effects **(C)** and genetic PRS-related effects **(D)**. (*) denotes the 2.37e-4 significance level. In **(C)** and **(D),** we display the statistical association results that are consistent between British and non-British populations. On top of that, the imaging phenotypes at particular brain region beyond the significant level (p<0.05) in both British and non-British cohorts are marked by black box. Color indicates the brain region, and directions of effects are denoted by "+" for positive and "-" for negative.



Figure 3. Heatmaps of lifestyle, SES effects and their interaction effects with age on brain volumes **(A)** and white matter DTI measurements **(B)**. (*) denotes the significant effect with p-value less than 2.37×10^{-4}. **(C)** Scatterplots of left cerebellum exterior volume against age, from left to right are non-APOE4, 1 APOE4 and 2 APOE4 carriers. Each subgraph is grouped by sex, the regression lines and 95% confidence intervals are also displayed.



Figure 4. Identified brain regions with the effects of lifestyle factors. **(A)** Regions with effects of nonsmoking pheonotype and smoking PRS score on volume (shown with "V"; directions of effects are denoted by "+" for positive and "-" for negative). **(B)** Regions with effects of nonsmoking pheonotype on white matter diffusivity (shown with "F", "A", "M", "R" and "O" for FA, AxD, MD, RD and MO, respectively). **(C)** Regions with effects of excessive alcohol (EXCS Alcohol) on volume. **(D)** Regions with effects of excessive alcohol (EXCS Alcohol) on diffusivity. **(E)** Regions with effects of physical activity (Phys.Act.) on volume and diffusivity. **(F)** Regions with effects of Age-diet and Age-EXCS Alcohol interactions on diffusivity. In **(A)-(E)**, only signals with p-values below 2.37e-4 based by British population which are validated by nonBritish population (the same direction) were displayed. In **(F),** signals with p-values less than 0.01 based on British population that are validated by nonBritish population were displayed**.** Signals with $p < 0.05$ for nonBritish population were enclosed with a black rectangle.



Figure 5. Identified brain regions with the effects of socioeconomic status (SES). **(A)** Regions with effects of SES pheonotype on volume (shown with "V"; directions of effects are denoted by "+" for positive and "-" for negative). **(B)** Regions with effects of SES on white matter diffusivity (shown with "F", "A", "M", "R" and "O" for FA, AxD, MD, RD and MO, respectively). **(C)** Regions with effects of age-lifestyle and age-SES interactions on volume. In **(A)** and **(B)**, only signals with p-values below 2.37e-4 based by British population which are validated by nonBritish population (the same direction) were displayed. In **(C),** we display the statistical association results that are consistent between British and nonBritish populations. On top of that, the imaging phenotypes at particular brain region beyond the significant level (p<0.05) in both British and nonBritish cohorts are marked by black box. Color indicates the brain region.