

# 1 **Supplementary Methods**

## 2 **1. Subjects**

3 This study used plasma samples from EMIF-AD Multimodal Biomarker Discovery  
4 (EMIF-AD MBD) study [1]. EMIF-AD MBD is a cross-cohort study consisting of  
5 collated data from 11 European cohorts that aims to discover novel diagnostic and  
6 prognostic markers for AD-type dementia by performing analyses in multiple  
7 biomarker modalities [1]. This cross-cohort study includes a total of 1221 individuals  
8 across the cognitive spectrum: normal cognition (NC), Mild Cognitive Impairment  
9 (MCI) and AD-type dementia. Individuals were selected from prospective cohort  
10 studies based on the availability of plasma, DNA and CSF samples and MRI scans.  
11 Exclusion criteria for the EMIF-AD MBD study were the presence of neurological,  
12 psychiatric or somatic disorders that could cause cognitive impairment [1].

13 For the current study, we selected all participants from whom plasma samples were  
14 available for metabolomics analyses (n = 593). Participants were included from three  
15 multicenter studies: DESCRIPA (n = 16) [2], EDAR (n = 83) [3], PharmaCog (n = 40)  
16 [4], and eight single center studies: Amsterdam (n = 146) [5], Antwerp (n = 130) [6],  
17 San Sebastian GAP (n = 40) [7], Gothenburg (n = 22) [8], IDIBAPS (n = 8) [9],  
18 Lausanne (n = 20) [10], Leuven (n = 53) [11], Barcelona-Sant Pau (n = 35) [12].

19

## 20 **2. Clinical and cognitive data**

21 The definition of NC was a normal performance on neuropsychological assessment  
22 (within 1.5 SD of the average for age, gender and education). MCI was defined as  
23 having cognitive complaints and performance below 1.5 SD of the average on at least  
24 one neuropsychological test but no dementia [13]. AD-type dementia diagnosis was

25 made based on a clinical diagnosis, using the National Institute of Neurological and  
26 Communicative Disorders and Stroke – Alzheimer’s Disease and Related Disorders  
27 Association (NINCDS-ADRDA) criteria [14].

28 Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE) score [15] measuring an overall cognitive  
29 impairment was available for 590 participants at the time of blood donation and 405  
30 participants at follow-up (the average follow-up length of 2.44 years). Rate of cognitive  
31 decline (ROD) was calculated using linear mixed effect models based on the  
32 longitudinal MMSE assessments (n=405). After covariate adjustment (age at sampling,  
33 gender, *APOE* ε4), the slope coefficient for each sample was derived, multiplied by -1  
34 and then computed as z-score. The resulting values were defined as the ROD.

35 Neuropsychological tests measuring 5 different cognitive domains were also available  
36 at the time of blood donation; memory (-delayed, n=452; -immediate, n=537), language  
37 (n=572), attention (n=543), executive functioning (n=434), and visuoconstruction  
38 (n=346). One test for each cognitive domain was selected from each study and z-scores  
39 were computed based on local normative data when available, or published normative  
40 data from healthy controls otherwise. More detailed description on clinical diagnosis  
41 and assessment can be found in [1].

42

### 43 **3. Amyloid and tau level measurements**

44 Amyloid ( $A\beta$ ) status was defined by the CSF  $A\beta_{42/40}$  ratio of the central analyses  
45 (n=467). The ratio was derived from  $A\beta$  measurements using the 6E10 version of the  
46 MSD Abeta Triplex assay (Meso Scale Discovery, Rockville, MD). When no CSF was  
47 contributed for central analyses, the local CSF  $A\beta_{42}$  value (n=73) or the standardized  
48 uptake value ratio (SUVR) on an amyloid-PET scan (n=53) was used [16].

49 A $\beta$  measurements (A $\beta$  z-scores) were calculated at each center (Central A $\beta_{42/40}$ , local  
50 CSF A $\beta_{42}$ , amyloid-PET) and later combined. The measures were obtained  
51 predominately in CSF (n=476), the local CSF A $\beta_{42}$  value (n=73) or the standardized  
52 uptake value ratio (SUVR) on an amyloid-PET scan (n=53). The A $\beta$  z-scores were  
53 multiplied by -1 such that a positive score means more amyloid pathology. For  
54 phosphorylated tau (p-tau) and total tau (t-tau) the local measurements of each study  
55 were used, which we converted into z-scores within the group for which the same assay  
56 was used

57 For phosphorylated tau (p-tau) and total tau (t-tau) the local measurements of each  
58 study were used, which we converted into z-scores within the group for which the same  
59 assay was used. All central CSF analyses measuring phosphorylated tau (p-tau) and  
60 total tau (t-tau), were conducted using INNOTEST ELISA kits (Fujirebio, Ghent,  
61 Belgium) at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

62 The clinical design was explained in detail in the following publication [1]. Details on  
63 the amyloid and tau level measurements can be found in the supplementary methods 3.

#### 64 ***2.4. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) analyses***

65 Hippocampi volumes (left, right and sum) adjusted by intracranial volume were  
66 collected from 387 participants. Average cortical thickness across the whole brain and  
67 cortical thickness in AD signature regions as defined in [17] were available from 351  
68 participants. Detailed information regarding data acquisition, processing, and quality  
69 control assessment has been described elsewhere [16].

70

#### 71 ***2.5. Genetic analyses***

72 Genome-wide SNP genotyping was performed using Global Screening Array (Illumina,  
73 Inc). *APOE* genotypes were defined using the rs429358 SNP. This SNP was determined  
74 through imputation based on the Global Screening Array, but was also directly  
75 genotyped locally. Participants were classified as *APOE*  $\epsilon$ 4 carriers ( $\epsilon$ 4+) or non-  
76 carriers ( $\epsilon$ 4-).

77

#### 78 **4. Metabolomics data acquisition and treatment**

79 Metabolomics data for the current study was acquired by Metabolon Inc. (Morrisville,  
80 NC, USA). Relative levels of 883 plasma metabolites were measured in fasting blood  
81 samples using three different mass spectrometry methods. The first method utilized  
82 acidic, positive ionization conditions chromatographically optimized for hydrophilic  
83 compounds (UPLC-MS/MS positive polar). The second method used the same acidic  
84 positive ionization conditions but was chromatographically optimized for hydrophobic  
85 compounds (UPLC-MS/MS positive). The third method used negative ionization  
86 optimized conditions (UPLC-MS/MS negative). More details on the analytical method  
87 can be found in [17-19].

88 From the raw data, area counts for each metabolite in each sample were extracted. The  
89 extracted area counts were then normalized to correct for variation resulting from  
90 instrument inter-day tuning differences by the median value for each run-day, therefore,  
91 setting the medians to 1.0 for each run. This preserved variation between samples but  
92 allowed metabolites of widely different raw peak areas to be compared on a similar  
93 graphical scale. Metabolite levels below limit of quantification were replaced with 1  
94 while metabolites with more than 20% missing were excluded from the further analysis.  
95 This step resulted in data reduction from 883 to 648 metabolites, this step removed 85

96 metabolites of drug origin leaving 2 in the data set. Subsequently, the metabolomics  
97 data was log transformed to allow the data to be normally distributed and then each  
98 metabolite was scaled to have a mean value of 0 and a standard deviation value of 1.

99

## 100 **5. Statistical Analyses**

101 Prior to statistical analyses, baseline characteristics were compared between diagnostic  
102 group using the Chi-square test for categorical variables and ANOVA for continuous  
103 variables (Table 1). To investigate the association of each metabolite with AD clinical  
104 variables, linear regression was applied for continuous AD variables ( $A\beta$ , p-tau, t-tau,  
105 cognition, and MRI measurements) while logistic regression was applied for  
106 categorical AD variables (diagnosis and *APOE4* alleles). Each regression model was  
107 adjusted for age at sampling, gender and presence of *APOE*  $\epsilon 4$ . For the *APOE*  $\epsilon 4$  model,  
108 covariate adjustment was applied for age at sampling and gender. Adjustment for  
109 multiple testing was applied using a Bonferroni correction P-value  $< 7.72 \times 10^{-5}$  ( $= 0.05$   
110 / 648), where 648 is the number of metabolites tested against each AD clinical variable.  
111 All associations are reported as the change per one metabolite standard deviation (SD).

112 A schematic workflow of the primary data analysis used in this study can be found in  
113 the Supplementary Figure 1. All statistical analyses were performed using R Statistical  
114 Software (version 3.4.1). A circos plot [20] was generated using Perl based Circos  
115 algorithm (version 5.26.2).

116

## 117 **4. Reference**

118 [1] Bos I, Vos S, Vandenberghe R, Scheltens P, Engelborghs S, Frisoni G, et al. The EMIF-  
119 AD Multimodal Biomarker Discovery study: design, methods and cohort characteristics.  
120 *Alzheimers Res Ther.* 2018;10:64.

121 [2] Visser PJ, Verhey FR, Boada M, Bullock R, De Deyn PP, Frisoni GB, et al. Development  
122 of screening guidelines and clinical criteria for predementia Alzheimer's disease. The  
123 DESCRIPA Study. *Neuroepidemiology.* 2008;30:254-65.

124 [3] Reijs BLR, Ramakers I, Elias-Sonnenschein L, Teunissen CE, Koel-Simmelink M, Tsolaki  
125 M, et al. Relation of Odor Identification with Alzheimer's Disease Markers in  
126 Cerebrospinal Fluid and Cognition. *Journal of Alzheimer's disease : JAD.* 2017;60:1025-  
127 34.

128 [4] Galluzzi S, Marizzoni M, Babiloni C, Albani D, Antelmi L, Bagnoli C, et al. Clinical and  
129 biomarker profiling of prodromal Alzheimer's disease in workpackage 5 of the Innovative  
130 Medicines Initiative PharmaCog project: a 'European ADNI study'. *Journal of internal  
131 medicine.* 2016;279:576-91.

132 [5] van der Flier WM, Pijnenburg YA, Prins N, Lemstra AW, Bouwman FH, Teunissen CE,  
133 et al. Optimizing patient care and research: the Amsterdam Dementia Cohort. *Journal of  
134 Alzheimer's disease : JAD.* 2014;41:313-27.

135 [6] Somers C, Struyfs H, Goossens J, Niemantsverdriet E, Luyckx J, De Roeck N, et al. A  
136 Decade of Cerebrospinal Fluid Biomarkers for Alzheimer's Disease in Belgium. *Journal of  
137 Alzheimer's disease : JAD.* 2016;54:383-95.

138 [7] Estanga A, Ecay-Torres M, Ibanez A, Izagirre A, Villanua J, Garcia-Sebastian M, et al.  
139 Beneficial effect of bilingualism on Alzheimer's disease CSF biomarkers and cognition.  
140 *Neurobiology of aging.* 2017;50:144-51.

141 [8] Wallin A, Nordlund A, Jonsson M, Blennow K, Zetterberg H, Ohrfelt A, et al. Alzheimer's  
142 disease--subcortical vascular disease spectrum in a hospital-based setting: Overview of  
143 results from the Gothenburg MCI and dementia studies. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab.*  
144 2016;36:95-113.

145 [9] Fortea J, Sala-Llonch R, Bartres-Faz D, Bosch B, Llado A, Bargallo N, et al. Increased  
146 cortical thickness and caudate volume precede atrophy in PSEN1 mutation carriers. *J  
147 Alzheimers Dis.* 2010;22:909-22.

148 [10] Tautvydaite D, Kukreja D, Antonietti JP, Henry H, von Gunten A, Popp J. Interaction  
149 between personality traits and cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers of Alzheimer's disease  
150 pathology modulates cognitive performance. *Alzheimer's research & therapy.* 2017;9:6.

151 [11] Adamczuk K, Schaefferbeke J, Nelissen N, Neyens V, Vandenbulcke M, Goffin K, et al.  
152 Amyloid imaging in cognitively normal older adults: comparison between (18)F-  
153 flutemetamol and (11)C-Pittsburgh compound B. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.*  
154 2016;43:142-51.

155 [12] Alcolea D, Carmona-Iragui M, Suarez-Calvet M, Sanchez-Saudinos MB, Sala I, Anton-  
156 Aguirre S, et al. Relationship between beta-Secretase, inflammation and core  
157 cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease. *J Alzheimers Dis.* 2014;42:157-  
158 67.

159 [13] Petersen RC. Mild cognitive impairment as a diagnostic entity. *Journal of internal  
160 medicine.* 2004;256:183-94.

161 [14] McKhann G, Drachman D, Folstein M, Katzman R, Price D, Stadlan EM. Clinical  
162 diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: report of the NINCDS-ADRDA Work Group under the  
163 auspices of Department of Health and Human Services Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease.  
164 *Neurology.* 1984;34:939-44.

165 [15] Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for  
166 grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res.* 1975;12:189-98.

167 [16] Alcolea D, Martinez-Lage P, Sanchez-Juan P, Olazarán J, Antunez C, Izagirre A, et al.  
168 Amyloid precursor protein metabolism and inflammation markers in preclinical  
169 Alzheimer disease. *Neurology.* 2015;85:626-33.

170 [17] Evans AM, DeHaven CD, Barrett T, Mitchell M, Milgram E. Integrated, nontargeted  
171 ultrahigh performance liquid chromatography/electrospray ionization tandem mass

172 spectrometry platform for the identification and relative quantification of the small-  
173 molecule complement of biological systems. *Anal Chem.* 2009;81:6656-67.  
174 [18] Miller MJ, Kennedy AD, Eckhart AD, Burrage LC, Wulff JE, Miller LA, et al. Untargeted  
175 metabolomic analysis for the clinical screening of inborn errors of metabolism. *J Inherit*  
176 *Metab Dis.* 2015;38:1029-39.  
177 [19] Grinton KE, Benke PJ, Lines MA, Geraghty MT, Chakraborty P, Al-Dirbashi OY, et al.  
178 Disturbed phospholipid metabolism in serine biosynthesis defects revealed by  
179 metabolomic profiling. *Mol Genet Metab.* 2018;123:309-16.  
180 [20] Krzywinski M, Schein J, Birol I, Connors J, Gascoyne R, Horsman D, et al. Circos: an  
181 information aesthetic for comparative genomics. *Genome Res.* 2009;19:1639-45.

182