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Abstract

We have screened sporadic early-onset Alzheimer’s disease (sEOAD, n=408) samples using the NeuroX array for known causative and predicted pathogenic variants in 16 genes linked to familial forms of neurodegeneration. We found two sEOAD individuals harbouring a known causative variant in PARK2 known to cause early-onset Parkinson’s disease (EOPD); p.T240M (n=1) and p.Q34fs delAG (n=1). Additionally, we identified three sEOAD individuals harbouring a predicted pathogenic variant in MAPT (p.A469T) which has previously been associated with AD. It is currently unknown if these variants affect susceptibility to sEOAD, further studies would be needed to establish this. This work highlights the need to screen sEOAD individuals for variants that are more classically attributed to other forms of neurodegeneration.
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1. Introduction

Alzheimer’s disease (AD) is the commonest form of dementia in the world. AD and other dementias were the fourth leading cause of death in high-income countries in 2012 (WHO, 2012). Sporadic early-onset Alzheimer’s disease (sEOAD) has a disease onset ≤ 65 years of age and these individuals do not harbour a known causative mutation, the remaining sporadic cases are classified as late-onset Alzheimer’s disease (LOAD). Both forms of AD have a complex aetiology with heritability estimated to be 92-100% for sEOAD (Wingo, et al., 2012) and 70% for LOAD (Gatz, et al., 2006). Given the difference in heritability and age of onset between sEOAD and LOAD, it is likely that sEOAD patients have a more penetrant genetic aetiology and thus provide a good cohort to explore the genetics of AD.

Many types of dementia have a neuropathology and/or clinical crossover, for example Parkinson’s disease with/without dementia (PDD/PD) have alpha-synuclein deposits in the brain and a similar clinical presentation to dementia with Lewy bodies (DLB) (Jellinger, 2014). Mixed dementia has features linked to more than one type of dementia, such as AD with cerebrovascular lesions and/or Lewy bodies (Jellinger, 2014). It is not surprising then that some genetic loci identified thus far are associated with multiple types of dementias; the commonest example is that of APOE ε4 which is associated with AD (Corder, et al., 1993), posterior cortical atrophy (PCA) (Carrasquillo, et al., 2014) and DLB (Bras, et al., 2014). It is believed that sporadic AD could be in part due to the aggregate of multiple causative variants, therefore it is easy to imagine that different types of dementia have overlapping genetics; whereby a portion of variants that contribute to one dementia are also seen to contribute to a different type of dementia. Alternatively different types of dementia could be a result of pleiotropy, for example it has recently been reported that the alpha-synuclein gene (SNCA) is associated with DLB but this is a different haplotype to that associated with PDD (Bras, et al., 2014).
The NeuroX is a customised Illumina HumanExome DNA microarray; the first version of the chip contains 267,607 markers, most of which genotype rare missense variants, notably most of the genes in the human genome have at least one variant genotyped. The NeuroX includes standard content (242,901) designed by Illumina together with custom content (24,706) designed to be ‘neuro-specific’. The custom content was selected to genotype specific variants and genes linked to neurologic diseases, the inclusion criterion was determined using literature searches and genotyping data available before 2014. A more descriptive explanation of the NeuroX can be found in the consortia’s published paper (Nalls, et al., 2015). The NeuroX provides a convenient approach to screen for causative mutations and test for genetic crossover and/or pleiotropy amongst neurologic diseases.

We report the screening of 408 sEOAD individuals with the aim to identify causative or predicted pathogenic variants in 16 selected genes using the NeuroX. These 16 genes are linked to familial forms of neurodegeneration including Alzheimer’s disease (APP, PSEN1 and PSEN2), frontotemporal dementia/amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (C9orf72, CHMP2B, FUS, GRN, MAPT, TARDBP and VCP), Parkinson’s disease (LRRK2, PARK2, PARK7, PINK1 and SNCA) and prion disease (PRNP); all have pathogenic variants highlighted in freely accessible online databases.
2. **Materials and Methods**

Methods were conducted according to the manufacturer’s instructions unless otherwise stated. All sporadic early-onset Alzheimer’s disease (sEOAD) samples were screened for known causative variants in *APP* exons 16 and 17 by Sanger sequencing and in *PSEN1/PSEN2* using the NeuroX data, individuals harbouring a causative variant in either of these genes were removed prior to this analysis ([Barber, et al., 2016](#)).

2.1. **Samples**

sEOAD individuals (n=408) had an age of disease onset ≤ 65 years of age ([Table 1](#)). For 28 individuals where AAO was not documented, it was derived assuming 8 years disease duration from age at death ([Ryman, et al., 2014](#)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean AAO (±SD)</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>APOE ε4+ (%)</th>
<th>APOE ε4 MAF</th>
<th>APOE ε4ε4 (%)</th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>Probable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.3 (5.3)</td>
<td>9 (42.9)</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3 (14.3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>57.1 (5.5)</td>
<td>156 (47.6)</td>
<td>196 (59.8)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>46 (14.0)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58.2 (6.3)</td>
<td>12 (46.2)</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1 (3.8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55.6 (4.2)</td>
<td>19 (57.6)</td>
<td>19 (57.6)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3 (9.1)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>56.8 (5.5)</td>
<td>196 (48.0)</td>
<td>236 (57.8)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>53 (13.0)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Demographics of sporadic early-onset Alzheimer's disease (sEOAD) cohort

The cohort contains individuals from multiple centres; each centre is represented one per row. The number of individuals (N) from each centre is given along with the mean age of onset with standard deviation (Mean AAO (±SD)), this is followed by the number and percentage of female individuals per centre (Females (%)), the number and percentage of individuals harbouring at least one APOE ε4 allele (APOE ε4+ (%)), APOE ε4 minor allele frequency (APOE ε4 MAF) and number and percentage of individuals with APOE ε4ε4 genotype (APOE ε4ε4). The final columns state the number of individuals classed as either post mortem verified (Definite) or probable (Probable) Alzheimer’s disease according to NINCDS-ADRDA and CERAD guidelines. Key: N, number of individuals; SD, standard deviation.
sEOAD individuals were diagnosed as either definite or probable Alzheimer’s disease (AD) according to National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke and the Alzheimer’s disease and Related Disorders Association (NINCDS-ADRDA), and the Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer’s disease (CERAD) guidelines. All samples used in this study were received with informed consent and experimental procedures were approved by the local ethics committee, Nottingham Research Ethics Committee 2 (REC reference 04/Q2404/130). All experimental procedures were conducted in accordance with approved guidelines.

DNA was extracted from blood or brain tissue using a standard phenol chloroform extraction method. DNA quality and quantity was assessed by gel electrophoresis and NanoDrop™ 3300 spectrometry respectively.

2.2. Quality control of NeuroX data

Quality control (QC) of the NeuroX intensity data was conducted in Genome Studio version 2011.1 using the genotyping module version 1.9.4 with ‘exclude female Y-SNPs from SNP Statistics’ checked to ensure variants on the Y chromosome aren’t incorrectly labelled as having a low call rate. Standard content was clustered using the CHARGE cluster file version 1.0 (Grove, et al., 2013). All quality control of the markers in Genome Studio were conducted using only the best quality samples (≥ 99% call rate). Standard content with call rate < 100% and all custom content were clustered using Genome Studio’s clustering algorithm, this was followed by manual assessment and clustering for all non-autosomal markers, and manual assessment and clustering of autosomal markers matching any of the following criteria: ≤ 99% call rate, excess heterozygote calls, excess heterozygote calls relative to expected HWE, deficient heterozygote calls relative to expected HWE, low intensity, unexpected cluster positions, wide clusters or low cluster separation (Grove, et al., 2013). Once quality control had been conducted in Genome Studio the genotyping calls were exported from Genome Studio to PLINK format in the forward orientation with all samples and all variants included. The MapInfo (location) was updated for 29 markers that originally had no location
(Supplementary Table 1), and the chromosome was updated for 121 markers from chromosome X to the pseudo autosomal region (Supplementary Table 2). Additional quality control was performed in PLINK v1.07. Samples were first removed if they had a call rate < 98% followed by markers that had a call rate < 95%. Further samples were removed if they failed the following criteria: samples with identity by decent > 18.75% or heterozygosity rate outside ± 3 SD of the mean, both determined using an LD pruned version of the dataset (indep-pairwise 50 5 0.2) with only common autosomal variants (MAF > 0.1). Further common markers were removed if they had significant deviation (p.value < 1.2E-6) from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium in control samples (data not shown). The final NeuroX dataset had 265,049 markers with an average sample call rate of 99.9%.

2.3. Samples harbouring a known causative variant

A total of 1196 variations are documented in the PD online mutation database (PDMDB) [http://www.molgen.vib-ua.be/PDMutDB/ accessed August 2013], AD&FTD online mutation database (AD&FTD MDB) [http://www.molgen.vib-ua.be/ADMutations/ accessed August 2013] (Cruts, et al., 2012) and Human Prion Mutation Database [http://www.mad-cow.org/prion_point_mutations.html accessed November 2014] combined. These databases document variants across 16 genes known to cause familial forms of neurodegeneration (APP, C9orf72, CHMP2B, FUS, GRN, LRRK2, MAPT, PARK2, PARK7, PINK1, PRNP, PSEN1, PSEN2, SNCA, TARDBP and VCP), and includes three genes that are linked to Alzheimer’s disease (APP, PSEN1 and PSEN2). The databases include variants that don’t cause disease (not pathogenic), have unknown pathogenicity (pathogenic nature unclear) and are known to cause disease (known causative) (Supplementary Table 3). 1075 of these database variants are SNPs, small insertions or small deletions and therefore had the potential to be genotyped on the NeuroX.

The genomic position (relative to the reference build GRCh37, 27 Feb 2009), reference allele and alternative allele were successfully calculated for 265,828 markers (99%) on the NeuroX using an in-house script. A second in-house script was used to establish if any of these markers genotyped the
1075 database variants. It was established that 412 (38%) of these variants were genotyped on the NeuroX and included 38% of AD related variants, 32% of FTD/ALS related variants, 47% of PD related variants and 12% of prion related variants. Of the 412 variants, 407 passed quality control procedures and inspection of the cluster plots found they all clustered well.

The 407 database variants were filtered to retain only those labelled as causative and were also polymorphic in our sEOAD cohort, four variants fit this criterion. The sEOAD samples harbouring these four variants were identified and their genotype verified with Sanger sequencing. As expected these four variants were not located in APP, PSEN1 or PSEN2 as our sporadic cohort had been previously filtered to remove individuals harbouring these variants.

### 2.4. Samples harbouring a predicted pathogenic variant

It was established that 662 variants were genotyped on the NeuroX which passed QC and were located in one of the 16 genes linked to neurodegenerative diseases (Table 2), this list excluded the 407 known causative variants analysed previously. The gene ID, European minor allele frequency (MAF) from the 1000 Genomes Project (Genomes Project, et al., 2012), Polyphen score and SIFT score were retrieved for all 662 variants using ENSEMBL’s variant effect predictor (VEP) (McLaren, et al., 2010) which was installed locally and run over the command line using reference genome build GRCh37, Polyphen HDIV database and predicting one consequence per variant.
Variants were filtered to retain only those that were polymorphic in our sEOAD cohort, had a 1000 Genomes European MAF < 0.01, and were predicted to be probably pathogenic; which is defined here as a ‘deleterious effect’ by SIFT (≤0.05) or ‘probably damaging’ by PolyPhen (≥0.909). Three variants fit this criterion. The sEOAD samples harbouring these three variants were identified and their genotype verified with Sanger sequencing.

2.5. Sanger sequencing

Genomic DNA was amplified in a final volume of 15 μl using the following constituents and final concentrations: 2 ng/μl gDNA, 1 pM forward primer, and 1 pM reverse primer, 1x Buffer (BioLabs), 0.2 mM dNTPs (Thermo Scientific), 0.1 U/μl LongAmp Taq DNA polymerase (New England Biolabs) and molecular grade water to the required volume. The reaction was subjected to the following thermal conditions: initial denaturation step of 94°C for 2 min, followed by 35 cycles of 94°C for 30 sec, 57°C for 15 sec and 72°C for 45 sec, finished with a final extension step at 72°C for 7 min. A reaction containing no gDNA was included as a negative control. The PCR products were cleaned using ExoSAP-IT (Affymetrix). Primers used for sequencing were the same as those used for amplification (Eurogenomics). The primers used for p.T240M were forward 5’GCTCGTGTGGCAGAACAATA 3’ and reverse 5’ACACCCCCACCTCTGACAAG 3’; the product was 202 bp (base pairs) long. The primers used for p.G255V were forward 5’ TGGCAATCAAGACCAGTG 3’ and reverse 5’ GATTCATGCAATCCTCCACA 3’; the product was 243 bp long. The primers used for p.Q34fs were forward 5’ TCAGGCATGAATGTCAGATTG 3’ and reverse 5’ CCTTCCAATTTCCTTGGTCA 3’; the product was 272 bp long. The primers used for p.G107V were forward 5’AGAGCTGAGGCACCTTGGTA 3’ and reverse 5’ ATGGCAGGGAATCCCTTCAAA 3’; the product was 235 bp long. The primers used for p.S427F were forward 5’ TCCACACGTTCTCTTCTAAA 3’ and reverse 5’ AGCAGCTGGTTCTTCTTCAA 3’; the product was 230 bp long. The primers used for p.A469T were forward 5’
GGCTGGTGGTGTGACTCTTGGT 3’ and reverse 5’ TCTTACCAGAGCTGGTGTTG 3’; the product was 206 bp long.

Amplicons were sequenced using the Sanger di-deoxy method in the forward and reverse directions. Cleaned PCR products were sequenced in a final volume of 10 μl using 4 μl PCR product and the following constituents: 0.5 pM forward/reverse primer, 1x BigDye Sequencing Buffer (Life Technologies), 0.25x BigDye Terminator v3.1 (Life Technologies) and molecular grade water to the required volume. The reaction was subjected to the following thermal conditions: 25 cycles of 96°C for 30 sec, 50°C for 15 sec and finally 60°C for 4 min. The reactions were cleaned using Performa DTR Gel filtration Cartridges (Edge Biosystems). The eluent was dried and sequencing was performed on an ABI 3130 automated sequencer.
3. Results

sEOAD samples (n=408) were genotyped on the NeuroX DNA microarray. These samples were screened for variants known to cause disease (known causative variants) in 13 genes linked to familial forms of neurodegeneration (non-AD familial genes) and variants predicted to be pathogenic (predicted pathogenic variants) in 16 genes linked to familial forms of neurodegeneration (familial genes).

3.1. Validated genotypes

The NeuroX identified three sEOAD samples harbouring a known causative variant in two of the 13 non-AD familial genes and ten sEOAD samples harbouring a predicted pathogenic variant in one of the 16 familial genes. All samples were clinically diagnosed as having probable AD. Sanger sequencing confirmed that nine samples harboured a variant. Figure 1 shows the sequence chromatograms for the thirteen samples and Table 2 lists their genotypes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Genomic Position</th>
<th>Variant Reference ID</th>
<th>Base Change</th>
<th>MAF</th>
<th>Protein Change</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Seq</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>AAO</th>
<th>APOE ε</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exm593516</td>
<td>6:162394349</td>
<td>rs137853054</td>
<td>aCg/aTg</td>
<td>2.8e-04</td>
<td>p.T240M</td>
<td>PARK2</td>
<td>PD (R)</td>
<td>M177 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeuroX_PARK2_Gln34fs_del_AG</td>
<td>6:162864411-2</td>
<td>rs55777503</td>
<td>cga.cAG.ggg/cga.cgg.ggt</td>
<td>2.9e-04</td>
<td>p.Q34fs</td>
<td>PARK2</td>
<td>PD (R)</td>
<td>M099 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeuroX_PARK2_Gln34fs_del_A</td>
<td>6:162864412</td>
<td>rs748142049</td>
<td>cga.cAg.ggg/cga.cgg.ggg</td>
<td>8.2e-06</td>
<td>p.G225V</td>
<td>FUS</td>
<td>ALS (R)</td>
<td>M215 (Het)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Genomic Position</th>
<th>rsID</th>
<th>Base Change</th>
<th>MAF</th>
<th>Protein Change</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Seq</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>AAO</th>
<th>APOE ε</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exm1330962</td>
<td>17:44055753</td>
<td>rs144397565</td>
<td>gGc/gTc</td>
<td>2.4e-05</td>
<td>p.G107V</td>
<td>MAPT</td>
<td>FTD (D)</td>
<td>M820 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exm1331018</td>
<td>17:44067341</td>
<td>rs143956882</td>
<td>tCc/tTc</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>p.S427F</td>
<td>MAPT</td>
<td>FTD (D)</td>
<td>M357 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M143 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M697 (Het)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M245 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exm1331027</td>
<td>17:44068850</td>
<td>rs143624519</td>
<td>Gcc/Acc</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>p.A469T</td>
<td>MAPT</td>
<td>FTD (D)</td>
<td>M168 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M172 (Het)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M382 (Het)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M691 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M699 (Het)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Samples harbouring a variant in a familial gene

Samples identified by the NeuroX as harbouring a known causative variant in one of the 13 none AD familial genes (A) or a predicted pathogenic variant in one of the 16 familial genes. The name of the NeuroX marker (Marker) is followed by information about the variant genotyped by the marker, including the genomic position of the variant in reference genome build GRCh37 and format chromosome:base position (Genomic Position), and the reference ID of the variant according to dbSNP (Variant Reference ID). The variant is given at nucleotide level (Base Change) on the sense strand, the minor allele frequency in the general population according to ExAC (MAF) and amino acid level (Protein Change). Also listed is the gene the variant resides in (Gene) and the disease most associated with the gene, the Mendelian pattern of inheritance is given in brackets (Disease). The sample(s) harbouring the variant (Sample) is followed by the results of Sanger sequencing (Seq) and patient information including gender (Gender), age at onset (AAO) and APOE ε status (APOE ε). Key: rsID, reference single nucleotide polymorphism identification; U/K, unknown; FTD, frontotemporal dementia; D, dominant; R, recessive; C, Sanger sequencing confirmed the genotype of this sample; U, Sanger sequencing did not confirm the genotype of this sample.
Sanger sequencing confirmed that eight samples harboured the minor allele indicated by the NeuroX and one sample (M820) harboured an alternative minor allele. M820 appeared heterozygous for G>A base change (rs144397565, p.G170D), however sequencing confirmed it was heterozygous for G>T base change (rs144397565, p.G170V). Evidently this position is trimorphic, as this marker uses the Infinium II probe design it was able to detect both minor alleles but was unable to differentiate between them.

3.2. Invalidated genotypes

Of the variants not confirmed by Sanger sequencing, one sample (M099) was identified as heterozygous for p.Q34fs (delA) in addition to the confirmed variant p.Q34fs (delAG) at the same position. Notably the probe sequence for both markers was identical. As both deletions are followed by the same nucleotide (G), the single nucleotide extension design meant this probe was capable of detecting both variants, in this instance both probes detected the delAG variant.

Four samples (M215, M697, M172, M382) failed to verify with initial Sanger sequencing; the cluster plots were examined to establish call quality, which were found to be good (Figure 2). Three of the four samples (M215, M697 and M382) were re-sequenced from the original DNA stock; all three gave the same result as originally obtained (unconfirmed), thereby obviating a sample ‘mix-up’. We were unable to re-sequence M172 as no additional DNA was available. It is interesting to note that variant p.G225V is located within a GGC repeat region and this could be the reason for the discrepancy between the NeuroX genotype and sequencing result. Alternatively, the NeuroX genotypes could be correct for these samples and the PCR reaction may have resulted in allele dropout (Blais, et al., 2015), however it would be advisable to use a different primer pair as this might permit detection of the other allele.

In addition to the above, twenty-five samples were identified as harbouring the variant p.Q130fs (rs63750768, gaT.AGT/ga) in the GRN gene. Similar to the situation with M820 (as described in Section 3.1), Ghani and colleagues confirmed that this marker also genotypes a common alternative
minor allele at the same position (rs25646, gaT/gaC) (Ghani, et al., 2015). Consequently, this variant was discarded from further investigation.

4. Discussion

4.1. Known causative variants

Two sEOAD samples were confirmed heterozygous for a known causative variants; p.T240M (n=1) and p.Q34fs (delAG, n=1). Both of these variants are located in the gene PARK2. Known causative variants in PARK2 include point mutations and exon rearrangements/deletions/duplications, often as homozygote or compound heterozygotes in early-onset PD (EOPD).

Variant p.T240M has been seen in EOPD as a compound heterozygote with various exon deletions or duplications (Amboni, et al., 2009, Deng, et al., 2006, Periquet, et al., 2003, Sironi, et al., 2008), it has also been seen as a homozygote (Madegowda, et al., 2005) and a heterozygote (Camargos, et al., 2009). A compound heterozygote with an exon deletion has also been seen in one healthy individual (Deng, et al., 2006). Variant p.Q34fs (delAG) has been seen in EOPD as a compound heterozygote with exon deletions or SNPs (Abbas, et al., 1999, Guo, et al., 2008, Guo, et al., 2010, Hedrich, et al., 2002, Illarioshkin, et al., 2003, Koziorowski, et al., 2010, Lesage, et al., 2008, Lohmann, et al., 2009, Scherfler, et al., 2004), it has also been seen as a homozygote (Koziorowski, et al., 2010, Scherfler, et al., 2004) and a heterozygote (Brooks, et al., 2009, Bruggemann, et al., 2009). A compound heterozygote with an exon deletion has also been seen in LOPD (Lesage, et al., 2008).

Previous findings would suggest that p.T240M and p.Q34fs (delAG) elicit risk for PD, in particular EOPD. Finding these variants in our sEOAD cohort would suggest that they could also elicit risk to sEOAD; however we only found each of them in one sample (0.25% of our sEOAD cohort) as a heterozygote and we don’t know if these individuals were compound heterozygotes. These variants could elicit risk to sEOAD, however a large case-control association study would be needed to establish this.
Both of these patients (M117 and M099) had an APOE ε4ε4 status and there was nothing unusual about their presentation or progress, which suggests that a misdiagnosis is unlikely. However, M099 had a mother who was said to have had motor neuron disease (MND), so there was likely to have been physical signs in her, possibly consistent with a known causative variant in PARK2.

4.2. Predicted pathogenic variants

Seven sEOAD samples were confirmed heterozygous for a predicted pathogenic variant; p.G107V (n=1), p.S427F (n=3) or p.A469T (n=2). All these variants are located in the gene MAPT and are named in reference to the longest tau transcript (tau-g). The majority of known causative variants in MAPT are SNPs with autosomal dominant inheritance and result in FTD.

Variant p.G107V was predicted to be probably damaging (1.00) by Polyphen and deleterious (0) by SIFT, it is located in exon 4 of MAPT where no known causative variants have been documented. Variant p.S427F was predicted to be deleterious (0.02) by SIFT and probably damaging (0.99) by Polyphen, it is located in exon 4a which is spliced out in the transcript htau40 and thus not present in the human brain (Liu and Gong, 2008, Pittman, et al., 2006). It is unlikely this variant has a functional effect in the brain if the transcripts containing this variant are not present.

Variant p.A469T is also called p.A152T in htau40. It was predicted to be deleterious (0.05) by SIFT and benign (0.30) by Polyphen. This variant significantly increases the risk for both FTD (p.value=0.0005, OR=3.0 (CI: 1.6–5.6)) and AD (p.value=0.004, OR=2.3 (CI: 1.3–4.2)) when compared to controls (Coppola, et al., 2012). In vitro site-directed mutagenesis of human tau cDNA showed the variant resulted in less efficient binding to microtubules and a pronounced increase in the formation of tau oligomers (Coppola, et al., 2012). Furthermore, Isogenic human iPSCs generated from fibroblasts saw the variant result in axonal degeneration and cell death (Fong, et al., 2013). Whether heterozygous p.A469T in humans would cause the same effect is unknown. Notably, this variant is located in exon 7, the downstream residue (p.T153) is part of a Threonine-Proline motif that is phosphorylated during the cell cycle (Illenberger, et al., 1998) and the upstream residue (p.I151) is
seen to interact with microtubules using nuclear magnetic resonance (Mukrasch, et al., 2009). Variant p.A469T could affect the functioning of the upstream or downstream residue which might explain the experimental observations for this variant. This variant could elicit risk to sEOAD, however a large case-control association study would be needed to establish this.

4.3. Considerations

Although DNA microarrays are cost efficient, they have several drawbacks as evident from this study. The results of Sanger sequencing found that a high proportion of variants failed to verify, this emphasises the need to verify all genotypes called by DNA microarray technologies. The version of the NeuroX used in this study was only able to successfully genotype 182 of the 523 (35%) known causative variants documented in three online databases (Supplementary Table 3), since that time the number of variants documented in the online databases has increased by 147, albeit not all of these will be important (causative), but highlights the additional issue of having to redesign chips as new personal variants come to light, which questions the cost effectiveness of DNA microarray technology for extremely rare variants. Next generation sequencing (NGS) technology overcomes the limitations and drawbacks of DNA microarray technology, and the once debilitating cost of NGS has almost dissipated as the price has plummeted in recent years. There is no doubt that studies like this should be conducted, however given the drawbacks of DNA microarray technology they would be better conducted using NGS technologies.

This study has made use of an in-silico approach to classify the pathogenicity of variants; however in-silico predictions alone are insufficient to properly appraise a variant. Richards et al have developed an approach that can help define the definition of ‘pathogenic’ in the clinical and research setting with regard to Mendelian disorders (Richards, et al., 2015), this approach makes use of additional types of data including population, functional and segregation data. As our understanding of complex diseases increases no doubt an approach incorporating several lines of data will be used to define pathogenic variants for non-Mendelian disorders such as sEOAD and LOAD.
5. **Conclusion**

We have screened sporadic early-onset Alzheimer disease (sEOAD) individuals for known causative and predicted pathogenic variants in 16 genes linked to neurodegenerative diseases. We have identified nine sEOAD samples harbouring a known causative variant or a predicted pathogenic variant in *PARK2* and *MAPT*. These variants could elicit risk to sEOAD in addition to PD and FTD, however further studies would be needed to establish this. This work highlights the need to screen sEOAD individuals for variants that are more classically attributed to other forms of neurodegeneration as there could be a degree of genetic overlap.
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Figure Legends

Figure 1
Sequence chromatograms
Sequence chromatograms of all 13 individuals thought to harbour a pathogenic (A) or predicted pathogenic variant (B). Each individual was sequenced in forward (top row) and reverse (bottom row) orientations. Note that the forward orientation does not always correspond to the sense strand. The images were taken from Sequence Scanner (Applied Biosystems) with the variant at the centre and surrounded by two or three bases either side. Four individuals (M215, M697, M172 and M382) show wild-type sequence according to the chromatogram.

Figure 2
SNP cluster plot for genotypes unconfirmed with Sanger sequencing
SNP cluster graphs generated by GenomeStudio for markers NeuroX_16:31196410 (p.G225V located in FUS) (A), exm1331018 (p.S427F located in MAPT) (B) and exm1331027 (p.A469T located in MAPT) (C). Each coloured circle represents one individual, those coloured red are homozygous mutant (TT), those coloured purple are heterozygous (GT), those coloured blue are homozygous wildtype (GG), and finally those coloured black are not called. The plots show all ten samples called as heterozygotes cluster well and does not explain why four samples failed to verify with Sanger sequencing (M215, M697, M172 and M382).
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