



Figure 2. Forest plots of the two most strongly associated SNPs, rs3781834 (A) and rs11218343 (B), in the SORL1 region showing the strength and pattern of significance in the Japanese discovery and each replication dataset in the model of adjusting for population structure, age, and sex.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0058618.g002

wide significant AD locus in much larger GWAS [4,5]. Given the discovery sample size, effect size (odds ratio [OR] = 0.74) and MAF (0.23) of the top SORL1 SNP (rs3781834) in the Japanese sample, and a significance level of 2×10^{-5} (i.e., threshold for including a SNP in the Stage 2 replication phase), calculation of power *post hoc* using the PAWE-3D program [22] confirmed that the discovery sample had sufficient power (83.7%). By comparison, the Caucasian sample of 22,771 subjects had only 52.8% power to detect association with this SNP at the observed significance level

of 7.9×10^{-4} and OR (0.78) and a much lower MAF (0.02) than in Japanese.

The most significant result in the GWAS in Japanese was obtained for PALM2 SNP rs913360 ($P = 1.8 \times 10^{-7}$), but this SNP was not significant in the Japanese replication sample ($P = 0.16$) and the result for the combined Japanese datasets was less significant than in the discovery sample ($P = 6.6 \times 10^{-6}$). There was no evidence in the large Caucasian dataset supporting association for rs913360 ($P = 0.38$) or other PALM2 SNPs.

Table 3. Meta-analysis of top-ranked association results with *SORL1* in Japanese, Korean, and Caucasian datasets.

SNP	MA	Japanese (Stage 1+2)			Korean (Stage 3)			Caucasian (Stage 3)			Meta-Analysis (Stages 1-3)	
		MAF	OR (95% CI)	P	MAF	OR (95% CI)	P	MAF	OR (95% CI)	P	OR (95% CI)	P
rs4598682	G	0.23	0.75 (0.66–0.85)	9.5 × 10 ⁻⁶	not available			0.02	1.04 (0.85–1.28)	0.68	0.82 (0.72–0.93)	3.6 × 10 ⁻³
rs11218343	C	0.34	0.83 (0.75–0.92)	3.8 × 10 ⁻⁴	0.31	0.96 (0.79–1.17)	0.68	0.04	0.75 (0.67–0.83)	1.0 × 10 ⁻⁷	0.81 (0.75–0.87)	2.2 × 10 ⁻⁹
rs3781834	G	0.23	0.74 (0.66–0.84)	7.3 × 10 ⁻⁷	0.23	0.94 (0.75–1.16)	0.55	0.02	0.78 (0.68–0.9)	7.9 × 10 ⁻⁴	0.78 (0.72–0.85)	9.9 × 10 ⁻⁹
rs17125523	G	0.25	0.77 (0.68–0.86)	5.5 × 10 ⁻⁶	0.23	0.96 (0.78–1.19)	0.72	0.02	0.85 (0.74–0.99)	0.034	0.82 (0.76–0.89)	3.3 × 10 ⁻⁶
rs3737529	T	0.25	0.77 (0.68–0.86)	4.1 × 10 ⁻⁶	0.26	1.04 (0.84–1.29)	0.70	0.02	0.83 (0.71–0.97)	0.016	0.82 (0.76–0.89)	5.1 × 10 ⁻⁶

CH:MB, chromosome:position (in megabase pairs, build 19); MA, minor allele; MAF, minor allele frequenc; OR, odds ratio; P P-value.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0058618.t003

We obtained evidence in Japanese and Korean populations for association of AD with the same SNPs in the *PICALM* and *BIN1* regions that were identified as genome-wide significant in multiple large GWAS in Caucasians [4,5]. There are no previously reported association studies of these loci in Japanese. Several small association studies of *PICALM* in comparatively smaller Chinese samples have yielded conflicting results [23–25]. We also found nominally significant associations in the Japanese sample for previously associated SNPs in *CRI*, *CLU*, and *ABCA7*. Lack of association with *EPHA1*, *CD2AP*, *MS4A6A*, and *CD33* may be due to insufficient power, different linkage disequilibrium structure of these regions than in Caucasians, locus heterogeneity or intragenic heterogeneity.

In addition, our analyses showed numerous highly significant results for imputed SNPs in the *APOE* region (including *CEACAM1*, *BCL3*, *PVRL2*, *TOMM40*, and *LOC284352*) even after adjustment for the dose of the ε4 allele. However, recognizing that the reliability of imputation is poor for SNPs in this region [13], we genotyped 10 of the significant SNPs in the Japanese discovery and replication datasets. Only one of these results, a *PPP1R37* SNP, was nominally significant after adjustment for dose of ε4.

Association of AD with this SNP, which is located approximately 225 kb from *APOE*, has not been observed previously. *PVRL2* and *APOE* are located in a genomic region sandwiched between two recombination hotspots [26], where strong association signals for LOAD have been reproducibly detected in Caucasians [1,5], but dissipate almost completely for all non-*APOE* loci after conditioning on *APOE*, suggesting that no other loci in this region influence LOAD susceptibility [13]. This conclusion is consistent with the observation of moderate linkage disequilibrium between the SNPs determining *APOE* genotype, rs7412 and rs429358 (Fig. S5), SNPs showing genomewide significant evidence for association with LOAD without adjustment for *APOE* genotype, and our prior LOAD association studies with SNPs in this region among Caucasians [13].

SorL1, also known as SorLA and LR11, and APP proteins are co-localized in the endosomal and Golgi compartments [27]. SorL1 through its co-dependent interaction with vps26 regulates the intracellular transport and processing of APP, resulting in reduction of amyloid beta (Aβ) peptide production [20,27,28]. *SORL1* knock-out mice carrying both pathogenic mutations in the *PSEN1* (exon 9 deletion) and *APP* (Swedish, K595M/N596L)

Table 4. Association of LOAD in Asians with SNPs showing genome-wide significance in Caucasians.

Gene	CH	BP	SNP	MA	Japanese			Korean		
					MAF	P	OR (95% CI)	MAF	P	OR (95% CI)
CRI	1	207,692,049	rs6656401	A	0.04	9.02E-03	1.38 (1.08–1.76)	0.04	3.75E-01	1.24 (0.77–1.99)
CRI	1	207,784,968	rs3818361	A	0.39	2.54E-01	0.94 (0.85–1.04)	0.31	4.08E-01	0.92 (0.76–1.12)
BIN1	2	127,894,615	rs744373	G	0.33	1.39E-04	1.25 (1.11–1.4)	0.36	8.05E-01	0.98 (0.81–1.18)
CD2AP	6	47,453,378	rs9349407	G	0.14	3.83E-01	0.94 (0.82–1.08)	NT	–	–
EPHA1	7	143,109,139	rs11767557	C	0.17	6.47E-01	1.03 (0.9–1.17)	NT	–	–
CLU	8	27,456,253	rs2279590	T	0.25	7.01E-03	0.85 (0.76–0.96)	0.2	9.70E-02	0.82 (0.65–1.04)
CLU	8	27,464,519	rs11136000	T	0.28	1.09E-02	0.87 (0.78–0.97)	0.23	3.61E-02	0.79 (0.63–0.98)
CLU	8	27,468,862	rs9331888	G	0.41	6.97E-02	1.1 (0.99–1.22)	0.47	1.92E-01	0.89 (0.74–1.06)
MS4A6A	11	59,939,307	rs610932	T	0.3	7.99E-01	0.99 (0.89–1.1)	NT	–	–
MS4A6A	11	59,971,795	rs670139	T	0.4	8.23E-01	0.99 (0.89–1.09)	NT	–	–
MS4A6A	11	60,034,429	rs4938933	C	0.27	3.23E-01	1.06 (0.95–1.18)	NT	–	–
PICALM	11	85,868,640	rs3851179	T	0.39	1.71E-05	0.8 (0.73–0.89)	0.34	1.99E-02	0.79 (0.66–0.96)
ABCA7	19	1,046,520	rs3764650	G	0.42	3.66E-02	1.13 (1.01–1.27)	NT	–	–
EXOC3L2	19	45,708,888	rs597668	C	0.43	8.23E-03	0.88 (0.79–0.97)	0.37	7.31E-01	0.97 (0.8–1.17)
CD33	19	51,727,962	rs3865444	A	0.2	4.92E-01	1.04 (0.92–1.18)	NT	–	–

NT not tested; P<0.05 was italicized.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0058618.t004

exhibited increased production and accumulation of A β [29]. *SORL1* variants might influence the CSF A β 42 level in AD patients [30]. Recently, Pottier et al. sequenced the exomes of 29 index cases with autosomal dominant early-onset AD who lacked mutations in *APP*, *PSEN1* and *PSEN2* [2]. Seven of these subjects had private *SORL1* mutations (2 nonsense and 2 missense) that were predicted to have a pathogenic effect. By comparison, the two genome-wide significant SNPs in this study are both intronic. It is expected that future large resequencing studies of *SORL1* will identify the functional variants, thus providing important clues about the mechanisms governing normal and abnormal action of SorL1 on processes leading to LOAD. The emergence of *SORL1* as a genome-wide significant locus for AD confirms existing genetic and functional evidence and elevates the importance of intracellular trafficking involving retromer and the Golgi-to-endosome as a key pathway leading to AD [31,32].

Supporting Information

Figure S1 Quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plot of observed (y-axis) vs. expected (x-axis) P-values from tests of association genome-wide (5,877,918 SNPs) adjusted for population structure, age and sex for LOAD in the Japanese discovery sample. Genomic inflation was low ($\lambda = 1.047$). (TIF)

Figure S2 Manhattan plot of observed $-\log_{10}$ P-values for genome-wide SNP association tests for LOAD (y-axis) according to chromosomal location (x-axis) in the Japanese discovery sample adjusted for population structure, age, and sex. All genome-wide significant SNPs (above the horizontal line corresponding to $P = 5 \times 10^{-8}$ on the y-axis) are located in the *APOE* region on chromosome 19. (TIF)

Figure S3 Linkage disequilibrium (r^2) among SNPs in the *APOE* region genotyped using TaqMan calculated in the Japanese discovery (A) and replication (B) datasets. *APOE* genotype is derived from haplotypes of coding SNPs rs429358 and rs7412. (TIF)

Figure S4 Linkage disequilibrium (r^2) among SNPs in the *SORL1* region genotyped in the Japanese discovery (A) and replication (B) datasets. (TIF)

Figure S5 Comparison of *SORL1* association findings in the current study with association signals previously identified by Rogava et al. [20]. (A) Regional association plot of the *SORL1* region. P-values are expressed as $-\log_{10}(P)$ (y-axis) for every tested SNP ordered by chromosomal location (x-axis) and represented as blue rectangles for the Japanese discovery set (J1), light blue diamonds for the ADGC Caucasian set (C), pink circles for meta-analysis of Japanese discovery and Caucasian sets (J1+C), and red circles for meta-analysis of Japanese discovery, Japanese replication (J2), Korean (K), and Caucasian sets (J1+J2+K+C). The numbers below the line showing the orientation of *SORL1* are the designations for associated SNPs in the Rogava et al. study: 8 = rs668387, 9 = rs689021, 10 = rs641120, 11 = rs4935775, 19 = rs2070045, 22 = rs1699102, 23 = rs3824968, 24 = rs2282649, and 25 = rs1010159. Recombination hotspots are indicated by the continuous blue line behind the symbols for the SNP P-values. (B) Linkage disequilibrium (r^2) of the previously associated SNPs in the *SORL1* region [20] in the HapMap 2 reference Japanese population (JPT). The association signal with rs3781834 (contained in Block 2) appears to be independent of one

of the distinct AD-associated haplotypes reported by Rogava et al. [20] (including SNPs in Block 1), but not necessarily independent of the other AD-associated haplotype reported by Rogava et al which includes rs1699102 in Block 2 and the SNPs in Block 3.

(TIF)

Table S1 Top-ranked GWAS results in the Japanese GWAS dataset ($P < 1 \times 10^{-4}$ and imputation quality ≥ 0.8) with and without adjustment for the number of *APOE* $\epsilon 4$ alleles.

(DOCX)

Table S2 Association of individually genotyped SNPs in the *APOE* region in models with and without adjustment for the number of *APOE* $\epsilon 4$ alleles.

(DOCX)

Table S3 Association results for *SORL1* SNPs genotyped in the Japanese replication sample.

(DOCX)

Acknowledgments

We deeply thank all the patients with AD and their families, and the control individuals for their participation in this study. Without their contribution, this study would have been impossible. We acknowledge the valuable contributions of Drs. Satoshi Takahashi and Yoshikatsu Fujisawa who died before publication of this paper. We also thank Drs. D. Stephen Snyder and Marilyn Miller from NIA who are *ex-officio* ADGC members.

Alzheimer's Disease Genetics Consortium authors and affiliations

Marilyn S. Albert¹, Roger L. Albin^{2,3}, Liana G. Apostolova⁴, Steven E. Arnold⁵, Clinton T. Baldwin⁶, Robert Barber⁷, Michael M. Bamada⁸, Lisa L. Barnes^{9,10}, Thomas G. Beach¹¹, Gary W. Beecham^{12,13}, Duane Beekly¹⁴, David A. Bennett^{9,15}, Eileen H. Bigio¹⁶, Thomas D. Bird¹⁷, Deborah Blacker^{18,19}, Bradley F. Boeve²⁰, James D. Bowen²¹, Adam Boxer²², James R. Burke²³, Joseph D. Buxbaum²⁴⁻²⁶, Nigel J. Cairns²⁷, Laura B. Cantwell²⁸, Chuanghai Cao²⁹, Chris S. Carlson³⁰, Regina M. Carney³¹, Minerva M. Carrasquillo³², Steven L. Carroll³³, Helena C. Chui³⁴, David G. Clark³⁵, Jason Comeau³⁶, Paul K. Crane³⁷, David H. Cribbs³⁸, Elizabeth A. Crocco³⁹, Carlos Cruchaga⁴⁰, Philip L. De Jager^{41,42}, Charles DeCarli⁴³, Steven T. DeKosky⁴⁴, F. Yesim Demirci⁸, Malcolm Dick⁴⁵, Dennis W. Dickson³², Ranjan Duara⁴⁶, Nilufer Ertekin-Taner^{32,47}, Denis Evans⁴⁸, Kelley M. Faber⁴⁹, Kenneth B. Fallon³³, Martin R. Farlow³⁰, Steven Ferris⁵¹, Tatiana M. Foroud⁴⁹, Matthew P. Frosch⁵², Douglas R. Galasko⁵³, Mary Ganguli⁵⁴, Marla Gearing^{55,56}, Daniel H. Geschwind⁵⁷, Bernardino Ghetti⁵⁸, John R. Gilbert^{12,13}, Sid Gilman², Jonathan D. Glass⁵⁹, Alison M. Goate⁴⁰, Neill R. Graff-Radford^{32,47}, Robert C. Green⁶⁰, John H. Growdon⁶¹, Hakon Hakonarson⁶², Kara L. Hamilton-Nelson¹², Ronald L. Hamilton⁶³, John Hardy⁶⁴, Lindy E. Harrell³⁵, Elizabeth Head⁶⁵, Lawrence S. Honig⁶⁶, Matthew J. Huentelman³⁶, Christine M. Hulette⁵⁷, Bradley T. Hyman⁶¹, Gail P. Jarvik^{68,69}, Gregory A. Jicha⁷⁰, Lee-Way Jim⁷¹, M. Ilyas Kamboh^{8,72}, Anna Karydas⁷³, John S.K. Kauwe⁷³, Jeffrey A. Kaye^{74,75}, Ronald Kim⁷⁶, Edward H. Koo⁵³, Neil W. Kowall^{77,78}, Joel H. Kramer⁷⁹, Patricia Kramer^{74,80}, Walter A. Kukull⁸¹, Frank M. LaPerla⁸², James J. Lah³⁹, Eric B. Larson^{37,83}, James B. Leverenz⁸⁴, Allan I. Levey⁵⁹, Ge Li⁸⁵, Chiao-Feng Lin²⁸, Andrew P. Lieberman⁸⁶, Oscar L. Lopez⁷², Kathryn L. Lunetta⁸⁷, Constantine G. Lyketsos⁸⁸, Wendy J. Mack⁸⁹, Daniel C. Marson³⁵, Eden R. Martin^{12,13}, Frank Martiniuk⁹⁰, Deborah C. Mash⁹¹, Eliezer Masliah^{53,92}, Wayne C. McCormick³⁷, Susan M. McCurry⁹³, Andrew N. McDavid³⁰, Ann C. McKee^{77,78}, Marsel Mesulam⁹⁴, Bruce L. Miller²², Carol A. Miller⁹⁵, Joshua W. Miller⁷¹, Thomas J. Montine⁸¹, John C. Morris^{27,96}, Jill R. Murrell^{49,98}, Amanda J. Myers³⁹, Adam C. Naj¹², John M. Olichney⁴³, Vernon S. Pankratz⁹⁷, Joseph E. Paris^{98,99}, Elaine Peskind⁸⁵, Ronald C. Petersen⁹⁷, Aimee Pierce³⁸, Wayne W. Poon⁴⁵, Huntington Potter²⁹, Joseph F. Quinn⁷⁴, Ashok Raj²⁹, Ruchita A. Rajbhandary¹², Murray Raskind⁸⁵, Eric M. Reiman^{36,100-102}, Barry Reisberg^{51,103}, Christiane Reitz^{66,104,105}, John M. Ringman⁴, Erik D. Roberson³⁵, Ekaterina Rogava¹⁰⁶, Howard J. Rosen³², Roger N. Rosenberg¹⁰⁷, Mary Sano²⁵, Andrew J. Saykin^{49,108}, Julie A. Schnei-

- der^{9,109}, Lon S. Schneider^{34,110}, William W. Seeley²², Amanda G. Smith²⁹, Joshua A. Sonnen⁸⁴, Salvatore Spina⁵⁸, Robert A. Stern⁷⁷, Rudolph E. Tanzi⁶¹, John Q. Trojanowski²⁸, Juan C. Troncoso¹¹¹, Debby W. Tsuang⁸⁵, Otto Valladares²⁸, Vivianna M. Van Deerlin²⁸, Linda J. Van Eldik¹¹², Badri N. Vardarajan⁶, Harry V. Vinters^{4,113}, Jean Paul Vonsattel¹¹⁴, Sandra Weintraub⁹⁴, Kathleen A. Welsh-Bohmer^{23,115}, Jennifer Williamson⁶⁶, Randall L. Woltjer¹¹⁶, Clinton B. Wright¹¹⁷, Steven G. Younkin³², Chang-En Yu³⁷, Lei Yu⁹.
- 1 Department of Neurology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
 - 2 Department of Neurology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
 - 3 Geriatric Research, Education and Clinical Center (GRECC), VA Ann Arbor Healthcare System (VA AHS), Ann Arbor, Michigan.
 - 4 Department of Neurology, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.
 - 5 Department of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 - 6 Department of Medicine (Genetics Program), Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.
 - 7 Department of Pharmacology and Neuroscience, University of North Texas Health Science Center, Fort Worth, Texas.
 - 8 Department of Human Genetics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
 - 9 Department of Neurological Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois.
 - 10 Department of Behavioral Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois.
 - 11 Civin Laboratory for Neuropathology, Banner Sun Health Research Institute, Phoenix, Arizona.
 - 12 The John P. Hussman Institute for Human Genomics, University of Miami, Miami, Florida.
 - 13 Dr. John T. Macdonald Foundation Department of Human Genetics, University of Miami, Miami, Florida.
 - 14 National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
 - 15 Rush Alzheimer's Disease Center, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois.
 - 16 Department of Pathology, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois.
 - 17 Department of Neurology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
 - 18 Department of Epidemiology, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts.
 - 19 Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital/Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts.
 - 20 Department of Neurology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota.
 - 21 Swedish Medical Center, Seattle, Washington.
 - 22 Department of Neurology, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California.
 - 23 Department of Medicine, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.
 - 24 Department of Neuroscience, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York.
 - 25 Department of Psychiatry, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York.
 - 26 Departments of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York.
 - 27 Department of Pathology and Immunology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.
 - 28 Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 - 29 USF Health Byrd Alzheimer's Institute, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida.
 - 30 Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington.
 - 31 Department of Psychiatry, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.
 - 32 Department of Neuroscience, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida.
 - 33 Department of Pathology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama.
 - 34 Department of Neurology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
 - 35 Department of Neurology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama.
 - 36 Neurogenomics Division, Translational Genomics Research Institute, Phoenix, Arizona.
 - 37 Department of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
 - 38 Department of Neurology, University of California Irvine, Irvine, California.
 - 39 Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Florida.
 - 40 Department of Psychiatry and Hope Center Program on Protein Aggregation and Neurodegeneration, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri.
 - 41 Program in Translational NeuroPsychiatric Genomics, Institute for the Neurosciences, Department of Neurology & Psychiatry, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts.
 - 42 Program in Medical and Population Genetics, Broad Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
 - 43 Department of Neurology, University of California Davis, Sacramento, California.
 - 44 University of Virginia School of Medicine, Charlottesville, Virginia.
 - 45 Institute for Memory Impairments and Neurological Disorders, University of California Irvine, Irvine, California.
 - 46 Wien Center for Alzheimer's Disease and Memory Disorders, Mount Sinai Medical Center, Miami Beach, Florida.
 - 47 Department of Neurology, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida.
 - 48 Rush Institute for Healthy Aging, Department of Internal Medicine, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois.
 - 49 Department of Medical and Molecular Genetics, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana.
 - 50 Department of Neurology, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana.
 - 51 Department of Psychiatry, New York University, New York.
 - 52 C.S. Kubik Laboratory for Neuropathology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Charlestown, Massachusetts.
 - 53 Department of Neurosciences, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California.
 - 54 Department of Psychiatry, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
 - 55 Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.
 - 56 Emory Alzheimer's Disease Center, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.
 - 57 Neurogenetics Program, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.
 - 58 Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana.
 - 59 Department of Neurology, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.
 - 60 Division of Genetics, Department of Medicine and Partners Center for Personalized Genetic Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts.
 - 61 Department of Neurology, Massachusetts General Hospital/Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts.
 - 62 Center for Applied Genomics, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 - 63 Department of Pathology (Neuropathology), University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
 - 64 Institute of Neurology, University College London, Queen Square, London.
 - 65 Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, Department of Molecular and Biomedical Pharmacology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
 - 66 Taub Institute on Alzheimer's Disease and the Aging Brain, Department of Neurology, Columbia University, New York.
 - 67 Department of Pathology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.
 - 68 Department of Genome Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
 - 69 Department of Medicine (Medical Genetics), University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
 - 70 Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, Department Neurology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
 - 71 Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of California Davis, Sacramento, California.
 - 72 University of Pittsburgh Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
 - 73 Department of Biology, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

- 74 Department of Neurology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon.
- 75 Department of Neurology, Portland Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Portland, Oregon.
- 76 Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of California Irvine, Irvine, California.
- 77 Department of Neurology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 78 Department of Pathology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 79 Department of Neuropsychology, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California.
- 80 Department of Molecular & Medical Genetics, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon.
- 81 Department of Epidemiology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- 82 Department of Neurobiology and Behavior, University of California Irvine, Irvine, California.
- 83 Group Health Research Institute, Group Health, Seattle, Washington.
- 84 Department of Pathology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- 85 Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- 86 Department of Pathology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 87 Department of Biostatistics, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 88 Department of Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- 89 Department of Preventive Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- 90 Department of Medicine - Pulmonary, New York University, New York.
- 91 Department of Neurology, University of Miami, Miami, Florida.
- 92 Department of Pathology, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California.
- 93 School of Nursing Northwest Research Group on Aging, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- 94 Cognitive Neurology and Alzheimer's Disease Center, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois.
- 95 Department of Pathology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- 96 Department of Neurology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- 97 Department of Biostatistics, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota.
- 98 Department of Anatomic Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota.
- 99 Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota.
- 100 Arizona Alzheimer's Consortium, Phoenix, Arizona.
- 101 Banner Alzheimer's Institute, Phoenix, Arizona.
- 102 Department of Psychiatry, University of Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona.
- 103 Alzheimer's Disease Center, New York University, New York.
- 104 Gertrude H. Sergievsky Center, Columbia University, New York.
- 105 Department of Neurology, Columbia University, New York.
- 106 Tanz Centre for Research in Neurodegenerative Disease, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.
- 107 Department of Neurology, University of Texas Southwestern, Dallas, Texas.
- 108 Department of Radiology and Imaging Sciences, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- 109 Department of Pathology (Neuropathology), Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois.
- 110 Department of Psychiatry, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- 111 Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- 112 Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
- 113 Department of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.
- 114 Taub Institute on Alzheimer's Disease and the Aging Brain, Department of Pathology, Columbia University, New York.
- 115 Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.
- 116 Department of Pathology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon.
- 117 Evelyn F. McKnight Brain Institute, Department of Neurology, Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Florida.

Author Contributions

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: RM JH MP-V GS LAF RK. Obtained funding: J-WK RM JH MP-V GS LAF RK. Conceived and designed the experiments: JG KT ST J-WK LAF RK. Performed the experiments: AM NN KT KY RK. Analyzed the data: GJ AK L-SW MY AM LAF. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: ST EM TK M. Shoji NT HA TA YH M. Ikeda MA HH SH TI MN TM M. Suga YK HA TY KK M. Imagawa TH MY TT KN YF K. Sasaki KW YW KU TO MT TY K. Serikawa SY RN DLN SWS C-SK H-HW IM-J The Alzheimer's Disease Genetics Consortium PSG-H RM JH MP-V GS LAF IK YI RK. Wrote the paper: GJ AM AK LAF RK.

References

1. Ertekin-Taner N (2010) Genetics of Alzheimer disease in the pre- and post-GWAS era. *Alzheimer's Res Ther* 2: 3.
2. Pottier C, Hannequin D, Coutant S, Rovelet-Lecrux A, Wallon D, et al. (2012) High frequency of potentially pathogenic SORL1 mutations in autosomal dominant early-onset Alzheimer disease. *Mol Psychiatry* 17: 875–879.
3. Farrer LA, Cupples LA, Haines JL, Hyman BT, Kukull WA, et al. (1997) Effects of age, gender and ethnicity on the association of apolipoprotein E genotype and Alzheimer disease. *JAMA* 278: 1349–1356.
4. Hollingworth P, Harold D, Sims R, Gerrish A, Lambert JC, et al. (2012) Common variants at ABCA7, MS4A6A/MS4A4E, EPHA1, CD33 and CD2AP are associated with Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Genet* 43: 429–435.
5. Naj AC, Jun G, Beecham GW, Wang L-S, Vardarajan BN, et al. (2011) Common variants at MS4A4/MS4A6E, CD2AP, CD33 and EPHA1 are associated with late-onset Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Genet* 43: 436–441.
6. Kuwano R, Kuwano R, Miyashita A, Arai H, Asada T, et al. (2006) Dynamin-binding protein gene on chromosome 10q is associated with late-onset Alzheimer's disease. *Hum Mol Genet* 15: 2170–2182.
7. Miyashita A, Arai H, Asada T, Imagawa M, Matsubara E, et al. (2007) Genetic association of CTNNA3 with late-onset Alzheimer's disease in females. *Hum Mol Genet* 16: 2854–2869.
8. McKhann G, Drachman D, Folstein M, Katzman R, Price D, et al. (1984) Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: report of the NINCDS-ADRDA Work Group under the auspices of Department of Health and Human Services Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease. *Neurology* 34: 939–944.
9. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR (1975) "Mini-mental state": A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* 12: 129–138.
10. Morris JC (1993) The Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR): current version and scoring rules. *Neurology* 43: 2412–2414.
11. Reisberg B (1988) Functional assessment staging (FAST). *Psychopharmacol Bull* 24: 653–659.
12. Seo SW, Im K, Lee JM, Kim YH, Kim ST, et al. (2007) Cortical thickness in single- versus multiple-domain amnesic mild cognitive impairment. *Neuroimage* 36: 289–297.
13. Jun G, Vardarajan BN, Buros J, Yu C-E, Hawk MV, et al. (2012) A comprehensive search for Alzheimer disease susceptibility loci in the APOE region. *Arch Neurol* 69: 1270–1279.
14. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, Thomas L, Ferreira MA, et al. (2007) PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses. *Am J Hum Genet* 81: 559–575.
15. Price AL, Patterson NJ, Plenge RM, Weinblatt ME, Shadick NA, et al. (2006) Principal components analysis corrects for stratification in genome-wide association studies. *Nat Genet* 38: 904–909.
16. Li M, Boehnke M, Abecasis GR (2006) Efficient study designs for test of genetic association using sibship data and unrelated cases and controls. *Am J Hum Genet* 78: 778–792.
17. Donnelly P, Marchini J (2009) A flexible and accurate genotype imputation method for the next generation of genome-wide association studies. *PLoS Genetics* 5: e1000529.
18. Willer CJ, Li Y, Abecasis GR (2010) METAL: fast and efficient meta-analysis of genomewide association scans. *Bioinformatics* 26: 2190–2191.
19. Rogava E, Meng Y, Lee JH, Gu Y-J, Zou F, et al. (2007) The sortilin-related receptor SORL1 is functionally and genetically associated with Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Genet* 39: 168–177.

20. Reitz C, Rogaeve E, Lee JH, Tokuhira S, Bettens K, et al. (2011) Association of SORL1 gene variants with Alzheimer's disease: A meta-analysis. *Arch Neurol* 68: 99–106.
21. Cuenco KT, Lunetta K, Baldwin CT, McKee AC, Guo J, et al. (2008) Distinct variants in SORL1 are associated with cerebrovascular and neurodegenerative changes related to Alzheimer disease. *Arch Neurol* 65: 1640–1648.
22. Gordon D, Haynes C, Blumentfeld J, Finch SJ (2005) PAWE-3D: visualizing power for association with error in case-control genetic studies of complex traits. *Bioinformatics* 21: 3935–3937.
23. Li HL, Shi SS, Guo QH, Ni W, Dong Y, et al. (2011) PICALM and CR1 variants are not associated with sporadic Alzheimer's disease in Chinese patients. *J Alzheimers Dis* 25: 111–117.
24. Yu JT, Song JH, Ma T, Zhang W, Yu NN, et al. (2011) Genetic association of PICALM polymorphisms with Alzheimer's disease in Han Chinese. *J Neurol Sci* 300: 78–80.
25. Chen LH, Kao PY, Fan YH, Ho DT, Chan CS, et al. (2012) Polymorphisms of CR1, CLU and PICALM confer susceptibility of Alzheimer's disease in a southern Chinese population. *Neurobiol Aging* 33: 210.e1–7.
26. Takei N, Miyashita A, Tsukie T, Arai H, Asada T, et al. (2009) Genetic association study on and around the APOE in late-onset Alzheimer disease in Japanese. *Genomics* 93: 441–448.
27. Andersen OM, Reiche J, Schmidt V, Gorthardt M, Spoelgen R, et al. (2005) Neuronal sorting protein-related receptor sorLA/LR11 regulates processing of the amyloid precursor protein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 102: 13461–13466.
28. Fjorback AW, Seaman M, Gustafsen C, Mehmedbasic A, Gokool S, et al. (2012) Retromer binds the FANSHY sorting motif in SorLA to regulate amyloid precursor protein sorting and processing. *J Neurosci* 32: 1467–1480.
29. Dodson SE, Andersen OM, Karmali V, Fritz JJ, Cheng D, et al. (2008) Loss of LR11/SORLA enhances early pathology in a mouse model of amyloidosis: evidence for a proximal role in Alzheimer's disease. *J Neurosci* 28: 12877–12886.
30. Kölsch H, Jessen F, Wiltfang J, Lewczuk P, Dichgans M, et al. (2008) Influence of SORL1 gene variants: association with CSF amyloid-beta products in probable Alzheimer's disease. *Neurosci Lett* 440: 68–71.
31. Vardarajan BN, Breusegem SY, Harbour ME, Rivka Inzelberg, Friedland R, et al. (2012) Identification of Alzheimer disease associated variants in genes that regulate retromer function. *Neurobiol Aging* 33: 2231.e15–2231.e30.
32. Choy RW-Y, Cheng Z, Schekman R (2012) Amyloid precursor protein (APP) traffics from the cell surface via endosomes for amyloid β (A β) production in the trans-Golgi network. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 109: 2077–2082.

