Supplementary Material

Plasma Amyloid-β, Total Tau, and Neurofilament Light Chain Across the Alzheimer's Disease Clinical Spectrum: A Population-Based Study

Supplementary Material 1. Definitions, assessments, and categorizations of covariates

The trained staff collected data through face-to-face interviews, clinical examinations, and laboratory tests, following a structured questionnaire, which included data on sociodemographic features (age, sex, and education), behavioral factors (e.g., smoking and alcohol consumption), metabolic factors (e.g., blood pressure, diabetes, lipids, creatinine, weight, and height), health conditions (e.g., coronary heart disease and stroke), use of medications (e.g., antihypertensive agents, blood glucose-lowering drugs, and cholesterol-lowering agents), and apolipoprotein E (*APOE*) genotype.

All medications were classified and coded according to the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) Classification System [1]. Educational level was dichotomized into illiteracy (no formal schooling education) and literacy. APOE genotype was performed using multiplepolymerase chain reaction (iGeneTech Bioscience Co., Ltd., Beijing, China) and was dichotomized into carriers versus non-carriers of the ɛ4 allele. Smoking and alcohol consumption were dichotomized into never or former, and current smoking or alcohol intake. Weight and height were measured light clothing without shoes. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight (kg) divided by height (m^2) . Peripheral blood samples were taken after an overnight fast. Blood glucose, lipids and creatine were measured at the Yanlou Town Hospital laboratory following standardized protocol. Estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) was calculated using Chinese improved Modification of Diet in Renal Disease equation [2]. Arterial blood pressure was measured on the right arm using an electronic blood pressure monitor (Omron HEM-7127J; Omron Corporation, Kyoto, Japan) after a 5-min rest. Hypertension was defined as blood pressure \geq 140/90 mmHg or current use of antihypertensive medication (ATC codes C02, C03, and C07-C09). Diabetes mellitus was defined as having a self-reported history of diabetes, fasting blood glucose ≥7.0 mmol/L or use of glucose-lowering drugs or insulin injection (ATC code A10). High cholesterol was defined as total cholesterol $\geq 6.2 \text{ mmol/L}$ or use of cholesterollowering drugs (ATC codes C10). Coronary heart disease (e.g., angina pectoris, myocardial

infarction, and coronary intervention) was ascertained via self-reported history of physician diagnosis or electrocardiogram examination. History of stroke was determined via self-report or the judgment by a neurologist or physician via clinical and neurological examination.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cong L, Ren Y, Hou T, Han X, Dong Y, Wang Y, Zhang Q, Liu R, Xu S, Wang L, Du Y, Qiu C (2020) Use of cardiovascular drugs for primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular disease among rural-dwelling older Chinese adults. *Front Pharmacol* 11, 608136.
- [2] Zhang L, Wang F, Wang L, Wang W, Liu B, Liu J, Chen M, He Q, Liao Y, Yu X, Chen N, Zhang JE, Hu Z, Liu F, Hong D, Ma L, Liu H, Zhou X, Chen J, Pan L, Chen W, Wang W, Li X, Wang H (2012) Prevalence of chronic kidney disease in China: a cross-sectional survey. *Lancet* 379, 815-822.

| ADresultACC (53.6 C1)SenativitySpecificityADversus Non-dementia $A\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 13040.56 (0.51-0.61)0.320.80 $A\beta_{42}, Pg/ml$ 142 versus 13040.56 (0.51-0.61)0.320.80 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)142 versus 13040.56 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml140 versus 12970.73 (0.69-0.77)0.610.76Base model*141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.680.84Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.690.83Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model+NfL139 versus 12650.85 (0.81-0.88)0.740.82AD versus Normal cognition0.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.80 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.800.86 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.800.76 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 9020.56 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml142 versus 8000.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Sase model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0. | Tost | n nor group | AUC (05% CT) | Sonsitivity | Specificity | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|-------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | AD varsus Non domentia | n per group | AUC (75 /0 CI) | Scusitivity | specificity | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | AB versus non-uemenua AB ₄₀ ng/ml | 142 yereye 1304 | 0.62 (0.58 0.67) | 0.67 | 0.53 | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $A \beta_{42}$, pg/ml | 142 versus 1304 1/2 versus 1204 | 0.02 (0.36 - 0.07) 0.56 (0.51 0.61) | 0.07 | 0.55 | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Ap ₄₂ , pg/iiii A β_{42} , A β_{42} ratio ($\times 100$) | 142 versus 1304 | 0.30(0.31-0.01) 0.57(0.52,0.61) | 0.52 | 0.80 | | | | |
| $\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Total tau ng/ml | 142 versus 1304 | 0.37(0.32-0.01) 0.62(0.57,0.67) | 0.30 | 0.39 | | | | |
| NIL, pg/nl140 Versus 12770.73 (0.09-0.77)0.010.70Base model ^{1a} 141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.680.84Base model ¹⁺ A β_{42} 141 versus 12720.84 (0.80-0.87)0.700.85Base model ¹⁺ A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.690.83Base model ¹⁺ A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model ¹⁺ A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 12720.84 (0.80-0.88)0.720.84Base model ¹⁺ MIL139 versus 12650.85 (0.81-0.88)0.740.82AD versus Normal cognitionA β_{40} , pg/ml142 versus 9020.64 (0.59-0.69)0.670.55A β_{42} , β_{20} ratio (×100)142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.80A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)142 versus 9020.56 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml140 versus 8970.75 (0.70-0.79)0.610.78Base model ^{1a} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model ¹⁺ A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model ¹⁺ A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model ¹⁺ A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model ¹⁺ A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base model ¹⁺ A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0 | NfL ng/ml | 142 versus 1304 | 0.02(0.37-0.07) 0.72(0.60,0.77) | 0.43 | 0.70 | | | | |
| Base model141 Versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.060.04Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.85Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model+Total-tau141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model+Total-tau141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model+Total-tau141 versus 12720.84 (0.80-0.88)0.720.84Base model+AffL139 versus 12650.85 (0.81-0.88)0.740.82AD versus Normal cognition42versus 9020.64 (0.59-0.69)0.670.55A β_{42} , pg/ml142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.800.80A β_{42} , pg/ml142 versus 9020.56 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml140 versus 8970.75 (0.70-0.79)0.610.78Base model*141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.88Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base | NIL, pg/IIII Daga modal ^a | 140 versus 1297 | 0.73(0.09-0.77) | 0.01 | 0.70 | | | | |
| Base model+Ap40141 versus 12720.84 (0.80-0.87)0.700.83Base model+Ap42141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.690.83Base model+Ap42/Ap40 ratio141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model+NfL139 versus 12720.84 (0.80-0.88)0.720.84Base model+NfL139 versus 12650.85 (0.81-0.88)0.740.82 AD versus Normal cognition | Dase model A R | 141 versus 1272 | 0.83(0.79-0.87) | 0.08 | 0.84 | | | | |
| Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 12720.83 (0.80-0.88)0.720.84Base model+NfL139 versus 12650.85 (0.81-0.88)0.740.82 AD versus Normal cognition 142 versus 9020.64 (0.59-0.69)0.670.55 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.80 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)142 versus 9020.58 (0.53-0.63)0.520.64Total-tau, pg/ml140 versus 8970.75 (0.70-0.79)0.610.78Base model*141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model*A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.99)0.700.89Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+MfL139 versus 8750.87 (0.84-0.91)0.740.87 MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired 402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired402 versus 9020.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model*392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66Base model*392 versus 8800.64 (0.61-0.67)0.540.66Base model*392 versus 8800.64 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66 | Base model $+ A \beta_{40}$ | 141 versus 1272 | 0.84(0.80-0.87) | 0.70 | 0.83 | | | | |
| Base model+ π / μ_2 / μ_2 / μ_4 141 versus 12720.83 (0.79-0.87)0.700.84Base model+Total-tau141 versus 12720.84 (0.80-0.88)0.720.84Base model+NfL139 versus 12650.85 (0.81-0.88)0.740.82 AD versus Normal cognition 142 versus 9020.64 (0.59-0.69)0.670.55 $\Lambda\beta_{42}$, pg/ml142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.80 $\Lambda\beta_{42}/\Lambda\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)142 versus 9020.58 (0.53-0.63)0.520.64Total-tau, pg/ml142 versus 9020.62 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml140 versus 8970.75 (0.70-0.79)0.610.78Base model ⁴ 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model+ $\Lambda\beta_{42}$ 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+ $\Lambda\beta_{42}$ 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+ $\Lambda\beta_{42}$ 141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base model+ $\Lambda\beta_{42}$ 141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86< | Base model $\pm A \beta_{42}$ | 141 versus 1272 | 0.83(0.79-0.87) | 0.09 | 0.85 | | | | |
| Base model+10tal-tau141 versus 12/20.84 (0.80-0.88)0.720.84Base model+NfL139 versus 12650.85 (0.81-0.88)0.740.82 AD versus Normal cognition </td <td>Base model + Total tau</td> <td>141 versus 1272</td> <td>0.83(0.79-0.87)</td> <td>0.70</td> <td>0.84</td> | Base model + Total tau | 141 versus 1272 | 0.83(0.79-0.87) | 0.70 | 0.84 | | | | |
| Base model+NL139 versus 1265 $0.83 (0.81-0.88)$ 0.74 0.82 AD versus Normal cognition $A\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 902 $0.64 (0.59-0.69)$ 0.67 0.55 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 902 $0.56 (0.51-0.62)$ 0.32 0.80 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)142 versus 902 $0.58 (0.53-0.63)$ 0.52 0.64 Total-tau, pg/ml142 versus 902 $0.62 (0.57-0.67)$ 0.45 0.76 NfL, pg/ml140 versus 897 $0.75 (0.70-0.79)$ 0.61 0.78 Base model ^a 141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.89)$ 0.68 0.88 Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.89)$ 0.69 0.87 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.90)$ 0.70 0.89 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.90)$ 0.75 0.86 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.90)$ 0.75 0.86 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.83-0.90)$ 0.75 0.86 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.83-0.90)$ 0.75 0.86 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.83-0.90)$ 0.75 0.86 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio140 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.76 0.35 $A\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ 402 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.70 Total-tau, pg/ml402 | Dase model + 10tal-tau | 141 versus 1272 | 0.84(0.80-0.88) | 0.72 | 0.84 | | | | |
| AD versus Normal cognition $A\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 9020.64 (0.59-0.69)0.670.55 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.80 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)142 versus 9020.58 (0.53-0.63)0.520.64Total-tau, pg/ml142 versus 9020.62 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml140 versus 8970.75 (0.70-0.79)0.610.78Base model ^a 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model+A\beta_{40}141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A\beta_{42}141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.99)0.700.89Base model+Af4_2/Aβ_{40} ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+HTotal-tau141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base model+MfL139 versus 8750.87 (0.84-0.91)0.740.87MCI versus Cognitive unimpairedAβ_{40}, pg/ml402 versus 9020.51 (0.48-0.55)0.820.23Aβ_{42/Aβ_{40} ratio (×100)402 versus 9020.51 (0.48-0.55)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model+Aβ_{42}392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66NfL, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model+Aβ_{42}392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66Base model+Aβ_{42}392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)< | Base model+INIL | 139 versus 1265 | 0.85 (0.81-0.88) | 0.74 | 0.82 | | | | |
| Ap40, pg/ml142 versus 9020.64 (0.39-0.69)0.670.53A β_{42} , pg/ml142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.320.80A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)142 versus 9020.58 (0.53-0.63)0.520.64Total-tau, pg/ml142 versus 9020.62 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml140 versus 8970.75 (0.70-0.79)0.610.78Base model ^a 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 9020.56 (0.53-0.59)0.760.35MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired $$ | AD versus Normal cognition | 142 | 0.64(0.50,0.60) | 0.67 | 0.55 | | | | |
| Ap42, pg/ml142 versus 9020.56 (0.51-0.62)0.520.80A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)142 versus 9020.58 (0.53-0.63)0.520.64Total-tau, pg/ml142 versus 9020.62 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml140 versus 8970.75 (0.70-0.79)0.610.78Base model ^a 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+Total-tau141 versus 8800.86 (0.84-0.91)0.740.87MCI versus Cognitive unimpairedA $\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ 402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.59)0.760.35A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model*392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66Base model*392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 88 | Ap $_{40}$, pg/ml | 142 versus 902 | 0.64 (0.59 - 0.69) | 0.67 | 0.55 | | | | |
| Ap42/Ap40 ratio (×100)142 versus 9020.58 (0.53-0.63)0.520.64Total-tau, pg/ml142 versus 9020.62 (0.57-0.67)0.450.76NfL, pg/ml140 versus 8970.75 (0.70-0.79)0.610.78Base model ^a 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A β_{42} /A β_{40} ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.720.88Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.750.86Base model+NfL139 versus 8750.87 (0.84-0.91)0.740.87MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired $A\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ 402 versus 9020.51 (0.48-0.55)0.820.23 $A\beta_{42}, \betag/ml$ 402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 9020.52 (0.48-0.55)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model ^a 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66NfL, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model ^a 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A β_{40} ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560 | Ap $_{42}$, pg/ml | 142 versus 902 | 0.50(0.51-0.62) | 0.32 | 0.80 | | | | |
| Total-tail, pg/ml142 versus 902 $0.62 (0.57-0.67)$ 0.45 0.76 NfL, pg/ml140 versus 897 $0.75 (0.70-0.79)$ 0.61 0.78 Base model ^a 141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.89)$ 0.68 0.88 Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.83-0.90)$ 0.72 0.88 Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.89)$ 0.69 0.87 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.90)$ 0.70 0.89 Base model+Total-tau141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.83-0.90)$ 0.75 0.86 Base model+NfL139 versus 875 $0.87 (0.84-0.91)$ 0.74 0.87 MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired $A\beta_{40}$, pg/ml402 versus 902 $0.56 (0.53-0.59)$ 0.76 0.35 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.70 Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 902 $0.56 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.56 0.57 Base model ^a 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.54 0.66 NfL, pg/ml400 versus 897 $0.56 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.56 0.57 Base model ^a 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.42 0.79 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.54 0.64 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base mod | Ap_{42}/Ap_{40} ratio (×100) | 142 versus 902 | 0.58 (0.53-0.63) | 0.52 | 0.64 | | | | |
| NfL, pg/ml140 versus 897 $0.75 (0.70-0.79)$ 0.61 0.78 Base model ^a 141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.89)$ 0.68 0.88 Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.83-0.90)$ 0.72 0.88 Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.89)$ 0.69 0.87 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.90)$ 0.70 0.89 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.82-0.90)$ 0.70 0.89 Base model+NfL139 versus 880 $0.86 (0.83-0.90)$ 0.75 0.86 Base model+NfL139 versus 875 $0.87 (0.84-0.91)$ 0.74 0.87 MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired 402 versus 902 $0.56 (0.53-0.59)$ 0.76 0.35 A β_{42} , pg/ml402 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.70 Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.66 NfL, pg/ml400 versus 897 $0.56 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.56 0.57 Base model ^a 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.42 0.79 Base model ^a 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.54 0.64 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.64 (0.61-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8 | l otal-tau, pg/ml | 142 versus 902 | 0.62 (0.57-0.67) | 0.45 | 0.76 | | | | |
| Base model*141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.680.88Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.720.88Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+Total-tau141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base model+NfL139 versus 8750.87 (0.84-0.91)0.740.87MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired402 versus 9020.56 (0.53-0.59)0.760.35A β_{42} , pg/ml402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 9020.52 (0.48-0.55)0.400.66NfL, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model*A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66Base model*A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67) | NfL, pg/ml | 140 versus 897 | 0./5 (0./0-0./9) | 0.61 | 0.78 | | | | |
| Base model+A β_{40} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.720.88Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.690.87Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+Total-tau141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base model+NfL139 versus 8750.87 (0.84-0.91)0.740.87MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired402 versus 9020.56 (0.53-0.59)0.760.35A β_{40} , pg/ml402 versus 9020.51 (0.48-0.55)0.820.23A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 9020.52 (0.48-0.55)0.400.66NfL, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model^a392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66Base model*A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.550.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 | Base model" | 141 versus 880 | 0.86 (0.82-0.89) | 0.68 | 0.88 | | | | |
| Base model+A β_{42} 141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.89)0.690.87Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+Total-tau141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base model+NfL139 versus 8750.87 (0.84-0.91)0.740.87 MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired $A\beta_{40}$, pg/ml402 versus 9020.56 (0.53-0.59)0.760.35A β_{42} , pg/ml402 versus 9020.51 (0.48-0.55)0.820.23A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model*392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66NfL, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.570.56Base model*392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.64 (0.61-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.64 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+Total-tau392 versus 8800.64 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+NfL390 versus 8750.64 (0.60-0.67)0.400.82 | Base model+A β_{40} | 141 versus 880 | 0.86 (0.83-0.90) | 0.72 | 0.88 | | | | |
| Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio141 versus 8800.86 (0.82-0.90)0.700.89Base model+Total-tau141 versus 8800.86 (0.83-0.90)0.750.86Base model+NfL139 versus 8750.87 (0.84-0.91)0.740.87MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired402 versus 9020.56 (0.53-0.59)0.760.35A β_{42} , pg/ml402 versus 9020.51 (0.48-0.55)0.820.23A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml400 versus 9020.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model*392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66NfL, pg/ml392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.64 (0.61-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.64 (0.61-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.64 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+NfL39 | Base model+A β_{42} | 141 versus 880 | 0.86 (0.82-0.89) | 0.69 | 0.87 | | | | |
| Base model+Total-tau141 versus 880 $0.86 (0.83-0.90)$ 0.75 0.86 Base model+NfL139 versus 875 $0.87 (0.84-0.91)$ 0.74 0.87 MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired 402 versus 902 $0.56 (0.53-0.59)$ 0.76 0.35 $A\beta_{42}$, pg/ml 402 versus 902 $0.56 (0.53-0.59)$ 0.76 0.35 $A\beta_{42}$, pg/ml 402 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.70 Total-tau, pg/ml 402 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.66 NfL, pg/ml 400 versus 897 $0.56 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.56 0.57 Base modela 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.42 0.79 Base model+A β_{40} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.55 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+NfL 390 versus 875 $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.40 0.82 | Base model+A β_{42} /A β_{40} ratio | 141 versus 880 | 0.86 (0.82-0.90) | 0.70 | 0.89 | | | | |
| Base model+NfL139 versus 875 $0.87 (0.84-0.91)$ 0.74 0.87 MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired $A\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ 402 versus 902 $0.56 (0.53-0.59)$ 0.76 0.35 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 402 versus 902 $0.51 (0.48-0.55)$ 0.82 0.23 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.70 Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 902 $0.52 (0.48-0.55)$ 0.40 0.66 NfL, pg/ml400 versus 897 $0.56 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.56 0.57 Base model ^a 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.54 0.66 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.64 (0.61-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+Total-tau392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+NfL390 versus 875 $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.40 0.82 | Base model+Total-tau | 141 versus 880 | 0.86 (0.83-0.90) | 0.75 | 0.86 | | | | |
| MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired $A\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ 402 versus 9020.56 (0.53-0.59)0.760.35 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 402 versus 9020.51 (0.48-0.55)0.820.23 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 9020.52 (0.48-0.55)0.400.66NfL, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base model ^a 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.420.79Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.530.70Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+NfL390 versus 8750.64 (0.60-0.67)0.400.82 | Base model+NfL | 139 versus 875 | 0.87 (0.84-0.91) | 0.74 | 0.87 | | | | |
| $A\beta_{40}, pg/ml$ $402 versus 902$ $0.56 (0.53-0.59)$ 0.76 0.35 $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ $402 versus 902$ $0.51 (0.48-0.55)$ 0.82 0.23 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100) $402 versus 902$ $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.70 Total-tau, pg/ml $402 versus 902$ $0.52 (0.48-0.55)$ 0.40 0.66 NfL, pg/ml $400 versus 897$ $0.56 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.56 0.57 Base model ^a $392 versus 880$ $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.54 0.66 Base model+A β_{40} $392 versus 880$ $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A β_{42} $392 versus 880$ $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio $392 versus 880$ $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio $392 versus 880$ $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio $392 versus 880$ $0.64 (0.61-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+Total-tau $392 versus 880$ $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+NfL $390 versus 875$ $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.40 0.82 | MCI versus Cognitive unimpaired | | | | | | | | |
| $A\beta_{42}, pg/ml$ 402 versus 902 $0.51 (0.48-0.55)$ 0.82 0.23 $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 902 $0.55 (0.52-0.58)$ 0.40 0.70 Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 902 $0.52 (0.48-0.55)$ 0.40 0.66 NfL, pg/ml400 versus 897 $0.56 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.56 0.57 Base model ^a 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.54 0.66 Base model+A β_{40} 392 versus 880 $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.42 0.79 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+Total-tau392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+NfL390 versus 875 $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.40 0.82 | $A\beta_{40}$, pg/ml | 402 versus 902 | 0.56 (0.53-0.59) | 0.76 | 0.35 | | | | |
| $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100)402 versus 9020.55 (0.52-0.58)0.400.70Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 9020.52 (0.48-0.55)0.400.66NfL, pg/ml400 versus 8970.56 (0.52-0.59)0.560.57Base modela392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.540.66Base model+A β_{40} 392 versus 8800.64 (0.60-0.67)0.420.79Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.530.70Base model+Total-tau392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+NfL390 versus 8750.64 (0.60-0.67)0.400.82 | A β_{42} , pg/ml | 402 versus 902 | 0.51 (0.48-0.55) | 0.82 | 0.23 | | | | |
| Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 902 $0.52 (0.48-0.55)$ 0.40 0.66 NfL, pg/ml400 versus 897 $0.56 (0.52-0.59)$ 0.56 0.57 Base modela392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.54 0.66 Base model+A β_{40} 392 versus 880 $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.42 0.79 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.64 (0.61-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+Total-tau392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+NfL390 versus 875 $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.40 0.82 | $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100) | 402 versus 902 | 0.55 (0.52-0.58) | 0.40 | 0.70 | | | | |
| NfL, pg/ml400 versus 897 0.56 ($0.52-0.59$) 0.56 0.57 Base modela392 versus 880 0.63 ($0.60-0.67$) 0.54 0.66 Base model+A β_{40} 392 versus 880 0.64 ($0.60-0.67$) 0.42 0.79 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 0.63 ($0.60-0.67$) 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 0.64 ($0.61-0.67$) 0.53 0.70 Base model+Total-tau392 versus 880 0.63 ($0.60-0.67$) 0.56 0.64 Base model+NfL390 versus 875 0.64 ($0.60-0.67$) 0.40 0.82 | Total-tau, pg/ml | 402 versus 902 | 0.52 (0.48-0.55) | 0.40 | 0.66 | | | | |
| Base modela392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.54 0.66 Base model+A β_{40} 392 versus 880 $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.42 0.79 Base model+A β_{42} 392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.57 0.64 Base model+A $\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 880 $0.64 (0.61-0.67)$ 0.53 0.70 Base model+Total-tau392 versus 880 $0.63 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.56 0.64 Base model+NfL390 versus 875 $0.64 (0.60-0.67)$ 0.40 0.82 | NfL, pg/ml | 400 versus 897 | 0.56 (0.52-0.59) | 0.56 | 0.57 | | | | |
| Base model+ $A\beta_{40}$ 392 versus 8800.64 (0.60-0.67)0.420.79Base model+ $A\beta_{42}$ 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+ $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.64 (0.61-0.67)0.530.70Base model+Total-tau392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+NfL390 versus 8750.64 (0.60-0.67)0.400.82 | Base model ^a | 392 versus 880 | 0.63 (0.60-0.67) | 0.54 | 0.66 | | | | |
| Base model+ $A\beta_{42}$ 392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.570.64Base model+ $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio392 versus 8800.64 (0.61-0.67)0.530.70Base model+Total-tau392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+NfL390 versus 8750.64 (0.60-0.67)0.400.82 | Base model+A β_{40} | 392 versus 880 | 0.64 (0.60-0.67) | 0.42 | 0.79 | | | | |
| Base model+Aβ42/Aβ40 ratio392 versus 8800.64 (0.61-0.67)0.530.70Base model+Total-tau392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+NfL390 versus 8750.64 (0.60-0.67)0.400.82 | Base model+A β_{42} | 392 versus 880 | 0.63 (0.60-0.67) | 0.57 | 0.64 | | | | |
| Base model+Total-tau392 versus 8800.63 (0.60-0.67)0.560.64Base model+NfL390 versus 8750.64 (0.60-0.67)0.400.82 | Base model+A _{β42} /A _{β40} ratio | 392 versus 880 | 0.64 (0.61-0.67) | 0.53 | 0.70 | | | | |
| Base model+NfL390 versus 8750.64 (0.60-0.67)0.400.82 | Base model+Total-tau | 392 versus 880 | 0.63 (0.60-0.67) | 0.56 | 0.64 | | | | |
| | Base model+NfL | 390 versus 875 | 0.64 (0.60-0.67) | 0.40 | 0.82 | | | | |
| MCI versus AD | MCI versus AD | | | | | | | | |
| A β_{40} , pg/ml 402 versus 142 0.59 (0.54-0.65) 0.44 0.73 | A β_{40} , pg/ml | 402 versus 142 | 0.59 (0.54-0.65) | 0.44 | 0.73 | | | | |
| Aβ ₄₂ , pg/ml 402 versus 142 0.55 (0.49-0.61) 0.31 0.81 | A β_{42} , pg/ml | 402 versus 142 | 0.55 (0.49-0.61) | 0.31 | 0.81 | | | | |
| $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100) 402 versus 142 0.53 (0.48-0.59) 0.55 0.58 | $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio (×100) | 402 versus 142 | 0.53 (0.48-0.59) | 0.55 | 0.58 | | | | |
| Total-tau, pg/ml402 versus 1420.63 (0.58-0.68)0.480.74 | Total-tau, pg/ml | 402 versus 142 | 0.63 (0.58-0.68) | 0.48 | 0.74 | | | | |
| NfL, pg/ml400 versus 1400.69 (0.64-0.74)0.490.82 | NfL, pg/ml | 400 versus 140 | 0.69 (0.64-0.74) | 0.49 | 0.82 | | | | |
| Base modela390 versus 1410.77 (0.72-0.82)0.670.76 | Base model ^a | 390 versus 141 | 0.77 (0.72-0.82) | 0.67 | 0.76 | | | | |

Supplementary Table 1. Diagnostic accuracy of plasma biomarkers between normal cognition, mild cognitive impairment, and Alzheimer's disease

| Base model+A β_{40} | 390 versus 141 | 0.77 (0.73-0.82) | 0.70 | 0.74 |
|---|----------------|------------------|------|------|
| Base model+A β_{42} | 390 versus 141 | 0.77 (0.72-0.82) | 0.56 | 0.86 |
| Base model+A β_{42} /A β_{40} ratio | 390 versus 141 | 0.77 (0.72-0.82) | 0.67 | 0.78 |
| Base model+Total-tau | 390 versus 141 | 0.79 (0.74-0.83) | 0.75 | 0.74 |
| Base model+NfL | 390 versus 139 | 0.79 (0.74-0.83) | 0.75 | 0.71 |

AUC, areas under the receiver operating characteristics curve; CI, confidence interval; AD, Alzheimer's disease; MCI, mild cognitive impairment; A β , amyloid- β ; NfL, neurofilament light chain; *APOE*, apolipoprotein E gene.

^a Base model includes age, sex, education, and *APOE* genotype.



Supplementary Figure 1. Spearman rank correlations between plasma biomarkers.

The figure shows the Spearman rho coefficients. Positive correlations (r>0) were exhibited in blue, and negative correlations (r<0) were exhibited in red in the heatmap figure. A β , amyloid beta; NfL, neurofilament light chain. Eight outliers with plasma NfL values >5 SDs above the mean of the whole data, as well as one plasma NfL value below the lower limit of quantification was excluded from the main analysis (n=1,437, 897 with normal cognition, 400 with mild cognitive impairment, and 140 with Alzheimer's disease). ***p<0.001.



Supplementary Figure 2 Associations of age, sex, education, and APOE ɛ4 allele with plasma biomarkers.

Aβ, amyloid-β; t-tau, total-tau; NfL, neurofilament light chain; APOE, apolipoprotein E gene.

^a These data were natural log-transformed to normalize the distributions (n=1446, 402 with mild cognitive impairment, 142 with Alzheimer's disease).

^b Eight outliers with plasma NfL values >5 SDs above the mean of the whole data, as well as one plasma NfL value below the lower limit of quantification was excluded from the main analysis (n=1437, 400 with mild cognitive impairment and 140 with Alzheimer's disease).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.

Model was adjusted for age, sex, education, APOE genotype, behavioral, metabolic, and clinical factors.



Supplementary Figure 3. Correlations of plasma biomarkers with age by cognitive status.

The figure shows the Pearson rho coefficients of plasma $A\beta_{40}$ (A), $A\beta_{42}$ (B), $A\beta_{40}/A\beta_{42}$ ratio (C), t-tau (D), and NfL (E) with age. A β , amyloid beta; T-tau, total tau; NfL, neurofilament light chain. Eight outliers with plasma NfL values 5 SDs above the mean of the whole data, as well as one plasma NfL value below the lower limit of quantification was excluded from the main analysis (n=1437, 897 with normal cognition, 400 with mild cognitive impairment and 140 with Alzheimer's disease).