

## Alzheimer's disease and the family effect

Sir—Van Duijn *et al.*<sup>1</sup> reported in the May 1994 issue of *Nature Genetics* that both the number of  $\epsilon 4$  alleles in the apolipoprotein E (apoE) genotype and a family history of a first-degree relative with memory problems influence risk of early-onset Alzheimer disease (EOAD), in a population-based sample. However, their data do not demonstrate that family history modifies the apoE genotype effect. Such modification, statistical interaction, would mean that the effect of family history is not the same for all genotypes. When logistic regression is used to formally test for a statistically significant interaction in their data, interaction can be rejected ( $p = 0.65$ , or  $p = 0.38$  if the small number of  $\epsilon 4\epsilon 4$  individuals are excluded). There are highly significant additive effects of both family history ( $p = 0.0001$ ) and number of apoE  $\epsilon 4$  alleles ( $p = 0.0001$ ). Given recent evidence that the  $\epsilon 2$  allele modifies AD risk, pooling the genotypes by number of  $\epsilon 4$  alleles is contraindicated and could mask some types of interaction<sup>2</sup>. Whether these two factors act additively or interact in the prediction of AD, has important implications on the patho-physiologic mechanisms at work. We have presented evidence that family history and apoE genotype interact in the prediction of AD in a primarily late-onset (LOAD), population-based sample<sup>3</sup>. The contradictory results in EOAD and LOAD are consistent with an aetiological difference between these two groups.

**Gail Pairitz Jarvik**  
**Ellen M. Wijsman**  
 Division of Medical Genetics  
 University of Washington  
 Mail Stop RG-25  
 Seattle, Washington 98195

IN REPLY — Jarvik and Wijsman argue that our data do not show evidence for modification, by family history, (FH) of the effect of the Apolipoprotein  $\epsilon 4$  (APOE\*4) genotype on the risk of EOAD<sup>1</sup>. Absence of such an effect contrast with their observation in late-onset Alzheimer's

disease (LOAD) and may underlie aetiological differences between EOAD and LOAD.

Their argument is based on the results of the statistical tests for interaction which are indeed non-significant. However, lack of statistical significance should be interpreted with caution because of the limited statistical power<sup>4-6</sup>. Given our finding of a 1.6 fold increase in risk of EOAD associated with the APOE\*4 genotype in those with a positive FH as compared to those with a negative FH, a population of more than 1,000 patients and controls is needed to reject the hypothesis of no interaction with a probability of 95%.

To increase the statistical power, we have reanalysed our data adding 373 age-matched control subjects derived from another Rotterdam population-based study<sup>7</sup>. This analysis did not change any of our initial conclusions<sup>1</sup>. For the APOE\*4 heterozygotes with a positive FH, a significant increase in EOAD risk was found, but not in those with a negative FH (OR 1.3; 95% confidence interval 0.7–2.3). The risk of EOAD for the APOE\*4 homozygotes was always significantly increased. The effect of

the APOE\*4 allele and FH was non-additive ( $p=0.03$ ), confirming effect modification. Also, in both homozygotes and heterozygotes the risk for those with a positive FH was 1.6 times increased compared to those with a negative FH.

Our new data indicate that there is no evidence for differences between EOAD and LOAD with respect to FH modifying the APOE genotype effect.

**C. van Duijn**  
 Department of Epidemiology  
 & Biostatistics,  
 Erasmus University Medical School,  
 3000 DR Rotterdam  
 The Netherlands

**C. Van Broeckhoven**  
 Laboratory of Neurogenetics,  
 Born Bunge Foundation  
 University of Antwerp (UIA),  
 2600 Antwerpen  
 Belgium

1. van Duijn *et al.* *Nature Genet.* **7**, 74–78 (1994).
2. Jarvik, G.P. *et al.* *Neurology* (in the press).
3. Jarvik, G.P. *et al.* *Genet. Epidemiol.* (in the press).
4. Smith, P.G. & Day, N.E. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **13**, 356–365 (1984).
5. Breslow, N.E. & Day, N.E. IARC Scientific Publications, No. 32 (1980).
6. Rothman, K.J. *Modern Epidemiology* (Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1986).
7. Hofman, A., Grobbee, D.E., DeJong, P.T.V.M. & Vandenouweland, F.A. *Eur. J. Epidemiol.* **7**, 403–422 (1991).



Subscription information, Table of Contents and selected abstracts are available on-line on the first day of each month through the Electronic Newsstand.

On the internet:  
 gopher to [gopher.internet.com](http://gopher.internet.com)  
 or telnet to [gopher.internet.com](http://gopher.internet.com)  
 and login as enews