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ABSTRACT

The biological mechanisms that link Beta-amyloid (Aβ) plaque deposition, neurodegeneration, and clinical decline in Alzheimer’s disease (AD) dementia, have not been completely elucidated. Here we studied whether amyloid accumulation and neurodegeneration, independently or interactively, predict clinical decline over time in a group of memory impaired older individuals [diagnosed with either amnestic mild cognitive impairment (MCI), or mild AD dementia]. We found that baseline Aβ-associated cortical thinning across clusters encompassing lateral and medial temporal and parietal cortices was related to higher baseline Clinical Dementia Rating Sum-of-Boxes (CDR-SB). Baseline Aβ-associated cortical thinning also predicted CDR-SB over time. Notably, the association between CDR-SB change and cortical thickness values from the right lateral temporo-parietal cortex and right precuneus was driven by individuals with high Aβ burden. In contrast, the association between cortical thickness in the medial temporal lobe (MTL) and clinical decline was similar for individuals with high or low Aβ burden. Furthermore, amyloid pathology was a stronger predictor for clinical decline than MTL thickness. While this study validates previous findings relating AD biomarkers of neurodegeneration to clinical impairment, here we show that regions outside the MTL may be more vulnerable and specific to AD dementia. Additionally, excluding mild AD individuals revealed that these relationships remained, suggesting that lower cortical thickness values in specific regions, vulnerable to amyloid pathology, predict clinical decline already at the prodromal stage.

1. Introduction

Deposition of Beta-amyloid (Aβ) plaques begins years before the onset of clinical symptoms present across the Alzheimer’s disease (AD) dementia continuum (Selkoe and Hardy, 2016; Sperling et al., 2011) and continues to slowly accumulate (Jack et al., 2013; Villemagne et al., 2013; Walsh and Teplow, 2012). While Aβ deposition is only moderately associated with cognitive decline (Villemagne et al., 2011), neurodegeneration may have a closer relationship with symptom progression in MCI (Jack et al., 2008b) and mild to moderate AD dementia patients (Jack et al., 2009, 2008a; Hyman et al., 1991). Previous studies have shown that neurodegenerative processes are facilitated by amyloid deposition (Pooler et al., 2015; Butterfield, 2002; Calhoun et al., 1998), suggesting that Aβ and neurodegeneration may interact at some point along the disease continuum. Overall, Aβ and neurodegeneration do not seem to provide entirely overlapping diagnostic information (Jack et al., 2008a).

Neurodegeneration in mild AD dementia has most consistently been found in medial and lateral temporo-parietal regions (Desikan et al., 2009; Jack et al., 2008a; Jack et al., 2009; Jack et al., 1997). Terms such as the ‘signature’ regions of AD, or constructs such as “STAND” (STructural Abnormality iNDex) (Dickerson et al., 2009; Vemuri et al., 2009), have been used to describe these AD-vulnerable clusters, and thickness in such aggregates have been found to predict cognitive
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decline or disease progression (Pettigrew et al., 2016; Eskildsen et al., 2013; Desikan et al., 2009; Dickerson et al., 2009; Querbes et al., 2009; Vemuri et al., 2009). Clinical decline has also been investigated using regional structural measures. For example, a previous study showed that greater rates of impairment in instrumental activities of daily living in MCI and mild AD dementia were associated with decreased cortical thickness in the inferior temporal cortex and supramarginal gyrus, and with lower levels of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) Aβ (Marshall et al., 2014).

While widespread relationships between baseline cortical thickness and change in Clinical Dementia Rating Sum-of-Boxes (CDR-SB, Morris, 1997) – used to quantify clinical impairment – have been observed in MCI patients, CSF measures of Aβ-42 have not been shown to predict a change in CDR-SB (Fjell et al., 2010; Walhovd et al., 2010). However, in those studies, interactions between amyloid pathology and regional neurodegeneration were not examined (Marshall et al., 2014; Fjell et al., 2010; Walhovd et al., 2010) despite there being discordant relationships between amyloid and regional neurodegeneration in patients with AD dementia (Fjell et al., 2010; Jack et al., 2008a).

Two crucial questions remain unanswered: first, whether amyloid and neurodegeneration have interactive or independent associations with clinical decline across the AD spectrum, and second, whether these associations show different regional patterns in areas known to be susceptible to pathology. To that end, we investigated whether cortical thickness and amyloid deposition, as measured with Pittsburgh Compound B positron emission tomography (PiB-PET), have an interactive or independent effect on longitudinally-measured CDR-SB scores in MCI and mild AD individuals. We examined these associations in specific amyloid-vulnerable regions as determined from a whole-brain correlational approach. As amyloid is considered to potentiate neurodegeneration, we hypothesized that this approach would provide us with a set of regions to further investigate independent versus interactive effects without biasing toward regions that may have no association with Aβ. Additionally, to assess specificity of these findings, we also included the precentral motor cortex as a control region. Overall, having a better understanding of regional associations between Aβ, neurodegeneration, and clinical decline, contributes to the development of more sensitive measures for the diagnosis and prognosis of AD dementia.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants and behavioral measures

Forty-seven older adults [34% female, mean age = 72.52(8.29)] from an ongoing study on aging and AD dementia were included in the current study [Table 1]. Written informed consent was obtained prior to experimental procedures, and the study was approved and conducted, in accordance with the Partners Human Research Committee at the Massachusetts General Hospital and Brigham and Women’s Hospital (Boston, MA).

All participants completed the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE, Folstein et al., 1975), the Clinical Dementia Rating scale (CDR, Morris, 1997), and an extensive neuropsychological test battery. Additionally, to assess clinical diagnosis at baseline, three experienced clinicians held a consensus meeting to review CDR and neuropsychological testing, a procedure explained in further detail in a previous study (Huijbbers et al., 2015). Clinicians were blinded to the neuroimaging data during clinical assessment. The Clinical Dementia Rating Sum-of-Boxes (CDR-SB) [range: 0–18] was used to quantify clinical impairment, with higher scores indicating greater clinical decline. Forty-one participants received a diagnosis of amnestic MCI, single or multiple domain (Petersen, 2004), and six participants were diagnosed with AD dementia with amnestic symptoms (McKhann et al., 2011). All six mild AD dementia individuals, and 53.6% of MCI individuals, were Aβ+. Seven individuals (Aβ−: 1, Aβ+ : 6) with diagnoses at follow-up were classified as having progressed in clinical diagnosis from MCI to AD dementia, while twenty-six (Aβ−: 15, Aβ+ : 11) remained ‘stable’ in their MCI diagnosis. Test metrics were acquired across 36 months from baseline [baseline (N = 47), 3 months (N = 31), 6 months (N = 33), 12 months (N = 34), 18 months (N = 27), 24 months (N = 21), and 36 months (N = 21)].

2.2. MRI acquisition

All participants underwent an anatomical magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan at baseline, on average 35.74 (SD = 34.85) days [median = 29, interquartile range (IQR) = 10.50, 51.50, minimum = 0, maximum = 197.0, days] from the baseline clinical visit – there were no significant differences between Aβ status (Aβ− or Aβ+) groups on these time differences [t(45) = −0.68, p = 0.500]. Data were acquired at the Athinoulia A. Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging using a Siemens Trio 3T system with a 12-channel phased array head coil. Foam pads were used to restrict head motion. The anatomical MRI consisted of a T1-weighted magnetization-prepared rapid gradient-echo scan (MPRAGE, 256 sagittal slices, isotropic 1 mm, repetition time (TR) = 2300 ms, echo time (TE) = 2.98 ms, inversion time = 900 ms, flip angle = 9°, FOV = 270 × 253mm, matrix = 256 × 240, voxel size = 1.05 × 1.05 × 1.2 mm). Anatomical MRI data were analyzed using the standard processing pipeline within FreeSurfer v5.1. Technical details of the pipeline have been described in prior publications (Dale et al., 1999; Fischl and Dale, 2000; Fischl et al., 1999). White and pial surface segmentation was examined visually for quality assessment and edited when necessary. Cortical thickness values were mapped onto a semi-inflated surface of each participant’s reconstructed brain. Maps were smoothed using a circularly symmetric Gaussian kernel of 15 mm full-width at half-maximum (FWHM), and averaged across participants using a non-rigid high-dimensional spherical averaging method aligning cortical folds. In accordance with the Desikan-Killiany atlas (Desikan et al., 2006), we separated a large cluster that encompassed the lateral, ventral, and medial aspects of the right hemisphere into two clusters, such that one cluster became a Lateral Temporo-Parietal cluster, and the second a Medial Temporal Lobe/Pusiform Gyrus cluster. Additionally, we separated a cluster that encompassed a large portion of the postero-medial and caudal dorsal aspect of the right hemisphere into a Precuneus cluster, a Lingual/Occipital cluster, and a Superior Parietal cluster [Fig. S1].

2.3. Amyloid PET imaging

Positron Emission Tomography (PET) imaging data were acquired on average 165.04 (SD = 203.43) days [median = 57.0, IQR = 25.0, 106.50, minimum = 0, maximum = 778.0, days] from the MRI measure – with no significant differences between Aβ groups [t(45) = −0.34, p = 0.736], and on average 165.04 (SD = 203.43) days [median = 88.0, IQR = 55.50, 137.50, minimum = 0, maximum = 812.0, days] from the baseline clinical visit – with no significant differences between Aβ status groups [t(45) = −0.74, p = 0.461]. Deposition of Aβ was measured using Pittsburgh Compound B (PiB) [N-methyl-[11C]-2-(4-methylaminophenyl)-6-hydroxy-benzothiazole] according to previously described methods (Johnson et al., 2007). In short: 60 min of dynamic PET data were acquired, following intravenous administration of [C11] PiB, using an HR + PET camera (Siemens) operating in 3D mode (image planes = 63, axial field of view = 15.2-cm, transaxial resolution = 5.6 mm, slice interval = 2.4 mm, 69 frames: 12 frames × 15 s, 57 frames × 60s). PET data were reconstructed and attenuation-corrected using standard Siemens software. Each frame was evaluated for head motion and adequate count statistics. Using Logan’s graphical analysis method (Logan, 2000), we calculated PiB retention expressed as a distribution volume ratio (DVR) using a gray matter cerebellum reference region (Price et al., 2005).

Neocortical Aβ deposition was quantified using an aggregate DVR...
from a set of regions that comprise association cortices, including the frontal, lateral parietal, lateral temporal, and retrosplenial cortices (FLR) (Klunk et al., 2004). A cut-off of PiB DVR > 1.2 indicated ‘Aβ+’ status classification (N = 28). This threshold was determined by a Gaussian mixture modeling approach (Mormino et al., 2014b) on an independent data sample with an identical amyloid PiB-PET protocol (Johnson et al., 2007). To note, we used a dichotomous PiB-PET measure rather than a continuous one in order to enhance the interpretability of the three-way interaction models; having a dichotomous measure allowed for an easier breakdown of the three-way interactions for visualization purposes.

2.4. Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were performed in SPSS (IBM SPSS, version 21; IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) and R software (R, version 3.2.2; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Group differences on demographics and neuropsychological measures at baseline were compared using one-sample and independent two-sample t-tests for continuous variables, and chi-square tests for comparing proportions.

To determine regions susceptible to amyloid pathology, we associated baseline cortical thickness with amyloid deposition within FreeSurfer v5.1. Surface maps of cortical thickness effects were generated regressing [C11] PiB uptake in the FLR regions as a continuous covariate in the regression model; having a dichotomous PIB-PET measure rather than a continuous one in order to enhance the interpretability of the three-way interaction models; having a dichotomous measure allowed for an easier breakdown of the three-way interactions for visualization purposes.

To determine regions susceptible to amyloid pathology, we associated baseline cortical thickness with amyloid deposition within FreeSurfer v5.1. Surface maps of cortical thickness effects were generated regressing [C11] PiB uptake in the FLR regions as a continuous covariate in the regression model; having a dichotomous PIB-PET measure rather than a continuous one in order to enhance the interpretability of the three-way interaction models; having a dichotomous measure allowed for an easier breakdown of the three-way interactions for visualization purposes.

To determine regions susceptible to amyloid pathology, we associated baseline cortical thickness with amyloid deposition within FreeSurfer v5.1. Surface maps of cortical thickness effects were generated regressing [C11] PiB uptake in the FLR regions as a continuous covariate in the regression model; having a dichotomous PIB-PET measure rather than a continuous one in order to enhance the interpretability of the three-way interaction models; having a dichotomous measure allowed for an easier breakdown of the three-way interactions for visualization purposes.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entire sample (N = 47)</th>
<th>Aβ− (N = 19)</th>
<th>Aβ+ (N = 28)</th>
<th>Aβ− vs Aβ+ t or χ² scores, p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>72.52 (8.29)</td>
<td>72.11 (9.39)</td>
<td>72.80 (7.61)</td>
<td>t = -0.28, p = 0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (years)</td>
<td>16.51 (2.69)</td>
<td>16.11 (2.87)</td>
<td>16.79 (2.57)</td>
<td>t = -0.85, p = 0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female %)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>χ² = 0.01, p = 0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMSE</td>
<td>26.85 (2.29)</td>
<td>27.95 (1.39)</td>
<td>26.07 (2.50)</td>
<td>t = 3.25, p = 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDR global</td>
<td>44/3</td>
<td>19/0</td>
<td>25/3</td>
<td>χ² = 2.18, p = 0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDR-SB</td>
<td>2.02 (1.33)</td>
<td>1.26 (0.63)</td>
<td>2.54 (1.44)</td>
<td>t = -4.13, p = 0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI/AD dementia</td>
<td>41/6</td>
<td>19/0</td>
<td>22/6</td>
<td>χ² = 4.67, p = 0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-amyloid</td>
<td>1.41 (0.31)</td>
<td>1.09 (0.05)</td>
<td>1.63 (0.19)</td>
<td>t = -14.37, p &lt; 0.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global mean cortical thickness (mm)</td>
<td>2.35 (0.10)</td>
<td>2.40 (0.08)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.09)</td>
<td>t = 3.11, p = 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N at 3 months follow-up</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N at 6 months follow-up</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N at 12 months follow-up</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N at 18 months follow-up</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N at 24 months follow-up</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N at 36 months follow-up</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals that progressed to AD dementia status</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals that remained as MCI diagnosis*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with no follow-up diagnosis*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 MCI</td>
<td>6 MCI</td>
<td>2 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are means (standard deviation) or frequencies. AMNART VIQ, American National Adult Reading Test verbal intelligence quotient; MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; CDR-SB, Clinical Dementia Rating scale sum of boxes; MCI, mild cognitive impairment; AD, Alzheimer’s disease dementia; Aβ, β-amyloid; PiB, Pittsburgh Compound-B (PiB) retention expressed as a distribution volume ratio (DVR) in neocortical regions of interest comprised of frontal, lateral temporal and retrosplenial (FLR) cortex. *Reasons for no follow-up diagnosis include having only one baseline time-point and no further follow-up visits, or unavailable diagnosis status at the follow-up visit used for our analyses.

All models included age as a covariate, predicting CDR-SB. Results are listed as β estimate, then Standard Error of the Mean (SEM). Age and cortical thickness measures were continuous variables. Age, as a control variable, was centered at the group mean (72.55). CDR-SB, Clinical Dementia Rating Sum-of-Boxes; LTP, lateral temporo-parietal; MTL, medial temporal lobe; FFG, fusiform gyrus; SP, superior parietal; r, right; l, left. **p-value significant at Bonferroni-corrected level p < 0.0056 (α = 0.05, 9 models considered).

Next, to attain estimates of progression of clinical decline over time, we performed linear mixed effects models (LMEs) using mean cortical thickness, Aβ status (Aβ− or Aβ+), and their interaction with time, to predict change in CDR-SB (over 167 observations). We conducted three models (Table 3): the first model included only Aβ status (dichotomous), and its interaction with time; the second model included Aβ status, cortical thickness, and their interaction with time to probe for independent effects (the effects of cortical thickness from each significant cluster were assessed separately in different models); the third model included the three-way interaction of Aβ status × cortical thickness × time to investigate possible regional interactive effects on...
CDR-SB change. All LMEs included age and its interaction with time as covariates, and included a random intercept for each participant. Results were Bonferroni-corrected (α = 0.05, p-threshold = 0.0019, 27 models considered).

The fit of complex models was compared using the corrected-Akaike Information Criterion (AICc), a correction of the Akaike Information Criterion with a greater penalty for extra parameters in small data sets (decreasing the probability of selecting models that have many parameters). We also utilized the likelihood ratio and p-values from analyses of variance (ANOVAs) to assess the significance of the model comparisons [Table S1].

Lastly, to assess whether either a model with only Aβ burden or only medial temporal cortical thickness is better in predicting CDR-SB scores over time, we compared the Akaike weights of each LME model against the other. Specifically, we compared Akaike weights between Model I and Model III, and calculated an evidence ratio (Burnham et al., 2011).

To investigate whether our findings were restricted to brain regions demonstrating an association with Aβ burden (as defined by the vertex-wise analysis) or also seen in brain regions that show no association with Aβ burden, we also extracted cortical thickness values from a control region in the pre-central motor cortex as defined by the Desikan-Killiany atlas (Desikan et al., 2006) [Table 3].

To ensure that our effects were not driven by the inclusion of mild AD dementia cases, we performed additional LME models relating ROI cortical thickness to CDR-SB change in the MCI individuals only [Table S2].

Additionally, we performed a supplementary analysis investigating the contribution of intracranial volume corrected-hippocampal volume (HPV) on the three-way interactions found in Table 3 of ROI cortical thickness vs amyloid burden on CDR-SB change [Table S3]. This could help explain whether Aβ-neurodegeneration interactions predict clinical decline above HPV or not.

3. Results

3.1. Demographic characteristics by amyloid-status group

There were no significant differences between Aβ− and Aβ+ groups on any demographic variable [Table 1]. However, at baseline, Aβ+ individuals had lower MMSE scores (p = 0.002), and higher CDR-SB scores (Fig. 2a, p = 0.0002), than Aβ− individuals.

3.2. The association between amyloid burden and whole-brain cortical thickness

Regressing Aβ deposition as a continuous variable on cortical thickness vertex-wise across the entire cortical surface revealed significant negative associations in clusters encompassing the right lateral temporoparietal (LTP), right medial temporal lobe/fusiform gyrus (MTL/FFG), bilateral precuneus, right parietal superior (SP), right caudal middle frontal, right lingual/occipital, and left lateral occipital cortices (p < 0.05, cluster-wise corrected). Overall, at baseline, greater Aβ deposition was related with lower cortical thickness in an AD-like regional pattern [Fig. 1].

3.3. Aβ-associated baseline cortical thickness predicts baseline CDR-SB

Extracted baseline cortical thickness values from the right LTP, right MTL/FFG, right SP, right caudal middle frontal, right lingual/occipital, left lateral occipital, and bilateral precuneus, were associated with baseline CDR-SB scores (controlling for age, p < 0.01) [Table 2]. In contrast, baseline cortical thickness values from the bilateral motor cortex region did not show an association with baseline CDR-SB scores. Results are reported as significant after Bonferroni-correction (α = 0.05, p-threshold = 0.0056, 9 models considered).

3.4. Increased Aβ burden predicts change in CDR-SB

After accounting for age and its interaction with time, we found that baseline categorical Aβ (Aβ− vs Aβ+) predicted CDR-SB change across time (p < 0.0001), such that CDR-SB increased more so for Aβ+ individuals, than Aβ− individuals [Fig. 2B].

3.5. Independent versus interactive effects of cortical thickness and Aβ burden on predicting CDR-SB change

Accounting for age and its interaction with time, we investigated whether cortical thickness and Aβ burden independently contributed to or interacted in predicting change in CDR-SB over time. We found that Aβ burden and cortical thickness from the right LTP [Fig. 3A], right
precuneus [Fig. 3B], right SP [Fig. 3C], right caudal middle frontal [Fig. 3D], and left lateral occipital clusters [Fig. 3E], interacted in predicting CDR-SB change over time [see Table 3], showing that cortical thickness in these clusters predicted CDR-SB longitudinally in Aβ+ individuals, but not in Aβ− individuals.

For the right MTL/FFG cluster, the explained variance of baseline cortical thickness was completely shared with amyloid deposition, with amyloid being the strongest predictor of CDR-SB change [Table 3]. Left precuneus thickness explained significantly more variance than amyloid deposition in predicting CDR-SB change over time, and right lingual/occipital thickness predicted change over time, but without Aβ in the model [Table 3].

Model fit comparisons between two-way (Thickness × Time) and three-way interaction models (Aβ Status × Thickness × Time) indicated that modeling the three-way interactions statistically predicted CDR-SB change better than assessing the independent effects of the two-way interactions (right LTP, bilateral precuneus, right superior parietal, right caudal middle frontal, and left lateral lingual/occipital, p < 0.0001; right MTL/FFG, right lingual/occipital, p > 0.4) [Table S1].

In terms of whether Aβ burden predicted CDR-SB change better than medial temporal cortical thickness, we found that when comparing the AIC weights of a model with only Aβ in it (AIC-weight = 0.9998) with a model with only MTL/FFG cluster thickness (AIC-weight = 0.0002), the Aβ only model showed 4346.39 times more evidence (Burnham et al., 2011) of being the better model [see Fig. 4].

3.6. LME models using a control region

Lastly, in an LME model with precentral motor cortex thickness, covarying for age and its interaction with time, primary motor cortex thickness did not predict CDR-SB over time (p = 0.0956). Furthermore, in a model with both motor cortex thickness and Aβ Status, covarying for age and its interaction with time, we found that while motor cortex thickness was not a significant predictor of CDR-SB over time (p = 0.4508), the effect of Aβ Status × Time was significant (p < 0.0001) [Table 3].

3.7. Supplementary analysis excluding mild AD cases

Additional post-hoc LME models relating ROI cortical thinning with CDR-SB change excluding all mild AD cases showed equal results as those found when including these individuals [Table S2].

3.8. Supplementary three-way interaction models, covarying for hippocampal volume

Additionally, while not part of the cortical mantle or our original analysis, we performed the original three-way interaction models while covarying for intracranial volume-corrected bilateral hippocampal volume (HPV), investigating the effect above and beyond hippocampal volume, and found that the results remained unchanged even with hippocampal volume in the models (i.e., results remained the same as in Table 3), [Table S3].
Fig. 3. Lower cortical thickness at baseline predicts CDR-SB increase over time depending on amyloid status. Significant interactions of CDR-SB (Clinical Dementia Rating Sum-of-Boxes) over time by (A) right lateral temporo-parietal-thickness, (B) right precuneus-thickness, (C) right superior parietal-thickness, (D) right caudal middle frontal-thickness, (E) left lateral occipital-thickness. Colored lines represent: red, −1 standard deviation of the mean; blue, the mean; green, +1 standard deviation of the mean. Left Panel: $\beta^-$ individuals; Right Panel: $\beta^+$ individuals. While lower cortical thickness in these regions at baseline predicted greater increase in CDR-SB over time in $\beta^+$ individuals ($p < 0.0001$, right column), lower cortical thickness in these regions at baseline in $\beta^-$ individuals did not significantly predict change in CDR-SB ($p > 0.2$, left column). Models consisted of time, age centered at group mean (73.89), its interaction with time, and random individual intercepts.

4. Discussion

Here we aimed to investigate interactive and additive effects of amyloid and regional cortical thickness in predicting clinical decline over time. While previous studies have reported associations between CDR-SB increase and either cortical thickness in several regions or AD pathology, our study now shows that in memory impaired individuals, neocortical amyloid pathology and regional cortical thickness interact in predicting CDR-SB over time. Individuals with increased $\beta^+$ burden ($\beta^+\beta^+\beta^+$) and lower cortical thickness in right lateral temporo-parietal, right precuneus, right superior parietal, right caudal middle frontal, or left lateral occipital regions, showed greater CDR-SB over time than individuals with low $\beta$ burden ($\beta^-\beta^-\beta^-\beta^-\beta^-\beta^-$). Interestingly, when considering medial temporal lobe (MTL) thickness, neocortical amyloid pathology explained much more variance to clinical decline than thickness. These findings support the notion that AD-related pathology found within the MTL could reflect various age-related changes (Price et al., 2009; Savva et al., 2009; Raz et al., 2004; Jernigan et al., 1991). For example, Braak Stage I/II/III occurs largely within the MTL but is not always characterized by cognitive deficits (Delacourte et al., 2002; Delacourte et al., 1999; Braak and Braak, 1991). Excluding mild AD individuals from our linear mixed-effects models revealed that all these relationships remained significant, further suggesting that lower cortical thickness values in specific regions, vulnerable to amyloid pathology, predict clinical decline already at the prodromal stage.

Previous studies in older cognitively normal individuals have found that high $\beta^+$ burden is associated with lower cortical thickness in a specific set of regions, consisting of lateral parietal and posterior cingulate regions extending into the precuneus (Doré et al., 2013; Dickerson and Wolk, 2012; Becker et al., 2011; Fortea et al., 2011; Dickerson et al., 2009). Here we demonstrate a similar topography using an exploratory whole-brain approach relating $\beta^+$ to cortical thickness, validating that these regions are susceptible to AD pathology.

Our results showing a relationship between baseline cortical thickness and baseline CDR-SB are in accordance with previous studies. For instance, Dickerson et al. (2009), showed that a combination of medial temporal, inferior temporal, and inferior frontal cortical thickness ROIs provides the best model for cross-sectionally predicting CDR-SB (Dickerson et al., 2009). Similarly, our findings of baseline cortical thickness predicting change in CDR-SB is consistent with the findings from Vemuri et al. (2009), who found that an abnormal global brain structure index (“STAND” method) at baseline predicted CDR-SB increase over time, and better than [CSF] $\beta$ alone, a relationship most prominent in AD dementia patients as compared with amnestic MCI or clinically normal individuals (Vemuri et al., 2009). Importantly however, while global markers can be valuable for predicting disease progression (Eskildsen et al., 2013) as they are easy to implement in clinical settings, regional information is lost when combining regions together, and this also adds noise to the prediction model.

In the current study, we found that cortical thickness of the right precuneus, right caudal middle frontal, left lateral occipital cortex, right superior parietal lobule and right lateral temporal cortex predicted clinical decline in $\beta^+$ individuals. In particular, we found that the $\beta^+$ group had more variability than the $\beta^-$ group, driving these interactions (see Fig. 2a for a depiction of the variance between the two groups), such that $\beta^+$ individuals declined slower than $\beta^+$ individuals. This validates previous findings and suggests that individuals with increased $\beta$ burden have increased regional neurodegeneration, which in turn predicts clinical decline, as compared to individuals with low $\beta$ burden. For example, the co-occurrence of high $\beta^+$ and neurodegeneration has been shown to be predictive of cognitive decline even in clinically-normal (CN) individuals (Mormino et al., 2014a). Our results are in accordance with these previous findings in CN, and extend into the prodromal and clinical stage of AD.

Our findings suggest, consistent with the amyloid-cascade hypothesis, that the predictive value for disease progression using neocortical
thickness values from amyloid-associated regions is stronger when cognitively impaired individuals are Aβ+, and these associations seem to be specific to regions vulnerable to amyloid pathology. For example, using a control region in the premotor cortex revealed no association with cortical thickness, nor an interaction between cortical thickness and amyloid burden on CDR-SB change. Although we acknowledge that caution should be made on the generalizability of these findings to other brain regions not detected in our vertex-wise analysis, these results suggest that the interaction of amyloid and cortical thickness presented in the manuscript is restricted to Aβ-associated cortical regions.

While MTL thickness (on its own) marginally predicted clinical decline, these associations were similar for Aβ+ and Aβ− individuals, suggesting that the underlying structural correlates could be explained by a combination of both AD and non-AD pathology (see Freeze et al., 2017; Villeneuve et al., 2014). Jacobs et al. (2011) have previously shown that MTL atrophy alone is not sufficient in predicting conversion to AD dementia, and atrophy of the MTL has been previously related to normal aging (Raz et al., 2004; Jernigan et al., 1991). Furthermore, in CN individuals, MTL pathology may not necessarily be only related to amyloid (Morris et al., 2016; Jagust and Morris, 2011). This ultimately raises the question of whether thickness values across MTL regions behave differently, and whether they should potentially be excluded from future “signature” regions and aggregates for predicting clinical decline.

While we did not include hippocampal volume in our primary analyses as the hippocampus is not part of the cortical mantle and our approach was exploratory in that we used a voxel-wise surface-based approach, we conducted supplementary analyses investigating the influence of hippocampal volume on our longitudinal three-way interactions of cortical thickness × Aβ status × time, predicting CDR-SB change. Those results demonstrated that with hippocampal volume covaried for in the models, all relationships from our main analysis remained statistically significant, further supporting the possibility that atrophy in the MTL regions may not provide any additional information above Aβ burden and neocortical atrophy in relation to clinical decline.

While atrophy could be associated with several underlying pathologies, including vascular lesions, Lewy bodies, or neurofibrillary tangles, the spatial pattern of cortical thinning found in the current study seems, to some extent, spatially similar to the topography of tau pathology. Including information on tau pathology in models like the ones in the current study could further help elucidate the contribution of both Aβ and tau AD pathology markers on processes related to cortical thinning and clinical decline. For example, in preclinical AD patients, lower cortical thickness values in regions similar to the ones found in the current study have been shown to relate with higher levels of CSF phosphorylated tau (Pettigrew et al., 2016). Furthermore, phosphorylated tau-dependent cortical thinning has been observed in amyloid positive individuals (Fortea et al., 2014; Desikan et al., 2011), and Aβ-associated clinical decline has been shown to occur only in the presence of elevated phosphorylated tau (Pascoal et al., 2016; Desikan et al., 2012), demonstrating the complex, interacting relationships across molecular, morphological and clinical variables. To what extent tau pathology explains additional unique variance for predicting clinical decline within the context of amyloid pathology and cortical thinning can now be investigated with novel PET tau tracers (Johnson et al., 2016). For example, similarly to a previously found association between Flortaucipir (FTP) tau binding and temporo-parietal brain tissue loss in AD patients (Xia et al., 2017) and clinically normal individuals (LaPoint et al., 2017; Sepulcre et al., 2016), here we observe a similar spatial topography (e.g., in the temporo-parietal cortex) when relating Aβ to cortical thickness.

We acknowledge several limitations to our study. First, as we used baseline MRI and PET data, we cannot infer causality or direction of effect between Aβ retention and cortical thinning. Additionally, all individuals were highly educated, which could potentially provide cognitive reserve, delaying clinical decline in the context of brain pathology. Additionally, due to the relatively small sample size, future studies should reproduce the results found in the present study in larger samples. Furthermore, although there is no consensus regarding how to best capture clinical change, here we used the CDR as it includes a global and ‘sum-of-boxes’ score, combines a clinical interview and information from an informant, and has been shown to have excellent inter-rater reliability (Morris, 1997). In addition, the CDR-SB uses a continuous scale, which enhances its sensitivity for staging dementia severity across subjects as well as tracking individual changes over time (O’Bryant et al., 2008).

5. Conclusion

Using a surface-based whole-brain approach in a group of memory-impaired individuals, we found that greater neocortical Aβ was associated with lower cortical thickness consistent with previously reported structural patterns. Lower cortical thickness values predicted greater clinical decline over time in amyloid positive individuals, but not in amyloid negative individuals. However, associations between baseline medial temporal lobe thickness and clinical decline were similar for amyloid positive and amyloid negative individuals, and amyloid was overall a much stronger predictor of clinical decline than medial temporal lobe thickness. These relationships remained even when excluding patients with AD dementia. Overall, these findings may help reveal brain-behavior patterns that could enhance the prognosis of dementia among cognitively impaired individuals.
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