Collaborative work on characteristics of asymptomatic people with Alzheimer's disease neuropathologic change
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ABSTRACT

Objectives: We sought to identify demographic and clinical features that were associated with expression of symptoms in the presence of Alzheimer disease (AD) neuropathologic changes.

Methods: We studied 82 asymptomatic (Clinical Dementia Rating global score = 0) and 824 symptomatic subjects (Clinical Dementia Rating score >0) with low to high AD neuropathologic changes at autopsy who were assessed at 1 of 34 National Institute on Aging–funded Alzheimer's Disease Centers. All subjects underwent a clinical examination within 1 year of death. Logistic regression was used to evaluate factors associated with the odds of being asymptomatic vs symptomatic.
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Genetic differences: sx vs asx

From ADGC
Neuropathology → Symptoms

Demographics
Genetic status
Comorbid conditions (e.g. vascular disease)
Environmental influences
Cognitive reserve
National Institute on Aging–Alzheimer’s Association guidelines for the neuropathologic assessment of Alzheimer’s disease: a practical approach
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Table 2 “ABC” score for AD neuropathologic change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“A”</th>
<th>Thal Phase for Aβ plaques [57]</th>
<th>“B”</th>
<th>Braak and Braak NFT stage [14,15]</th>
<th>“C”</th>
<th>CERAD neuritic plaque score [41]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I or II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sparse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>III or IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>V or VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusion:
A: Thal phase ≥ 1 (any diffuse plaque)
OR
C: C ≥ 1 (any neuritic plaques)
Clinical status

CDR (Clinical Dementia Rating) global score at last clinical assessment:

• 0 = asymptomatic
• 0.5 or higher = symptomatic

≤ 1 year between last clinical assessment and autopsy.
Scatter-plot by B and C score

893 (91.5%) CDR ≥ 0.5 (symptomatic)
83 (8.5%) CDR = 0 (asymptomatic)
### Multivariable logistic regression: odds of being asymptomatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Full Model (n=559)</th>
<th>Without APOE (n=665)</th>
<th>Without APOE &amp; HIS (n=845)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>95% CI*</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at last visit</td>
<td>1.04 (1.01,1.07)</td>
<td>1.05 (1.02,1.08)</td>
<td>1.05 (1.02,1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (at least some college vs. no college)</td>
<td>1.46 (0.71,2.99)</td>
<td>1.52 (0.76,3.07)</td>
<td>1.82 (0.91,3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression (present within the past 2 years vs. absent)</td>
<td>0.65 (0.33,1.26)</td>
<td><strong>0.51 (0.26,0.99)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.43 (0.23,0.80)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female vs. male)</td>
<td>1.21 (0.66,2.21)</td>
<td>1.47 (0.82,2.63)</td>
<td>1.39 (0.81,2.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hachinski Ischemic Score</td>
<td><strong>0.82 (0.69,0.97)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.81 (0.69,0.96)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOE (e4 vs. no e4)</td>
<td><strong>0.36 (0.16,0.83)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B score (continuous)</td>
<td><strong>0.28 (0.17,0.45)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.26 (0.16,0.42)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.23 (0.15,0.36)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C score (continuous)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.62,1.36)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.64,1.42)</td>
<td>1.04 (0.72,1.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewy body pathology (present vs. not present)</td>
<td>0.68 (0.24,1.97)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.27,1.65)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.24,1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyloid angiopathy (present vs. not present)</td>
<td>0.69 (0.37,1.28)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.32,1.04)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.38,1.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

APOE

Still strong association with outcome even after adjusting for AD NP (B & C scores).
SIGNIFICANCE

One of first applications of NIA-AA guidelines

Proposed method for converting existing NP data in NACC database to NIA-AA format (Newer NP10 data have Thal phase, since beginning of 2014).

Useful for future studies on early AD using NACC NP data
SIGNIFICANCE

One of first applications of NIA-AA guidelines

Proposed method for converting existing NP data in NACC database to NIA-AA format (Newer NP data have Thal phase, since beginning of 2015).

Useful for future studies on early AD using NACC NP data
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I. Performance on neuropsychological tests.

- **Specific aims:**
  1. To determine whether persons with AD neuropathologic change and CDR global score of 0 have more subtle changes that are detectable by neuropsychological tests.
  2. To determine the clinical and neuropathologic features affecting these changes.
  3. To determine the trajectory of these changes over time.
  4. Secondary specific aim: Determine whether there are any neuropsychological tests that are particularly sensitive as an early sign of AD and which thus might be useful in clinical trials involving preclinical cases of AD.
Neuropsychological tests

• Three related papers: underway / planned

• 1. Trajectory over time:
  – AD NP vs no AD NP (all with CDR = 0).

• 2. Differences at baseline visit: progressors vs non-progressors.
  – (progressors: AD NP, CDR = 0 on initial visit; but develop MCI or dementia).

• 3. Determinants within AD NP
  – Not so much to show, but negative results might still be useful.
Cognitive Measures

• Cognitive Composites of UDS Measures
  (Hayden et al. 2011 ADAD)
  – Episodic Memory: WMS-R Logical Memory Immediate & Delayed Recall
  – Language: Boston Naming Test, Animal Naming, Vegetable Naming
  – Attention & Working Memory: WMS-R Digit Span Forward & Backwards
  – Executive Function: Trailmaking Test Parts A & B, WAIS Digit-Symbol
  – Global Composite: All measures above
211 participants who were never symptomatic (CDR 0), but died with significant levels of AD neuropathology (n=131), or who had no evidence of AD neuropathology (n=80).

Working memory/Attention declined faster in AD-NP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>No. of subject-visits</th>
<th>Annual mean change for AD-NP (95% CI)(^a,b)</th>
<th>Annual mean change for non-AD-NP (95% CI)(^a,b)</th>
<th>Annual mean difference between AD-NP and non-AD-NP (95% CI)(^a)</th>
<th>p Value(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Episodic memory</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>0.08 (−0.09, 0.25)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.08, 0.25)</td>
<td>−0.09 (−0.19, 0.02)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>−0.04 (−0.18, 0.09)</td>
<td>0.02 (−0.04, 0.08)</td>
<td>−0.07 (−0.15, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>−0.09 (−0.23, 0.06)</td>
<td>0.02 (−0.05, 0.09)</td>
<td>−0.11 (−0.19, −0.02)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive function</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>−0.02 (−0.24, 0.19)</td>
<td>0.01 (−0.09, 0.12)</td>
<td>−0.03 (−0.16, 0.09)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global composite</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>−0.02 (−0.15, 0.12)</td>
<td>0.06 (−0.01, 0.13)</td>
<td>−0.08 (−0.15, 0.00)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: AD = Alzheimer disease; CDR = Clinical Dementia Rating; CI = confidence interval; NP = neuropathologic.

\(^a\) Adjusted for age at visit; education; sex; presence of ischemic, hemorrhagic, or vascular pathology; presence of cerebral amyloid angiopathy; and presence of Lewy body pathology.

\(^b\) Interpretation: a negative mean annual change indicates a decline in cognition, whereas a positive slope indicates improvement in scores over time.
Significance

- Attention/working memory as earliest changes in preclinical AD
  - Balota et al, Psychol Aging, 2010
  - Tse et al, Neuropsychology, 2010
  - Storandt et al, Arch Neurol, 2009

- Subtle changes in preclinical AD more likely to be detected by changes over time
  - Knopman et al, Neurodegener Dis Manag 2012
  - Riley et al, J Alz Dis, 2011
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GWAS / IGAP genes

• Most studies have compared genetic profiles of clinically-diagnosed cases of dementia or MCI with non-demented controls.

• Recently, several studies have assessed association of these loci with AD NP at autopsy.
  - Genetic profiles of people with clinical dementia and mod to high AD NP vs controls without dementia and no or low AD NP
  - 14 (of 22) loci associated with dementia and AD NP
    • (Shulman 2013; Beecham 2014; Chibnik 2011, Kramer 2011)
• Potential associations between expression of existing AD NP and other (non-APOE) loci not yet explored.

• Findings could potentially explain some of the variation in determining whether a person with AD NP would express symptoms or not.

• Identify pathways to disease heterogeneity.
II. Genetic differences between symptomatic and asymptomatic persons with AD neuropathologic change.

Specific aim:

• 1. To determine the differences in the proportions of persons having different alleles that have been associated with higher risks of AD for symptomatic (CDR global > 0) vs. asymptomatic (CDR global = 0) persons with AD neuropathologic change.
Data

• NACC UDS and NP data linked with:
• ADGC data for:
  – 9 loci with GWAS defined associations
  – 12 loci identified by IGAP
  – MAPT
• Inclusion criteria: AD NP as per prior 2 studies
  – 521 with symptoms (CDR global > 0)
  – 68 without symptoms (CDR = 0)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>SNP</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>OR in APOE e4 carriers (95% CI)</th>
<th>OR in APOE e4 non-carriers (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>rs6656401</td>
<td>1.46 (0.85,2.49)</td>
<td>1.56 (0.53,4.53)</td>
<td>1.44 (0.76,2.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN1</td>
<td>rs6733839</td>
<td>0.96 (0.63,1.46)</td>
<td>1.02 (0.41,2.54)</td>
<td>1.06 (0.65,1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD2AP</td>
<td>rs10948363</td>
<td>0.73 (0.50,1.09)</td>
<td><strong>0.35 (0.16,0.75)</strong></td>
<td>0.99 (0.62,1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLA-DRB5/HLA-DRB1</td>
<td>rs9271192</td>
<td>1.01 (0.67,1.50)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.41,2.11)</td>
<td>1.03 (0.64,1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPHA1</td>
<td>rs11771145</td>
<td>0.96 (0.65,1.41)</td>
<td>1.29 (0.60,2.77)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.56,1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLU</td>
<td>rs9331896</td>
<td>0.83 (0.55,1.25)</td>
<td>1.18 (0.49,2.87)</td>
<td>0.73 (0.45,1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTK2B</td>
<td>rs28834970</td>
<td>1.22 (0.85,1.77)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.66,2.88)</td>
<td>1.10 (0.71,1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4A4A</td>
<td>rs983392</td>
<td>1.29 (0.88,1.90)</td>
<td>1.57 (0.73,3.40)</td>
<td>1.19 (0.75,1.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICALM</td>
<td>rs10792832</td>
<td>1.16 (0.80,1.70)</td>
<td>1.03 (0.46,2.30)</td>
<td>1.15 (0.75,1.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORL1</td>
<td>rs11218343</td>
<td>1.72 (0.68,4.33)</td>
<td>2.99 (0.76,11.75)</td>
<td>1.45 (0.38,5.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC24A4/RIN3</td>
<td>rs10498633</td>
<td>1.24 (0.83,1.87)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.66,3.43)</td>
<td>1.15 (0.71,1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG2</td>
<td>rs8093731</td>
<td>0.96 (0.12,7.86)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.94 (0.11,8.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCA7</td>
<td>rs4147929</td>
<td><strong>1.66 (1.00,2.76)</strong></td>
<td>1.25 (0.52,3.02)</td>
<td>1.81 (0.97,3.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD33</td>
<td>rs3865444</td>
<td>1.26 (0.87,1.83)</td>
<td>1.28 (0.60,2.70)</td>
<td>1.44 (0.93,2.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS4</td>
<td>rs7274581</td>
<td>1.12 (0.62,2.04)</td>
<td>1.53 (0.54,4.35)</td>
<td>1.03 (0.49,2.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NME8</td>
<td>rs2718058</td>
<td>0.77 (0.51,1.15)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.40,2.02)</td>
<td>0.74 (0.46,1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELF1</td>
<td>rs10838725</td>
<td>0.99 (0.67,1.46)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.34,1.46)</td>
<td>1.14 (0.70,1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERMT2</td>
<td>rs17125944</td>
<td>1.69 (0.76,3.74)</td>
<td>3.05 (0.39,23.66)</td>
<td>1.41 (0.58,3.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPP5D</td>
<td>rs35349669</td>
<td>0.88 (0.61,1.28)</td>
<td>1.07 (0.50,2.27)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.49,1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEF2C</td>
<td>rs190982</td>
<td>1.24 (0.84,1.82)</td>
<td>1.03 (0.45,2.36)</td>
<td>1.15 (0.74,1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCWPW1</td>
<td>rs1476679</td>
<td>1.31 (0.87,1.96)</td>
<td><strong>2.98 (1.33,6.69)</strong></td>
<td>1.04 (0.63,1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPT</td>
<td>rs393152</td>
<td><strong>2.18 (1.26,3.75)</strong></td>
<td>3.73 (1.27,10.97)</td>
<td>1.77 (0.93,3.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Odds ratio (adjusted for age and sex) for symptomatic AD vs. asymptomatic AD for each SNP and stratified by APOE e4 carrier status assuming an additive mode of inheritance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>SNP</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>OR in APOE e4 carriers</th>
<th>OR in APOE e4 non-carriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD2AP</td>
<td>rs10948363</td>
<td>0.73 (0.50,1.09)</td>
<td><strong>0.35 (0.16,0.75)</strong></td>
<td>0.99 (0.62,1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCA7</td>
<td>rs4147929</td>
<td><strong>1.66 (1.00,2.76)</strong></td>
<td>1.25 (0.52,3.02)</td>
<td>1.81 (0.97,3.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCWPW1</td>
<td>rs1476679</td>
<td>1.31 (0.87,1.96)</td>
<td><strong>2.98 (1.33,6.69)</strong></td>
<td>1.04 (0.63,1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPT</td>
<td>rs393152</td>
<td><strong>2.18 (1.26,3.75)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.73 (1.27,10.97)</strong></td>
<td>1.77 (0.93,3.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABCA7**: Lipid metabolism; immune function

**Loci associated with CD2AP**: neuritic plaque burden; modulating a-beta clearance

**Loci associated with ZCWPW1**: little known about possible function

**MAPT**: tau encoding gene
Conclusions: NACC collaboration with ADCs

- ADCs: use UDS data by themselves.
- Smaller #: consultation with NACC staff.
- Develop ideas collaboratively.
Extra slides
Statistical analysis

• Table 1: asymptomatic and symptomatic demographic and neuropathologic differences assessed using chi square and t-tests

• Table 2: Additive test to explore association between number of risk alleles and asymptomatic status (CDR = 0) for each of the 21 SNPs

• Table 2: Additive to test to explore differences stratified by APOE e4 carrier status
## Risk score data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>19 SNPs with &lt;10% missing data&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>21 SNPs with &lt;15% missing data&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>All 22 SNPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>419</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>(1.60,4.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APOE e4 carriers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>(1.55,17.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APOE e4 non-carriers</strong></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>(1.29,4.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

NACC UDS NPDS (n=3345)

Low to High AD Neuropathologic Change
Died w/in 2 years of last visit
(n=2381)

Clinical Dementia Rating of 0 at baseline
Completed at least 2 visits
(n=314)

Progressed to CDR > 0
(n=173)

Non-Progressor CDR 0
(n=141)
Model 2: Age, Gender, Education, Infarcts, Lacunes, Hemorrhages, Microbleeds, Arteriosclerosis, Cerebral Amyloid Angiopathy
Summary

• In a large, autopsy-confirmed AD sample, those who progressed to symptomatic AD during life had **widespread** cognitive deficits at baseline.

• On average, Progressors performed 0.33 SDs worse than Non-Progressors and up to 0.6 SDs worse on Executive Functioning.

• Differences were not related to vascular neuropathology.