

## **HHS Public Access**

Author manuscript

Lab Invest. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2019 August 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Lab Invest. 2019 July; 99(7): 1049-1055. doi:10.1038/s41374-019-0186-0.

# Clinical diagnoses among individuals with primary age-related tauopathy versus Alzheimer's neuropathology

Merilee Teylan, MPH<sup>1</sup>, Lilah M. Besser, PhD, MSPH<sup>2</sup>, John F. Crary, MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>, Charles Mock, MD, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Kathryn Gauthreaux, MS<sup>1</sup>, Nicole M. Thomas, BS<sup>1</sup>, Yen-Chi Chen, PhD<sup>1</sup>, and Walter A. Kukull, PhD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

<sup>3</sup>Departments of Pathology and Neuroscience, Friedman Brain Institute, Ronald M. Loeb Center for Alzheimer's Disease, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY

#### **Abstract**

Primary age-related tauopathy (PART) is increasingly recognized as a pathologic entity distinct from Alzheimer's disease (AD). Given that the diagnosis of PART is an autopsy diagnosis, it is unclear how PART is perceived in clinical practice. Thus, we investigated the presumptive primary and contributing diagnoses in individuals who had cognitive impairment while alive and who met neuropathologic criteria for PART at autopsy. We also compared these clinical diagnoses for people with PART to those with AD neuropathology (ADNP). We used data on 1,354 participants from the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center, restricting to those with no neuritic plaques (PART) or moderate/frequent neuritic plaques (ADNP); clinical visit within two years of autopsy; and mild cognitive impairment (MCI) or dementia at last visit. To assess if PART participants were less likely to receive a clinical diagnosis of AD at their last visit prior to autopsy, we used logistic regression, controlling for age, sex, education, and APOE & status. There were 161 PART individuals (n=49 MCI; n=112 dementia) and 1,193 individuals with ADNP (n=75 MCI; n=1,118 dementia). Primary clinical diagnosis of AD was more common in those with ADNP (MCI: 69%; demented: 86%) than PART (MCI: 57%; demented: 52%). In the adjusted analysis, primary and contributing clinical diagnoses of AD remained less likely in PART versus ADNP participants with dementia (OR: 0.22, 95% CI: 0.13-0.38). This study suggests that clinicians recognize a distinction in the clinical presentation between PART and ADNP, diagnosing AD less frequently in

DISCLOSURE/CONFLICT OF INTEREST

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL

Users may view, print, copy, and download text and data-mine the content in such documents, for the purposes of academic research, subject always to the full Conditions of use: http://www.nature.com/authors/editorial\_policies/license.html#terms

Address for correspondence: Merilee Teylan, MPH, National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center, 4311 11th Ave NE #300, Seattle WA 98105, (206)616-6208, mateylan@uw.edu.

Ms. Teylan reports no disclosures.

Dr. Besser reports no disclosures.

Dr. Crary reports no disclosures.

Dr. Mock reports no disclosures.

Ms. Gauthreaux reports no disclosures.

Ms. Thomas reports no disclosers.

Dr. Chen reports no disclosures.

Dr. Kukull reports no disclosures.

those with PART. Nonetheless, clinical AD was diagnosed greater than 50% of the time in PART participants with MCI or dementia. Ante-mortem criteria for diagnosis of PART need to be established, as PART is a neuropathological entity that is distinct from AD and has its own clinical and cognitive outcomes.

#### INTRODUCTION

Increasing attention is being given to the neuropathological entity of primary age-related tauopathy (PART). This has been recognized as a neuropathologically overlapping yet separate category from Alzheimer's disease (AD). Both have similar features of neuronal tau deposits and eventual temporal lobe neurodegeneration. However, PART arises in the absence of the amyloid deposits that currently typify AD. The two conditions also have different clinical manifestations, with PART arising at an older age and being less likely to lead to more severe cognitive dysfunction (1–4).

Thus far, most studies of PART have focused on autopsy findings, with only a handful of studies investigating the clinical diagnoses given to individuals who are later determined to have PART at autopsy. Several older studies, which predate the establishment of PART as a separate diagnostic category, did report on symptoms and diagnoses of people with senile dementia of the tangle type or with neurofibrillary tangle predominant form of senile dementia, both of which are older terms encompassing cases on the severe end of cases now considered on the PART continuum <sup>(2, 5, 6)</sup>. While amnestic symptoms were considered dominant in these small studies, psychiatric (e.g., psychotic) symptoms were also noted <sup>(5)</sup>. One of these earlier studies reported on 11 cases, all of whom had been diagnosed with possible or probable AD during life <sup>(6–8)</sup>.

More recently, biomarker studies have increased the recognition of amyloid negative yet neurodegeneration positive persons. This has been termed suspected non-Alzheimer disease pathophysiology (SNAP) and appears to overlap with PART. Similar to PART, persons with SNAP test negative for amyloid deposits in the brain, but have other markers of neurodegeneration; although SNAP is based on ante-mortem biomarker assessment. Several different underlying neuropathological diagnoses, including PART, appear to be associated with SNAP. However, SNAP has primarily been a research term and has only been minimally utilized in clinical practice <sup>(2, 9–11)</sup>.

To better understand how PART is being or not being recognized in current clinical practice, we sought to identify the primary and contributing diagnoses in individuals who clinically presented with MCI or dementia and who met neuropathologic criteria for PART at autopsy. We also sought to compare these diagnoses for people with PART to those with AD neuropathology (ADNP) and to determine if individuals with PART less frequently received a clinical diagnosis of AD compared to those with ADNP.

### **METHODS**

#### **Data Source and Study Sample**

Data were obtained from the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) Uniform Data Set (UDS) and Neuropathology Data Set. NACC is a data repository for over thirty past and present NIA-funded Alzheimer's Disease Centers (ADC) from across the United States. ADCs contribute data to the UDS, a standardized set of clinical assessments that are collected approximately annually from ADC clinical core participants. Written informed consents were obtained from participants at each ADC and approved by the ADC's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Standardized postmortem neuropathological evaluations are obtained from a subset of ADC participants that consent to autopsy. Research using the NACC database was approved by the University of Washington IRB. The UDS and Neuropathology Data Set data are described in detail elsewhere (12–15).

As of the December 2017 freeze, data from 36,769 participants were included in the UDS, of which, 4,964 had neuropathology data. Hence, data had been collected between September 2005 and December 2017. Participants were included in this analysis if they had an autopsy within two years of their last UDS visit and had MCI or dementia at that visit. Participants were excluded if they were missing a primary clinical etiologic diagnosis, were missing data on CERAD neuritic plaques, or had any of the following comorbidities: neuropathological Lewy body disease (including amygdala-predominant), neuropathological prion disease, frontotemporal lobar degeneration (FTLD) neuropathology with tau inclusions, FTLD neuropathology with transactive response DNA-binding protein 43 (TDP-43), FTLD neuropathology not otherwise specified, or neuropathological amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS). The sample included 1,354 participants with either no neuritic plaques (i.e., PART) or moderate or frequent neuritic plaques (i.e., ADNP).

#### **Clinical Diagnosis**

At each UDS visit, participants are assessed for cognitive status (i.e., normal cognition, MCI, or dementia). If symptomatic (MCI or dementia) for cognitive impairment, participants are assigned a presumptive etiologic diagnosis. In other words, the underlying pathologic cause (presumptive etiologic diagnosis) of the cognitive disorder is assigned and a determination is made whether the given diagnosis is a primary, contributing, or noncontributing cause of the observed impairment. Diagnosis by single clinician, formal consensus panel, or other diagnostic methods is dependent on the routine practice at each ADC; however, all ADCs follow standard guidelines for the clinical diagnostic criteria for a cognitive disorder. In this paper, clinical diagnosis refers to the presumptive etiologic diagnosis made at the most recent UDS visit prior to autopsy, and we examine the distribution of these clinical diagnoses by the cognitive status assigned at the same visit.

#### Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were conducted using SAS version 9.4, and were stratified by cognitive status at last UDS visit (MCI or dementia). Independent *t* tests and Chi-square analysis were used to assess whether subjects with PART and those with ADNP differed by demographics, apolipoprotein (*APOE*) & carrier status, depression and AD clinical

diagnosis at last UDS visit, history of TBI, amnestic vs non-amnestic MCI (MCI participants only), and cerebrovascular neuropathological features. Exact Chi-square analysis was used if any cell sizes were less than 5. Multivariable logistic regression was used to assess if PART participants were significantly less likely to receive a primary or contributing clinical diagnosis of AD at their last visit. Models were adjusted for age at death, sex, education, and presence of 1 *APOE* e4 allele. Generalized estimating equations were used to account for ADC clustering.

#### **RESULTS**

Our final sample included a total of 1,354 participants, with 161 individuals with PART (i.e., no neuritic plaques) and 1,193 individuals with ADNP (i.e., moderate or frequent neuritic plaques). The PART and ADNP groups were stratified by cognitive status at their last UDS visit which resulted in 49 PART-MCI, 112 PART-dementia, 75 AD-MCI, and 1,118 AD-dementia. Our analyses excluded 155 PART and 86 ADNP participants who were diagnosed with normal cognition at their UDS visit prior to autopsy. Demographic and clinical characteristics, as well as cerebrovascular neuropathological features of the groups are described in Table 1. In those with MCI, ADNP participants were significantly more likely to be an *APOE* e4 carrier than those with PART (ADNP: 32.4%, PART: 15.2% PART, p=0.04). A larger difference in *APOE* e4 carriers was seen between ADNP-dementia and PART-dementia participants, with a reported 55.1% of ADNP-dementia participants having at least one *APOE* e4 allele, compared to 14.9% in those with PART-dementia (p<0.0001). PART-dementia participants were more likely to have microinfarcts (ADNP: 17.8%, PART: 26.8%, p=0.02) and infarcts or lacunes (ADNP: 20.9%, PART: 33.9%, p=0.0008) than those with ADNP-dementia.

Among PART-MCI, 57.1% were given a primary clinical diagnosis of AD (Table 2). Those who were not clinically diagnosed with AD were most commonly diagnosed with vascular brain injury (VBI; 8.2%), ALS (6.1%), and multiple system atrophy (MSA; 6.1%). Similarly, in those with ADNP-MCI, AD was the most frequent primary clinical diagnosis (69.3%), with VBI as the second most frequent primary clinical diagnosis (17.3%).

Clinical presentation for those with ADNP-dementia appeared to be more consistent from other cognitive disorders, as 85.8% received a primary clinical diagnosis of AD, compared to PART-dementia who were diagnosed with primary AD only 51.8% of the time (Table 2). This difference in the distribution of AD clinical diagnosis between ADNP-dementia and PART-dementia was statistically significant (p<0.0001; not shown). PART-dementia participants, who were not diagnosed with primary AD, often received diagnoses of VBI (17.0%) or primary progressive aphasia/behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia (PPA/bvFTD; 12.5%).

Seventeen participants with PART-dementia (15.2%; Table 3), who were not diagnosed with AD as their primary clinical diagnosis, had AD reported as a contributing clinical diagnosis. VBI, depression, and systemic disease/medical illness were recurrent contributing clinical diagnoses among all four groups, although with varying frequency between groups.

Contributing clinical diagnoses of depression were more common in those with PART than ADNP, in both MCI and dementia groups.

In the logistic regression analyses examining the odds of a clinical diagnosis of AD among those with PART compared to ADNP, reports of primary or contributing clinical diagnosis of AD were combined (Tables 4 & 5). Unadjusted models found that participants with primary/contributing clinical AD-MCI were often older at death than those who were not diagnosed with AD (OR: 1.07; 95% CI: 10.1–1.13). Older death age (OR: 1.05; 95% CI 1.04–1.06) and presence of an *APOE* &4 allele (OR: 1.66; 95% CI: 1.13–2.44) was observed more in those who were diagnosed with a primary/contributing clinical AD-dementia than in those who were not. Male sex (OR: 0.65; 95% CI 0.50–0.85) was less frequent among those with a clinical primary/contributing AD-dementia diagnosis.

Primary/contributing clinical diagnoses of AD was less likely in participants with PART neuropathology versus ADNP participants with dementia (OR: 0.19; 95% CI: 0.12–0.31; Table 4). Even after adjusting for age at death, sex, education, and *APOE* &4 allele carrier status, this relationship persisted (OR: 0.22, 95% CI: 0.13–0.38; Table 5).

#### DISCUSSION

In this study, we report the primary and contributing diagnoses in individuals who had antemortem clinical presentation of MCI or dementia and who met neuropathological criteria for PART at eventual autopsy. We found that people who had PART were most commonly categorized as AD, especially during the MCI stage. The percent of people diagnosed as having AD was less in the dementia stage, but even then, the majority of people with PART were still being diagnosed as having AD. Nonetheless, almost half of people with PART and dementia were diagnosed as something other than AD, particularly primary progressive aphasia/behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia (PPA/bvFTD), or vascular brain injury.

Given that AD is highly prevalent, and that there are currently no ante-mortem diagnostic criteria for PART, it is not surprising that most individuals who eventually were determined to have PART were diagnosed as having AD while alive. Moreover, given that mixed pathology is common in the elderly <sup>(16)</sup>, and that PART is relatively less symptomatic than AD, other pathologies may indeed be playing a role in the production of symptoms of people who had underlying PART neuropathology. For example, the 17% of people with PART and dementia who were diagnosed as having vascular brain injury may have had either the vascular insult as a contributor to or cause of their cognitive impairment, with PART itself playing a lesser or non-existent role. It is also notable that the assignment of the diagnosis of AD was similar between PART and ADNP for participants with MCI. However, in those with dementia, the distribution diverged, with 86% of persons with ADNP being assigned a diagnosis of AD, in comparison to only 52% of participants with PART. Thus, it appears that clinicians are perceiving a notable difference in how dementia symptoms manifest clinically in people with PART neuropathology in comparison to people with ADNP.

In the literature, several older studies reported on symptoms and diagnoses of people with senile dementia of the tangle type or with neurofibrillary tangle predominant form of senile dementia, both of which are older terms for what has now been termed PART <sup>(2, 5, 6)</sup>. One of these earlier studies reported on 10 cases, all of whom had been diagnosed with possible or probable AD during life <sup>(6)</sup>. In 2003, one study suggested criteria for clinical diagnosis of "senile dementia of the neurofibrillary tangle type (tangle-only dementia)". These criteria included later age at onset, isolated memory disturbance at onset, slower progression, and CT or MRI findings of mild to moderate diffuse cortical and hippocampal atrophy with enlarged inferior horns of the lateral ventricles. However, the author went on to caution that development of reliable diagnostic tests would be necessary to reliably differentiate this entity from AD or other neurodegenerative dementias <sup>(17)</sup>. The current study adds to the literature by having a larger sample size (161 people with PART), by applying the latest consensus definition of PART <sup>(18)</sup>, and by undertaking a comparison with people with ADNP. The current study also shows new findings of potential non-amnestic symptoms, as indicated by the assignment of diagnoses such as PPA and bvFTD.

In recent years, the category of suspected non-Alzheimer disease pathophysiology (SNAP) has been increasingly recognized in living persons. SNAP denotes the finding of neurodegeneration in the absence of amyloid deposits in the brain. It may be present in persons independent of the presence, absence, or severity of cognitive impairment. The determination of SNAP is based primarily on biomarkers, including fluid biomarkers and neuroimagining. SNAP appears to overlap with PART. Although autopsy correlations have been limited thus far, several underlying neuropathological diagnoses appear to be associated with SNAP, including PART, hippocampal sclerosis, argyrophilic grain disease, cerebrovascular disorders, mixed pathologies, and TDP-43, among others. The relative proportions of each of these neuropathologic diagnoses in people with SNAP have not been well worked out <sup>(2, 9–11)</sup>. There is also some evidence that the overlap between SNAP and PART may be fairly minimal, at least in people who are clinically normal. For example, one recent study looked at clinically normal people with SNAP and found minimal evidence of elevated tau on PET imaging <sup>(19)</sup>. Moreover, SNAP has primarily been a research term and has only been minimally utilized in clinical practice <sup>(2, 9–11)</sup>.

The term SNAP is not listed as a choice for diagnosis in the UDS. However, clinicians assessing the presumptive etiology of the cognitive disorder have an option to write in a diagnosis that is not in the standardized list. In the NACC database, as of the December 2017 data freeze, there have been only twenty-three participants who had SNAP listed as a diagnosis. All of these were alive at that time and hence none were included in the current study. With increasing understanding of both PART and SNAP, it is possible that use of this diagnosis might grow in the future, especially if it were to be offered as a choice for diagnosis in the UDS.

This study had important limitations. First, the NACC database is derived from convenience samples at each ADC. Participants tend to be more highly educated and with a greater proportion of people of white race than the population at large. These factors limit our ability to draw inferences to the general population. However, these demographic factors were not differentially distributed between the two groups (PART and ADNP) analyzed in

the study. Second, we utilized the presence of neuritic plaques (i.e., CERAD score) as an inclusion criterion for ADNP. Diffuse plaques (i.e., Thal phase) have recently been incorporated into the criteria for neuropathologic diagnosis of ADNP (20, 21), and adopted as part of the NACC neuropathology evaluation in NP version 10, implemented in 2014. Therefore, Thal phase is not available for most participants in the NACC database. Because of this, some participants classified as PART in this study might have been classified as ADNP if Thal phase had been used in addition to the CERAD neuritic plaque score. However, it also appears that diffuse plaques contribute less to ante-mortem cognitive change than neuritic plaques (22). Hence, the effect of such classification on study findings is likely small. Lastly, there are limited data available in the NACC database about whether ante-mortem biomarker assays were run to determine amyloid burden, or if available test results were considered when making the primary clinical diagnosis. While ante-mortem criteria for diagnosis of PART are not established, if participants were tested for antemortem biomarkers, the results may have altered the clinical diagnosis. Despite these limitations, this study has several notable strengths. These include the fact that data were collected from multiple centers in widely separated geographic areas (increasing the generalizability of the data) using standardized methods for gathering clinical data and classifying cognitive status and for performing and reporting autopsy findings.

In conclusion, this study suggests that clinicians may recognize the clinical distinction between PART and ADNP, diagnosing AD less frequently in those with PART, especially for patients with dementia. Nonetheless, clinical AD was diagnosed greater than 50% of the time in PART participants with MCI or dementia. As PART is being increasingly recognized as a neuropathological entity that is distinct from ADNP and that has its own, usually less severe, cognitive outcomes, ante-mortem criteria for diagnosis of PART need to be established.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The NACC database is funded by NIA/NIH Grant U01 AG016976. NACC data are contributed by the NIA-funded ADCs: P30 AG019610 (PI Eric Reiman, MD), P30 AG013846 (PI Neil Kowall, MD), P50 AG008702 (PI Scott Small, MD), P50 AG025688 (PI Allan Levey, MD, PhD), P50 AG047266 (PI Todd Golde, MD, PhD), P30 AG010133 (PI Andrew Saykin, PsyD), P50 AG005146 (PI Marilyn Albert, PhD), P50 AG005134 (PI Bradley Hyman, MD, PhD), P50 AG016574 (PI Ronald Petersen, MD, PhD), P50 AG005138 (PI Mary Sano, PhD), P30 AG008051 (PI Thomas Wisniewski, MD), P30 AG013854 (PI M. Marsel Mesulam, MD), P30 AG008017 (PI Jeffrey Kaye, MD), P30 AG010161 (PI David Bennett, MD), P50 AG047366 (PI Victor Henderson, MD, MS), P30 AG010129 (PI Charles DeCarli, MD), P50 AG016573 (PI Frank LaFerla, PhD), P50 AG005131 (PI James Brewer, MD, PhD), P50 AG023501 (PI Bruce Miller, MD), P30 AG035982 (PI Russell Swerdlow, MD), P30 AG028383 (PI Linda Van Eldik, PhD), P30 AG053760 (PI Henry Paulson, MD, PhD), P30 AG012300 (PI Roger Rosenberg, MD), P30 AG049638 (PI Suzanne Craft, PhD), P50 AG005136 (PI Thomas Grabowski, MD), P50 AG033514 (PI Sanjay Asthana, MD, FRCP), P50 AG005681 (PI John Morris, MD), P50 AG047270 (PI Stephen Strittmatter, MD, PhD), P

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Besser LM, Crary JF, Mock C, et al. Comparison of symptomatic and asymptomatic persons with primary age-related tauopathy. Neurology 2017; 89:1707–1715. [PubMed: 28916532]
- 2. Crary JF, Trojanowski JQ, Schneider JA, et al. Primary age-related tauopathy (PART): a common pathology associated with human aging. Acta Neuropathol 2014; 128:755–766. [PubMed: 25348064]

 Crary JF. Primary age-related tauopathy and the amyloid cascade hypothesis: the exception that proves the rule? J Neurol Neuromedicine 2016; 1:53–57. [PubMed: 27819070]

- Kryscio RJ, Abner EL, Nelson PT, et al. The Effect of Vascular Neuropathology on Late-life Cognition: Results from the SMART Project. J Prev Alzheimers Dis 2016; 3:85–91. [PubMed: 27709107]
- 5. Ikeda K, Akiyama H, Arai T, et al. Clinical aspects of 'senile dementia of the tangle type'-- a subset of dementia in the senium separable from late-onset Alzheimer's disease. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 1999; 10:6–11.
- 6. Bancher C, Jellinger KA. Neurofibrillary tangle predominant form of senile dementia of Alzheimer type: a rare subtype in very old subjects. Acta Neuropathol 1994; 88:565–570. [PubMed: 7879604]
- Ranginwala NA, Hynan LS, Weiner MF, et al. Clinical criteria for the diagnosis of Alzheimer disease: still good after all these years. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2008;16(5):384–8. [PubMed: 18448850]
- 8. Beach TG, Monsell SE, Phillips LE, et al. Accuracy of the clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer disease at national institute on aging Alzheimer disease centers, 2005–2010. Neuropathol Exp Neurol 2012; 71(4):266–73.
- Jack CR Jr., Knopman DS, Chetelat G, et al. Suspected non-Alzheimer disease pathophysiologyconcept and controversy. Nat Rev Neurol 2016; 12:117–124. [PubMed: 26782335]
- Wisse LEM, Butala N, Das SR, et al. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I. Suspected non-AD pathology in mild cognitive impairment. Neurobiol Aging 2015; 36:3152–3162. [PubMed: 26422359]
- Yamada M Suspected Non-Alzheimer's Disease Pathophysiology (SNAP) and Its Pathological Backgrounds in the Diagnosis of Preclinical and Clinical Alzheimer's Disease. Brain Nerve 2018; 70:59–71. [PubMed: 29348375]
- Morris JC, Weintraub S, Chui HC, et al. The Uniform Data Set (UDS): clinical and cognitive variables and descriptive data from Alzheimer Disease Centers. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2006; 20:210–216. [PubMed: 17132964]
- Beekly DL, Ramos EM, Lee WW, et al. The National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) database: the Uniform Data Set. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2007; 21:249–258. [PubMed: 17804958]
- 14. Beekly DL, Ramos EM, van Belle G, et al. The National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) database: an Alzheimer disease database. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2004;18:270–277. [PubMed: 15592144]
- Besser LM, Kukull WA, Teylan MA, et al. The Revised National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center's Neuropathology Form-Available Data and New Analyses. J Neuropathol Exp Neurol 2018; 77(8):717–726. [PubMed: 29945202]
- Schneider JA, Arvanitakis Z, Bang W, et al. Mixed brain pathologies account for most dementia cases in community-dwelling older persons. Neurology 2007;69(24):2197–204. [PubMed: 17568013]
- Yamada M Senile dementia of the neurofibrillary tangle type (tangle-only dementia): neuropathological criteria and clinical guidelines for diagnosis. Neuropathology 2003; 23:311–317. [PubMed: 14719548]
- Crary JF, Trojanowski JQ, Schneider JA, et al. Primary age-related tauopathy (PART): a common pathology associated with human aging. Acta Neuropathol 2014; 128(6):755–66. [PubMed: 25348064]
- Mormino EC, Papp KV, Rentz DM, et al. Heterogeneity in Suspected Non-Alzheimer Disease Pathophysiology Among Clinically Normal Older Individuals. JAMA Neurol 2016; 73(10):1185–1191. [PubMed: 27548655]
- 20. Thal DR, Rub U, Orantes M, et al. Phases of A beta-deposition in the human brain and its relevance for the development of AD. Neurology 2002; 58:1791–1800. [PubMed: 12084879]
- 21. Sperling RA, Aisen PS, Beckett LA, et al. Toward defining the preclinical stages of Alzheimer's disease: recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimers Dement 2011; 7:280–292. [PubMed: 21514248]

22. Serrano-Pozo A, Qian J, Muzikansky A, et al. Thal Amyloid Stages Do Not Significantly Impact the Correlation Between Neuropathological Change and Cognition in the Alzheimer Disease Continuum. J Neuropathol Exp Neurol 2016; 75:516–526. [PubMed: 27105663]

Teylan et al. Page 10

Table 1.

Demographics and clinical characteristics at last visit before death in symptomatic individuals with PART versus ADNP, as of December 2017 data freeze

	MCI diagno	MCI diagnosis at last visit		Dementia di	Dementia diagnosis at last visit	risit
Characteristic	PART n=49	ADNP n=75	p-value <sup>a</sup>	PART n=112	ADNP n=1,118	p-value <sup>a</sup>
Age at death, mean (SD)	84.7 (12.2)	88.1 (7.2)	80.0	82.4 (13.3)	80.5 (11.0)	0.16
Male, n (%)	28 (57.1%)	35 (46.7%)	0.25	65 (58.0%)	593 (53.0%)	0.31
Education (years), mean (SD)	15.0 (2.6)	15.7 (2.8)	0.15	14.9 (3.4)	15.1 (3.3)	0.53
Non-white race, n (%)	1 (2.1%)	4 (5.4%)	0.65	11 (10.1%)	73 (6.6%)	0.17
1 APOE e4 allele, n (%)	7 (15.2%)	22 (32.4%)	0.04	15 (14.9%)	539 (55.1%)	<.0001
Depression at last visit, n (%)	30 (61.2%)	39 (52.0%)	0.31	65 (58.0%)	620 (55.5%)	09.0
History of TBI, n (%)	10 (20.4%)	15 (20.0%)	96.0	22 (19.6%)	155 (13.9%)	0.10
MCI type, n (%)						
Amnestic	33 (67.4%)	61 (81.3%)	0.08	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-amnestic	16 (32.7%)	16 (32.7%) 14 (18.7%)		N/A	N/A	N/A
Microinfarct(s)	13 (26.5%)	17 (22.7%)	0.62	30 (26.8%)	199 (17.8%)	0.02
Hemorrhage(s)/microbleed(s)	3 (6.1%)	6 (8.5%)	0.74	9 (8.1%)	68 (6.1%)	0.42
Infarct(s)/lacune(s)	16 (32.7%)	19 (25.7%)	0.40	38 (33.9%)	225 (20.2%)	0.0008
Moderate/severe Arteriolosclerosis	15 (34.9%)	29 (45.3%)	0.28	57 (52.8%)	430 (43.3%)	90.0

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ Used Exact chi-square if any cell size <5

demential education (3), APOE (11), race (3) hemorrhage/microbleed (1), arteriolosclerosis (4); [ADNP-demential education (9), APOE (140), race (6), microinfarct (2), hemorrhage/microbleed (11), infarct/lacune (6), arteriolosclerosis (124). bissing data: [PART-MCI] APOE (3), race (1), arteriolosclerosis (6); [ADNP-MCI] education (1), APOE (7), race (1), hemorrhage/microbleed (4), infarct/lacune (1), arteriolosclerosis (11); [PART-MCI]

Table 2.

Primary clinical diagnoses at last visit before death in symptomatic individuals with PART versus ADNP, as of December 2017 data freeze

	MCI diagnosis at last visit		Dementia diagnosis at last visit		
Primary clinical diagnosis a,b	PART n=49	ADNP n=75	PART n=112	ADNP n=1,118	
AD	28 (57.1%)	52 (69.3%)	58 (51.8%)	959 (85.8%)	
DLB	2 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	28 (2.5%)	
Parkinson's disease	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (0.5%)	
PSP	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	
CBD	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.7%)	16 (1.4%)	
PPA or bvFTD	2 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (12.5%)	62 (5.6%)	
Vascular brain injury/dementia	4 (8.2%)	13 (17.3%)	19 (17.0%)	25 (2.2%)	
Prion	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	
Down syndrome	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	
Hydrocephalus	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.2%)	
CNS neoplasm	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.8%)	1 (0.1%)	
Depression	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Other psychiatric disease	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Alcohol abuse	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Medication	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Medical/systemic illness	2 (4.1%)	4 (5.3%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	
ALS	3 (6.1%)	1 (1.3%)	2 (1.8%)	1 (0.1%)	
MSA	3 (6.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
PCA	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.2%)	
Multiple sclerosis	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	
Probable CTE	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	
Unknown etiologic diagnosis	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (4.5%)	12 (1.1%)	
Other misc. write-in	1 (2.0%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (1.8%)	3 (0.3%)	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Each participant has only one primary diagnosis

b Abbreviations: AD – Alzheimer's disease; DLB – Dementia with Lewy bodies; PSP – Progressive supranuclear palsy; CDB – Corticobasal degeneration; PPA – Primary progressive aphasia; bvFTD – Behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia; CNS – Central nervous system; ALS – Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; MSA – Multiple system atrophy; PCA – Posterior cortical atrophy; CTE – Chronic traumatic encephalopathy.

Table 3.

Contributing clinical diagnoses at last visit before death in symptomatic individuals with PART versus ADNP, as of December 2017 data freeze

	MCI diagnosis at last visit		Dementia diagnosis at last visit	
Contributing clinical diagnosis $^{a,b}$	PART n=49	ADNP n=75	PART n=112	ADNP n=1,118
AD	1 (2.0%)	5 (6.7%)	17 (15.2%)	57 (5.1%)
DLB	2 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	35 (3.1%)
Parkinson's disease	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	9 (0.8%)
CBD	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	5 (0.5%)
PSP	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	1 (0.1%)
bvFTD or PPA	1 (2.0%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (1.8%)	23 (2.1%)
FTLD NOS	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)
Vascular brain injury/dementia	4 (8.2%)	6 (8.0%)	18 (16.1%)	111 (9.9%)
Prion disease	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)
Hydrocephalus	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	6 (0.5%)
CNS neoplasm	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.2%)
Depression	15 (30.6%)	12 (16.0%)	24 (21.4%)	87 (7.8%)
Schizophrenia	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)
Anxiety	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	3 (0.3%)
Other psychiatric disease	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (0.5%)
Alcohol abuse	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	4 (0.4%)
Systemic disease/medical illness	6 (12.2%)	2 (2.7%)	9 (8.0%)	22 (2.0%)
Medications	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.7%)	4 (3.6%)	10 (0.9%)
Essential tremor	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
TBI	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.8%)	13 (1.2%)

 $<sup>{}^{</sup>a}$ Each participant can have none, one, or more contributing diagnoses

b Abbreviations: AD – Alzheimer's disease; DLB – Dementia with Lewy bodies; PSP – Progressive supranuclear palsy; CDB – Corticobasal degeneration; PPA – Primary progressive aphasia; bvFTD – Behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia; FTLD NOS – Frontotemporal lobar dementia not otherwise specified; CNS – Central nervous system; TBI – Traumatic brain injury.

Table 4.

Unadjusted association between PART vs AD neuropathology and clinical diagnosis of AD (primary or contributing), as of December 2017 data freeze

	MCI diagnosis at last visit		Dementia diagnosis at last visit	
Characteristic	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Age at death (years)	1.07	1.01–1.13	1.05	1.04–1.06
Male	0.72	0.33-1.58	0.65	0.50-0.85
Education (years)	1.00	0.87-1.14	0.97	0.92-1.02
1 APOE e4 allele	1.01	0.41-2.48	1.66	1.13-2.44
PART (vs ADNP)	0.39	0.15-1.03	0.19	0.12-0.31
Microinfarct	0.56	0.29-1.08	0.82	0.50-1.34
Hemorrhage/microbleed	1.23	0.31-4.93	1.04	0.45-2.43
Moderate/severe arteriolosclerosis	1.10	0.42-2.92	1.11	0.72-1.70
Infarct/lacune	0.66	0.29-1.51	0.73	0.48-1.12

 $<sup>^</sup>a$ Bold values indicate significant findings (p<0.05).

**Table 5.**Adjusted association between PART vs AD neuropathology and clinical diagnosis of AD (primary or contributing), as of December 2017 data freeze

	MCI diagnosis at last visit		Dementia diagnosis at last visit		
Characteristic	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	
Age at death (years)	1.06	1.01-1.11	1.06	1.04-1.07	
Male	0.90	0.36-2.24	0.82	0.59-1.14	
Education (years)	0.99	0.82-1.20	0.96	0.91-1.02	
1 APOE e4 allele	1.00	0.39-2.58	1.43	0.92-2.22	
PART (vs ADNP)	0.53	0.25-1.12	0.22	0.13-0.38	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Bold values indicate significant findings (p<0.05).