of Clinical and Translational Neurology

The aim of this meta-analysis was to review systematically and to identify the

relationship between the severity and location of white matter hyperintensities

(WMHs) and the degree of cognitive decline in patients with Parkinson's dis-

ease (PD). We searched the PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Ovid, and

Cochrane Library databases for clinical trials of the severity and location of

WMHs on the degree of cognitive impairment in PD through October 2020. We conducted the survey to compare the association of WMH burden in patients with PD with mild cognitive impairment (PD-MCI) versus those with

normal cognition (PD-NC) and in patients with PD with dementia (PDD) ver-

sus those with PD without dementia (PD-ND). Nine studies with PD-MCI ver-

sus PD-NC and 10 studies with PDD versus PD-ND comparisons were

included. The WMH burden in PD-MCI patients was significantly different

compared to that in PD-NC patients (standard mean difference, SMD = 0.39,

95% CI: 0.12 to 0.66, p = 0.005), while there was no correlation shown in the

age-matched subgroup of the comparison. In addition, PDD patients had a sig-

nificantly higher burden of WMHs (SMD = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.44 to 1.71,

p < 0.0001), especially deep white matter hyperintensities (SMD = 0.54, 95%)

CI: 0.36 to 0.73, p < 0.0001) and periventricular hyperintensities

(SMD = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.36 to 1.04, p < 0.0001), than PD-NC patients, regard-

less of the adjustment of age. WMHs might be imaging markers for cognitive

impairment in PDD but not in PD-MCI, regardless of age, vascular risk factors,

or race. Further prospective studies are needed to validate the conclusions.

ANR^A

The influence of white matter hyperintensity on cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease

Hailing Liu^{1,2,*}, Bin Deng^{1,*}, Fen Xie^{1,*}, Xiaohua Yang¹, Zhenchao Xie¹, Yonghua Chen¹, Zhi Yang², Xiyan Huang³, Shuzhen Zhu¹ & Qing Wang¹

¹Department of Neurology, Zhujiang Hospital of Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, 510282, P.R. China

Abstract

²Department of Neurology, Maoming People's Hospital, Maoming, Guangdong, China

³Department of Rehabilitation, Zhujiang Hospital of Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, 510282, P.R. China

Correspondence

Shuzhen Zhu and Qing Wang, Department of Neurology, Zhujiang Hospital, Southern Medical University, Gongye Road 253, Guangzhou, Guangdong Province 510282, P. R. China. Tel: +86 20 62783082; Fax: +862062783082: E-mail: 453951712@qq.com; denniswq@yahoo.com

Funding Information

This work was supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (Grant NO: 2017YFC1310200), National Natural Science Foundation of China (NO: 81873777, 82071414), Initiated Foundation of Zhujiang Hospital (NO: 02020318005), Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong of China (NO: 2017A030311010), and Science and Technology Program of Guangdong of China (NO: 2020A0505100037) to Q.W; this work was supported by the Medical Scientific Research Foundation of Guangdong Province (NO: C2019120) to X.H.Y; the High-level Hospital Construction Research Project of Maoming People's Hospital to H.L.L; and Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (NO: 2018A030313952) to X.Y.H.

Received: 13 April 2021: Revised: 5 June 2021; Accepted: 2 July 2021

Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology 2021; 8(9): 1917-1934

doi: 10.1002/acn3.51429

*These authors contributed equally.

Introduction

Cognitive impairment, including impairment in attention, executive function, memory, speech, and visual perception, is a common and salient manifestation of Parkinson's disease (PD) and interferes with the ability to motor/non-motor dysfunctions and discriminative aspects.7-12 According to the degree of cognitive

© 2021 The Authors. Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Neurological Association This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and

distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

perform activities of daily living and patient outcomes.¹⁻⁶ Our recent studies have demonstrated various neuroimaging markers and their relative neuropathogenesis in PD and PD Syndromes (PDS), which appear to contribute to impairment,^{13,14} PD patients can be classified into those with PD with normal cognition (PD-NC), PD with mild cognitive impairment (PD-MCI), and PD with dementia (PDD). Approximately 30% of PD patients have mild cognitive impairment.^{15,16} Moreover, it has been reported that over 80% of PD patients could deteriorate into dementia in the terminal stage of PD,5,6,17-19 and PD-MCI patients have an increased risk of dementia.^{20,21} Multiple longitudinal studies have shown that PD-MCI is a prodromal stage of PDD.²²⁻²⁶ Therefore, early identification and intervention may delay the progression of MCI to dementia in PD. Currently, significant advances have been made in neuroimaging modalities in neurodegenerative disease.^{12,27–29} Neuroimaging on cognitive impairment has become a research hotspot in PD, providing in vivo insights into examining the structural and biochemical changes in PD.^{23,30-39} However, no reliable predictors of cognitive impairment exist in PD so far. Therefore, there is an urgent need for reliable neuroimaging biomarkers for the early identification and monitoring of the progression of PD.

White matter hyperintensities (WMHs) are neuroimaging biomarkers characterized by the signal enhancement of the T2-weighted sequence in magnetic resonance imaging.40 The location of WMHs commonly includes the periventricular, deep, basal ganglia, and infratentorial areas. Regional WMHs are believed to have different pathological origins, and the etiology of WMHs is unclear. Previous research^{41,42} found that axonal loss, demyelination, and mild gliosis may be involved in WMHs. The possible pathogenetic mechanisms include blood-brain barrier impairment; chronic ischemia, which is due to damage to the microvascular structure; and brain hypoperfusion, resulting from the dysfunction of cerebrovascular autoregulation.43-45 WMHs have been confirmed to be related to cognitive impairment and dementia, especially Alzheimer's disease (AD).^{46,47} In the spectrum of neurodegenerative diseases, the incidence of PD is second only to AD.48-50 Whether WMHs are correlated with cognitive impairment in PD remains controversial. Sunwoo et al.,⁵¹ reported that WMH burden could be a significant neuroimaging marker for PD-MCI conversion to PDD. In addition, one study⁵² independently demonstrated that WMHs but not vascular risk factors are a risk factor for PD-MCI. However, other studies^{53,54} did not find a significant difference in total WMH burden between PD and age-matched individuals. The impact of WMHs on cognitive impairment in PD patients remains unclear.

Previous studies demonstrated that different locations of lesions may result in distinct cognitive subdomain impairments in older individuals.^{55–61} WMHs are commonly located in the frontal and parietal subcortical white matter.⁶² It has been reported that WMHs in the parietal lobe are related to orienting efficiency, while WMHs in the frontal and temporal lobes are involved in attention and executive dysfunction.⁶³ Global WMH burdens are crucial to memory and executive function in PD patients.⁵⁶ The mechanisms underlying WMHs in different regions may be diverse, but the detailed pathogenies of WMHs remain elusive.

In our study, we pooled WMH data of PD patients with different degrees of cognitive impairment by metaanalysis, such as the PD-NC group, PD-MCI group, or PDD group. The aim of our study was to investigate the relationship between the severity and location of WMHs and the degree of cognitive decline in patients with PD and to explore whether WMHs can be effective biomarkers for PD patients with cognitive impairment (PD-MCI or PDD).

Methods

Literature search

We systematically searched the PubMed, Web of Science, and EMBASE databases, combined with Ovid and Cochrane Library, for articles published in full up to February 1, 2021. Three sets of keywords were combined to find articles. The detailed search strategy is shown in Table S1. The included articles were searched for publications that met the study criteria. We searched the following base terms as follows.

#1 White matter lesion OR WML OR white matter hyperintensity* OR WMH OR Leukoaraiosis OR small vessel disease OR RS-fMRI OR resting-state functional MRI.

#2 cognitive impairment OR cognitive dysfunction OR cognitive dysfunctions OR dysfunction, cognitive OR dysfunctions, cognitive OR cognitive impairments OR cognitive impairment OR impairment, cognitive OR impairments, cognitive OR mild cognitive impairment OR cognitive impairment, mild OR cognitive impairments, mild OR impairment, mild cognitive OR impairments, mild cognitive OR mild cognitive impairments OR mild neurocognitive disorder OR disorder, mild neurocognitive OR disorders, mild neurocognitive OR mild neurocognitive disorders OR neurocognitive disorder, mild OR neurocognitive disorders, mild OR cognitive decline OR cognitive declines OR decline, cognitive OR declines, cognitive OR mental deterioration OR deterioration, mental OR deteriorations, mental OR mental deteriorations OR dementia.

#3 Parkinson Disease OR Parkinson's Disease OR Parkinsonism.

#1 AND #2 AND #3

Study selection

For the present meta-analysis, we compared WMH studies comparing one group of PD-MCI patients to PD-NC patients or comparing another group of PDD patients to PD patients without dementia (PD-ND, including PD-NC). The inclusion criteria of the studies were as follows: (1) the type of study was case–control or longitudinal; (2) the study population contained PD-NC versus PD-MCI comparisons or PDD versus PD-ND comparisons, and WMHs in the studies were measured by quantitative methods. The measurement of WMHs contained visual and volumetric methods, while the former method included the Scheltens' visual rating scale, Fazekas score, Erkinjuntti scale or the age-related white matter change (ARWMC) rating scale; and (3) papers were published in English. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) in the comparison group, cognitively normal subjects as the control group were not extracted; (2) the PD group without cognitive categorization (PD-MCI or PDD) was also removed; (3) secondary or hereditary forms of Parkinsonism were excluded; and (4) the expression of grade data to WMH scale was removed. Moreover, we excluded duplicate studies, reviews, case reports, conference papers, or animal experimental studies. Two authors (Hailing Liu and Bin Deng) selected relevant studies independently. Any disagreements regarding article selection or data extraction were resolved through discussion or negotiation with the third author (Fen Xie).

Data abstraction

According to the inclusion criteria, two reviewers independently screened the abstracts and papers to find eligible studies. The demographic information extraction included the first author's name, country, ethnicity, publication year, number of cases and controls, age, and disease duration. Hoehn and Yahr staging (HY) combined with the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale part III (UPDRS III) was used to evaluate the severity and advancement of Parkinsonism. The Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) or Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) was included to evaluate global cognitive function. The optimal cutoff scores for cognitive dysfunction were determined according to the organization of the Movement Disorder Society Task Force,64-66 and the degree of cognitive dysfunction in PD was classified as normal cognition, mild cognitive impairment, and dementia. Moreover, WMH information (detailed data, location, and method of measurement) was extracted. The location of WMHs included periventricular, deep, basal ganglia, and infratentorial areas, the sum of which was the total WMH. However, the classification of WMH location measured by visual and volumetric methods is not consistent, and there were not enough unified data on WMH location to extract in the comparison group of MCI and PPD. Therefore, we divided all the trials into eight comparison groups: WMH by the volumetric method in PD-MCI versus PD-NC, WMH by the visual method in PD-MCI versus PD-NC, WMH by the volumetric method in PDD versus PD-ND, and total WMH, deep white matter hyperintensity (DWMH), periventricular hyperintensity (PVH), basal ganglia hyperintensity (BGH), and WMH of infratentorial areas in PDD versus PD-ND by the visual method. Information on the adjustment for vascular risk factors was extracted if available. If the information was missing, we contacted the relevant authors via email for related information about the studies.

Assessment of methodological quality

The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS),⁶⁷ with scores ranging from zero to nine stars, was utilized to assess the quality of the included articles, which was judged on three broad viewpoints, including selection, comparability, and outcome. More than seven stars were considered high quality on the basis of the NOS.

Statistical analysis

Using Review Manager 5.3, our meta-analysis was conducted to identify whether there was a significant difference between the two groups, including PD-MCI versus PD-NC and PDD versus PD-ND. We used a standardized mean difference (SMD) method to pool the individual markers with a random-effects model for included trials used different methods to measure WMHs (including various visual scores). We calculated Std. (Standard) Mean Difference (SMD) with a 95% confidence interval (CI) for each outcome measure.⁶⁸ The χ^2 and the I^2 tests were used to calculate the heterogeneity of pooled studies. Then, a random-effects model was used if $I^2 > 50\%$; otherwise, a fixed-effects model was used. A result with a value of p < 0.05 was considered indicative of a significant difference.

Second, we conducted sensitivity analysis⁶⁹ to verify the robustness of the review conclusions by omitting each individual study and identifying the reason for heterogeneity. In addition, subgroup analyses⁷⁰ were conducted to assess the impact of heterogeneity based on age matching and race. In addition, we used Stata 16 to assess publication bias via Begg's funnel plot and Egger's linear regression. p < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Study identification and selection

A total of 758 potentially relevant articles were obtained through the search of databases. Full-text articles of 42 of these articles remained to assess eligibility after removing duplicates, conference reports, reviews, case reports, and unrelated studies by screening the titles and abstracts. After screening the full articles, an additional 27 articles were excluded because of a lack of relevant comparisons and appropriate data for WMHs. Finally, 15 studies were included. Four studies included PD-MCI versus PD-NC, and PDD versus PD-ND population comparisons. Five studies contained a group of PD-MCI versus PD-NC, while six studies only included a comparison of PDD versus PD-ND. According to different measurements, seven studies with the volumetric method and two with visual methods included PD-MCI versus PD-NC group, while two studies with the volumetric method and eight with visual methods were included in PDD versus PD-ND comparison. A flow diagram of the article selection is displayed in Figure 1. Fourteen case-control studies and one longitudinal study were assessed. The study by Seung-Jae Lee 2010 obtained seven stars because of the small samples and confusing pattern of grouping, which contained comparisons of PD-ND, PD-MCI, and PDD. The evaluation results of the methodological quality of all included articles are summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

Characteristics of the involved studies

In our meta-analysis, 15 studies, including 1733 participants, met the inclusion criteria. Nine studies contained PD-MCI (408 patients) versus PD-NC (471 patients) comparisons, and 10 articles included PDD (301 patients) versus PD-ND (553 patients) comparisons. The basic participant demographics and characteristics of the two groups are presented in Tables 1 and 2. As expected, we found higher age, disease duration, HY stage, UPDRS III, and MMSE (MoCA) scores for PD-MCI than for the PD-NC population. Similar results were shown for PDD compared to PD without dementia. The meta-analysis of WMH severity in different stages of PD is illustrated as follows. However, information on WMH location was unavailable in the PD-MCI and PD-NC groups because of limited information. In the PDD versus PD-ND comparison, we obtained WMH data for different locations, including total WMH, deep white matter hyperintensity, periventricular hyperintensity, basal ganglia hyperintensity, and the WMH of infratentorial areas. Vascular factors included hypertension, diabetes, and stroke.



Figure 1. A flow diagram of the literature selection.

		Sampl	e size	Ă	ge ^a	Dis duratio	ease in (year)	H-Y s	tage ^a	UPDR	(S-III ^a	MMSE/	MOCA ^a	WMH se	verity ^b		Adiusted	
Study	Country/ ethnicity	PD- MCI	PD NC	PD-MCI	PD-NC	PD- MCI	PD-NC	PD- MCI	PD-NC	PD-MCI	PD-NC	PD-MCI	PD-NC	PD-MCI	PD-NC	WMH method	vascular risk	NOS score
Amboni (2015) ⁷³	ltaly/ Caucasian	21	21	65.2 (8.7)	65.8 (6.5)	6.6 (3.7)	5.9 (2.6)	1.5 (0.6)	1.5 (0.4)	14.3 (8.5)	13.1 (5.3)	26.68 (1.79).Na	28.66 (1.43)/Na	0.42 (0.43)	0.40 (0.46)	Volumetric	Na	∞
(2015) ⁷⁴	Spain/ Caucasian	22	43	66.1 (12.2)	64.0 (9.8)	8.8 (4.0)	10.8 (5.1)	Na	Na	18.2 (8.7)	14.1 (7.5)	28.50 (1.22)/	29.35 (0.90)/Na	0.97 (1.03)	0.79 (1.27)	Volumetric	Na	00
Huang (2020) ⁷⁷	Singapore/ Asian	94	81	65.4 (7.8)	61.3 (9.5)*	Na	Na	1.8 (0.4)	1.7 (0.4)	25.1 (11.1)	17.3 (7.5)	Na/23.20 (3.74)	Na/27.07 (2.21)	1.24 (2.86)	1.0 (3.41)	Volumetric	Diabetes	00
Kandiah (2013) ⁷¹	Singapore/ Asian	24	67	68.9 (6.1)	63.3 (7.5)*	4.9 (2.6)	5.3 (4.2)	1.8 (0.8)	1.9 (0.3)	Na	Na	26.92 (2.47)/ 24.5 (2.43)	28.31 (1.66)/ 26.99 (7 84)	8.20 (6.87)	4.09 (6.11)	Volumetric	Hypertension	00
Mak (2015) ⁷⁵	USA/ Caucasian	25	65	69.4 (6.4)	63.4 (7.6)*	5.0 (2.7)	5.4 (4.3)	1.8 (0.4)	1.9 (0.4)	20.0 (8.4)	17.5 (7.0)	26.70 (2.60)/ 24.50 (2.40)	28.4 (1.60)/ 27.0 (2.90)	12.30 (10.30)	4.20 (5.80)	Volumetric	Hypertension	00
Melzer (2013) ⁷²	New Zealand/ Caucasian	28	63	71.0 (7.3)	64.0 (9.2)*	5.8 (5.1)	3.7 (3.2)	2 (1.2)	2 (1.0)	30.6 (12.3)	25.3 (13.7)	27.40 (1.50)/ 23.0 (2.30)	29.00 (1.10)/ 26.70 (2.30)	6.40 (14.50)	1.00 (19.60)	Volumetric	Na	00
Stojkovic (2018) ⁷⁶	ltaly/ Caucasian	61	46	65.6 (7.9)	61.5 (8.1)*	8.9 (5.3)	7.2 (5.4)	2.4 (0.8)	2.1 (0.9)	44.5 (11.9)	36.5 (13.6)	26.98 (1.58)/ 24.54 (3.28)	28.39 (1.42)/ 27.43 (2.29)	1.15 (2.03)	0.43 (0.61)	Volumetric	Na	00
Ham (2014) ⁷⁹	Korea/ Asian	46	41	70.3 (8.1)	69.0 (6.1)	Na	Na	Na	Na	29.4 (10.9)	22.9 (9.4)	25.70 (3.50)/Na	28.10 (1.90)/Na	1.39 (1.90)	1.41 (1.80)	Visual	Hypertension, diabetes	00
Shin (2012) ⁷⁸	Korea/ Asian	87	44	69.5 (6.9)	66.6 (6.4)	3.1 (3.06)	2.2 (2.03)	Na	Na	19.0 (9.3)	17.9 (9.9)	25.70 (2.70)/Na	28.00 (1.50)/Na	2.40 (1.40)	2.30 (1.60)	Visual	Hypertension, diabetes,	00
Means of total		408	471	67.7	63.8	6.16	5.7	1.9	1.8	25.1	20.5	26.51/23.7	28.50/26.9	3.23	2.33			

*All included studies were not age-matched.

		Samp	le size	Ąć	ge ^a	, Disease	duration ^a	H-Y s	tage ^a	UPD	IRS-III ^a	MMSE	/MOCA ^a	WMH s	everity ^a		Adjusted	
Study	Country/ ethnicity	PDD	-DA ND	PDD	DN-DA	DD	DN-01	PDD	PD-ND	PDD	DN-DA	PDD	DN-D4	PDD	DN-DA	Method	vascular risk	NOS score
Beyer (2006) ⁸⁰	Nonway/ Caucasian	9	19	73.9	71.3	12.5 (7.4)	12.7 (6.4)	3.1 (0.6)	2.3 (0.6)	42.3 (12.4)	27.2 (13.1)	18.8 (4.5)/Na	28.5 (1.9)/Na	T 11.00 (5.55) D 7.10 (5.00) P 3.90 (1.40) B 1.20 (1.40)	T 6.30 (2.84) D 3.30 (2.50) P 3.00 (1.00) B 0.90 (2.00)	Scheltens scale	Hypertension, diabetes, stroke	∞
Daidaa (2018) ⁸⁴	Japan/ Asian	21	103	70.7 (9.0)*	62.2 (10.3)	9.5 (6.3)	11.1 (6.2)	3.6 (0.9)	2.8 (0.8)	a N	a N	19.6 (6.7)/Na	28.2 (1.8)/Na	n 0.50 (1.20) (1.23) (1.03) D 1.14 (0.91)	In 0.30 (1.10) T 1.32 (0.61) D 0.72 (0.66)	Scheltens scale	Hypertension, diabetes, stroke	œ
Lee (2010) ⁸¹	Korea/ Asian	35	1	70.2 (7.0)	65.5 (6.5)	1.9 (1.7)	1.4 (1.06)	2.2 (0.9)	1.5 (0.7)	22.5 (12.7)	8.5 (7.1)	19.7 (4.8)/Na	28.7 (1.1)/Na	P 1.43 (0.68) (10.68) (10.10) D 6.30 (5.00) P 3.40	P 0.6 (0.70) T 4.60 (5.50) D 2.90 (3.80) P 1.10	Scheltens scale	Hypertension, diabetes, stroke	~
Gonza'lez- Redondo (2012) ⁸²	Spain/ Caucasian	26	6 E	74.0 (6.0)*	68.0 (8.0)	14.0 (4.9)	13.3 (3.6)	3.6 (0.7)	2.8 (0.8)	44.6 (11.1)	32.2 (9.3)	e Z	r Z	(1.80) B 2.10 (3.30) In 0.60 (1.40) T 6.70 (6.20) D 6.16 (5.68) P 0.75	(0.80) B 0.50 (1.00) In 0.20 (0.40) T 5.70 (7.60) D 4.06 (5.38) P 0.35	Scheltens scale	Hypertension, diabetes, stroke	∞
lokia (2018) ⁸⁵	Japan/ Asian	20	50	75.7 (6.2)	74.5 (5.5)	л Z	a N	e Z	e Z	e Z	a Z	a N	Ra	(1.56) B 0.44 (0.98) In 0.08 (0.19) T 3.32 (1.01)	(0.76) B 0.71 (1.53) In 0 T 2.27 (0.65)	Faceca	Hypertension, diabetes	α 5

WMH and Cognitive Impairment in PD

		Sampl	le size	Ag	le ^a	Disease	duration ^a	H-Y s	itage ^a	UPC	iRS-III ^a	MMSEA	AOCA ^a	WMH s	everity ^a		۵diustad	
Study	Country/ ethnicity	PDD	DN PD	PDD	DN-DA	PDD	DN-DA	PDD	DN-DA	PDD	DN-DA	PDD	DN-OA	DDP	DN-04	Method	vascular risk	NOS score
														D 1.54 (0.58) P 1.78	D 1.38 (0.60) P 1.40			
Sławek (2013) ⁸³	Poland/ Caucasian	57	135	67.9 (8.7)*	61.9 (9.1)	8.7 (6.3)	5.9 (4.6)	2.4 (0.7)	2.0 (0.7)	42.9 (18.9)	29.6 (15.3)	25.0 (3.2)/Na	28.2 (1.6)/Na	(2.30) (2.30) D 1.62 (1.30)	(20.0) (2.05) (2.05) D 0.88 (1.06)	Erkinjuntti scale	Hypertension, diabetes	Ø
														P 1.24 (1.25)	P U.88 (1.20)			
Shin (2012) ⁷⁸	Korea/ Asian	44	40	71.6 (6.0)*	66.6 (6.4)	4.4 (2.6)	2.2 (2.03)	Na	Na	28.5 (10.8)	17.9 (9.9)	18.6 (4.9)/Na	28.0 (1.5)/Na	T 3.10 (1.90)	T 2.30 (1.60)	Scheltens scale	Hypertension, diabetes.	00
Ham	Korea/	36	41	69.8) 0.69	Na N	Na N	Na	Na	34.2	22.9 (9.4)	18.7	28.1	T 2.80	T 1.41	ARWMC	stroke Hypertension,	00
(2014) ⁷⁹	Asian	0	((5.9)	6.1)		1	; (í S	(13.6)	L	(3.5)/Na	(1.9)/Na	(3.40)	(1.80)	-	diabetes	c
Melzer (2013) ⁷²	New Zealand/ Caucasian	<u>×</u>	50	/ 3. / (6.5)	64.0 (9.2)	12.3 (8.6)	3.7 (3.2)	4 (2-4)	7 (1-3)	6.26 (16.3)	2.22 (13.7)	24.1 (3.0)/ 16.4 (3.7)	29.0 (1.1)/ 26.7 (2.3)	6.01 (17.9)	1.0 (19.6)	Volumetric	ez	x
Stojkovic (2018) ⁷⁶	ltaly/ Caucasian	23	46	70.6 (5.8)	61.5 (8.1)	11.9 (5.9)	7.2 (5.4)	3.7 (1.1)	2.1 (0.9)	61.0 (10.0)	36.5 (13.6)	14.0 (6.3)/ 11.3 (6.5)	28.3 (1.4)/ 27.4 (2.2)	2.01 (2.41)	0.43 (0.61)	Volumetric	Na	00
Means of total		301	553	71.7	66.4	80. 80.	7.9	2.8	2.2	39.6	24.1	22.5/13.5	27.9/26.9					
Abbreviatic and Yahr 5 Periventricu	ins: ARWMC, cale stage; Ir ilar hyperinte	, age-ré n, Infra nsity; T	elated tentori , Total	white mé al areas i white m	atter chan hyperinter atter hyp€	nges. The nsity; MN erintensit	e value of MSE, Mini- y; UPDRS-I	^a is mear -Mental S III, Unifiec) (standari itate Exam	d deviatio ination; l n's Diseas	n); B, Basal VIoCA, Mor e Rating Sci	ganglia hype ntreal Cogniti ale part III.	rintensity; D, ve Assessme	, Deep wh nt; Na, no	iite matter available;	hyperintens NOS, Newo	ity; H–Y stage, l astle-Ottawa Sc	Hoehn ale; P,

H. Liu *et al*.

© 2021 The Authors. Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Neurological Association

1923

Data analysis

WMH in PD-MCI versus PD-NC

Nine studies,^{71–79} seven with the volumetric method and two with visual method included WMH data for PD-MCI versus PD-NC comparisons. According to different WMH quantification methods, we performed metaanalysis to identify WMH data in volumetric and visual measurements separately. In the volumetric data analysis, a random-effects model was used as a result of heterogeneity $(p = 0.02, I^2 = 62\%)$. The meta-analysis showed that the WMH burden was higher in PD-MCI than in PD-NC (SMD = 0.39, 95% CI: 0.12 to 0.66, p = 0.005) (Fig. 2A). Then, we performed the sensitivity analysis to identify the reason for heterogeneity and confirmed that Elijah Mak 201575 was the reason for heterogeneity. After removing the study, we found that the WMH burden in the PD-MCI group was inferior to that in PD-NC (SMD = 0.27, 95% CI: 0.08 to 0.45, p = 0.005), with a heterogeneity of 11% (p = 0.35). In addition, considering age as a confounder, we conducted subgroup analysis according to the matched age. In the age-matched subgroup, we found no significant difference between comparisons (SMD = 0.1, 95% CI: -0.29 to 0.5, p = 0.60; $I^2 = 0\%$, p = 0.80), while a significant difference was observed in the subgroup without adjustment for age (SMD = 0.48, 95% CI: 0.15 to 0.82, $p = 0.005; I^2 = 71\%, p = 0.008)$ (Fig. 2B). When the study by Elijah Mak 2015 was removed, the heterogeneity decreased (p = 0.19, $I^2 = 37\%$) and a significant difference remained (p = 0.01). Furthermore, considering race might be a confounding variable, we performed subgroup analysis according to different ethnicities (Asian vs. Caucasian). In the Asian subgroup, we found significant difference between no comparisons (SMD = 0.33, 95% CI: -0.22 to 0.88, p = 0.24; $I^2 = 75\%$, p = 0.05), while a significant difference was observed in the Caucasian subgroup (SMD = 0.42, 95%CI: 0.08–0.77, p = 0.02; $I^2 = 61\%$, p = 0.04) (Fig. 2C). However, in the Caucasian with adjustment for age group, no significant difference was observed (p = 0.6) without heterogeneity $(I^2 = 0\%)$ (Fig. 2D).

In the visual data of WMH from two studies, Asians with adjustment for age, we found no significant difference in WMH burden between PD-MCI and PD-NC comparison (SMD = 0.03, 95% CI: -0.25 to 0.30, p = 0.86) (Fig. 2E) with fixed-effects model ($I^2 = 0\%$).

Total WMH in PDD versus PD-ND

A total of 854 participants in 10 studies^{72,76,78-85} were pooled to assess the effects of total WMH in PDD versus PD-ND population comparisons, eight of which were measured with the visual rating scale, incidentally, such as Fazekas, Scheltens' scale, Erkinjuntti scale or the ARWMC rating scale, and another two were measured with the volumetric method. In visual studies, a significant difference existed (SMD = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.44 to 1.71, p < 0.0001; $I^2 = 77\%$, p < 0.0001) (Fig. 3A), suggesting that WMH severity in PDD patients was higher than that in PD-ND patients. Then, we found that a significant difference remained during the sensitivity analysis conducted by removing every article one by one, suggesting that the result was stable. Considering age as a confounder, we also conducted subgroup analysis according to matched age in PDD versus PD-ND. Interestingly, we found significant difference between comparisons not only in the age-matched subgroup (SMD = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.54 to 1.27, p < 0.00001; $I^2 = 42\%$, p = 0.16), but also in the ageunmatched subgroup (SMD = 0.71, 95% CI: 0.07 to 1.36, $p = 0.03; I^2 = 87\%, p < 0.0001$) (Fig. 3B). Furthermore, considering race might be a confounding variable, we also performed subgroup analysis between Asian versus Caucasian. Still, a significant difference between PDD and PD-ND comparisons was found not only in the Asian subgroup (SMD = 0.84, 95% CI: 0.37 to 1.32, p = 0.0005; $I^2 = 77\%$, p = 0.002), but also in the Caucasian subgroup (SMD = 0.5, 95% CI: 0.09 to 0.92, p = 0.02; $I^2 = 55\%$, p = 0.11) (Fig. 3C). In volumetric studies, the meta-analysis showed that the WMH burden was higher in PDD than in PD-ND (SMD = 0.78, 95% CI: 0.21 to 1.34, p = 0.007) (Fig. 3D).

Deep white matter hyperintensity (DWMH) in PDD versus PD-ND

Six studies,^{80–85} including 564 participants, were pooled to evaluate DWMH severity in the PDD versus PD-ND comparison. DWMH severity in PDD patients was higher than that in PD-ND patients (SMD = 0.54, 95% CI: 0.36 to 0.73, p < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$, p = 0.50) (Fig. 4A).

Periventricular hyperintensity (PVH) in PDD versus PD-ND

PVH was evaluated in six studies^{80–85} (564 participants). Compared with patients with PD without dementia, the

Figure 2. Forest plot showing the Std. mean difference and 95% confidence intervals of differences in WMHs between the PD-MCI and PD-NC patients. (A) WMH severity with the volumetric method in patients with PD-MCI compared to PD-NC; (B) Subgroup analysis of WMH according to whether age-matched or not between comparisons; (C) Subgroup analysis of WMH in Asians and Caucasians; (D) WMHs in Caucasians with age-matched group; (E) WMHs with visual methods in patients with PD-MCI compared to PD-NC.

(A) WMH with volumetric method

	P	D-MCI		P	D-NC			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Elijah Mak2015	12.3	10.3	25	4.2	5.8	65	13.4%	1.10 [0.61, 1.59]	
Hugo-Cesar Baggio2015	0.97	1.03	22	0.79	1.27	43	12.8%	0.15 [-0.37, 0.66]	
Marianna Amboni2015	0.42	0.43	21	0.4	0.46	21	10.9%	0.04 [-0.56, 0.65]	
Nagaendran Kandiah2013	8.2	6.87	24	4.09	6.11	67	13.8%	0.65 [0.17, 1.12]	
Tanja Stojkovic2018	1.15	2.03	61	0.43	0.61	46	16.0%	0.45 [0.06, 0.84]	
Tracy R. Melzer2013	6.4	14.5	28	1	19.6	63	14.5%	0.29 [-0.15, 0.74]	+
X. Huang2020	1.24	2.86	94	1	3.41	81	18.6%	0.08 [-0.22, 0.37]	
Total (95% CI)			275			386	100.0%	0.39 [0.12, 0.66]	▲
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08;	Chi ² = 1	5.61, d	if = 6 (F	P = 0.02); ² = (62%			-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.	82 (P =)	0.005)							Favours [PD-MCI] Favours [PD-NC]

(B) WMH in age-matched subgroup

	Р	D-MCI		P	D-NC			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random. 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
5.1.1 age-matched subgro	up								
Hugo-Cesar Baggio2015	0.97	1.03	22	0.79	1.27	43	12.8%	0.15 [-0.37, 0.66]	
Marianna Amboni2015	0.42	0.43	21	0.4	0.46	21	10.9%	0.04 [-0.56, 0.65]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			43			64	23.7%	0.10 [-0.29, 0.50]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00;	Chi ² = 0	.07, df	= 1 (P	= 0.80);	² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.	.52 (P =	0.60)							
5.1.2 age-unmatched subg	group								
Elijah Mak2015	12.3	10.3	25	4.2	5.8	65	13.4%	1.10 [0.61, 1.59]	
Nagaendran Kandiah2013	8.2	6.87	24	4.09	6.11	67	13.8%	0.65 [0.17, 1.12]	
Tanja Stojkovic2018	1.15	2.03	61	0.43	0.61	46	16.0%	0.45 [0.06, 0.84]	
Tracy R. Melzer2013	6.4	14.5	28	1	19.6	63	14.5%	0.29 [-0.15, 0.74]	
X. Huang2020	1.24	2.86	94	1	3.41	81	18.6%	0.08 [-0.22, 0.37]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			232			322	76.3%	0.48 [0.15, 0.82]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10;	Chi ² = 1	3.68, 0	if = 4 (F	P = 0.00	8); l ² =	71%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	.80 (P =	0.005)							
Total (95% CI)			275			386	100.0%	0.39 [0.12, 0.66]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08;	Chi ² = 1	5.61, 0	f = 6 (F	e = 0.02); ² =	62%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	.82 (P =	0.005)							
Test for subaroup difference	es: Chi ² =	2.06.	df = 1 (P = 0.1	5). I² =	51.5%			

(C) WMH in ethnicity subgroup

	P	D-MCI		F	D-NC			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
6.1.1 Asian									
Nagaendran Kandiah2013	8.2	6.87	24	4.09	6.11	67	13.8%	0.65 [0.17, 1.12]	
X. Huang2020	1.24	2.86	94	1	3.41	81	18.6%	0.08 [-0.22, 0.37]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			118			148	32.3%	0.33 [-0.22, 0.88]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.12;	Chi ² = 3	.95, df	= 1 (P	= 0.05)	² = 7	5%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.	16 (P =	0.24)							
640 Coursesion									
6.1.2 Caucasian									
Elijah Mak2015	12.3	10.3	25	4.2	5.8	65	13.4%	1.10 [0.61, 1.59]	- /
Hugo-Cesar Baggio2015	0.97	1.03	22	0.79	1.27	43	12.8%	0.15 [-0.37, 0.66]	
Marianna Amboni2015	0.42	0.43	21	0.4	0.46	21	10.9%	0.04 [-0.56, 0.65]	
Tanja Stojkovic2018	1.15	2.03	61	0.43	0.61	46	16.0%	0.45 [0.06, 0.84]	
Tracy R. Melzer2013	6.4	14.5	28	1	19.6	63	14.5%	0.29 [-0.15, 0.74]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			157			238	67.7%	0.42 [0.08, 0.77]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.09;	$Chi^2 = 1$	0.25, c	f = 4 (F	P = 0.04); 2 =	61%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.	40 (P =	0.02)							
T-1-1 (05% OI)			075			000	400.00/	0 00 10 10 0 001	
1 otal (95% CI)			2/5			386	100.0%	0.39 [0.12, 0.66]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08;	Chi ² = 1	5.61, c	If = 6 (F	P = 0.02); $ ^2 = 0$	62%			-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.	82 (P =	0.005)							Favours [PD-MCI] Favours [PD-NC]
Test for subaroup difference	s: Chi ² =	= 0.08.	df = 1 (P = 0.7	8). I ² =	: 0%			

(D) WMH in Caucasians with age-matched group

	PD	-MCI		P	D-NC			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Hugo-Cesar Baggio2015	0.97	1.03	22	0.79	1.27	43	58.0%	0.15 [-0.37, 0.66]	
Marianna Amboni2015	0.42	0.43	21	0.4	0.46	21	42.0%	0.04 [-0.56, 0.65]	
Total (95% CI)			43			64	100.0%	0.10 [-0.29, 0.50]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.07,	df = 1 (P	9 = 0.8	30); l² =	: 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0).52 (P =	0.60)							Eavours [PD-MCI] Eavours [PD-NC]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.07$, Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	df = 1 (P).52 (P =	9 = 0.8 0.60)	30); I² =	:0%					-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [PD-MCI] Favours [PD-NC]

(E) WMH with visual methods

	P	D-MC	I .	PI	D-NC			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Jaeseung Shin2012	2.4	1.4	87	2.3	1.6	44	57.4%	0.07 [-0.30, 0.43]	
Jee Hyun Ham2014	1.35	1.9	46	1.41	1.8	41	42.6%	-0.03 [-0.45, 0.39]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	0.12, df = Z = 0.18	= 1 (F (P =	133 P = 0.73 0.86)	3); I² = 0	1%	85	100.0%	0.03 [-0.25, 0.30]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [PD-MCI] Favours [PD-NC]

		PDD		P	D-ND		3	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
Hideto Jokia2018	3.32	1.01	50	2.27	0.65	50	13.6%	1.23 [0.80, 1.66]	
Jaeseung Shin2012	3.1	1.9	19	2.3	1.6	44	12.2%	0.47 [-0.08, 1.01]	
Jarosław Sławek2013	2.84	2.3	57	1.78	2.05	137	14.9%	0.50 [0.18, 0.81]	
Jee Hyun Ham2014	2.8	3.4	36	1.41	1.8	41	13.3%	0.52 [0.06, 0.97]	
Kensuke Daida2018	2.57	1.03	21	1.32	0.61	103	12.5%	1.78 [1.26, 2.30]	
Mona K. Beyer2005	11	5.55	16	6.3	2.84	19	10.2%	1.07 [0.35, 1.79]	
R. Gonza'lez-Redondo2012	6.7	6.2	26	5.7	7.6	39	12.8%	0.14 [-0.36, 0.64]	
Seung-Jae Lee2010	eung-Jae Lee2010 12.5 10.1 35 4.6 5							0.84 [0.14, 1.54]	
Total (95% CI)			260			444	100.0%	0.80 [0.44, 1.17]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.21; Cl	hi² = 31.	10, df	= 7 (P •	< 0.000	1); ² =	77%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.29	9 (P < 0.	0001)							Favours [PDD] Favours [PD-ND]

(B) Total WMH in age-matched subgroup

		PDD		P	D-ND		:	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
7.1.1 age matched group									
Hideto Jokia2018	3.32	1.01	50	2.27	0.65	50	13.6%	1.23 [0.80, 1.66]	
Jee Hyun Ham2014	2.8	3.4	36	1.41	1.8	41	13.3%	0.52 [0.06, 0.97]	
Mona K. Beyer2005	11	5.55	16	6.3	2.84	19	10.2%	1.07 [0.35, 1.79]	
Seung-Jae Lee2010	12.5	10.1	35	4.6	5.5	11	10.4%	0.84 [0.14, 1.54]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			137			121	47.5%	0.91 [0.54, 1.27]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; C	hi² = 5.2	1, df =	3 (P =	0.16); I	² = 42%	6			
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.8	9 (P < 0.	00001)						
7.1.2 age unmatched group									
Jaeseung Shin2012	3.1	1.9	19	2.3	1.6	44	12.2%	0.47 [-0.08, 1.01]	
Jarosław Sławek2013	2.84	2.3	57	1.78	2.05	137	14.9%	0.50 [0.18, 0.81]	
Kensuke Daida2018	2.57	1.03	21	1.32	0.61	103	12.5%	1.78 [1.26, 2.30]	\rightarrow
R. Gonza'lez-Redondo2012	6.7	6.2	26	5.7	7.6	39	12.8%	0.14 [-0.36, 0.64]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			123			323	52.5%	0.71 [0.07, 1.36]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.37; C	hi² = 23.	63, df	= 3 (P	< 0.000	1); ² =	87%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.1	B (P = 0.	03)			51				
Total (95% CI)			260			444	100.0%	0.80 [0.44, 1.17]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.21; C	hi² = 31.	10, df	= 7 (P	< 0.000	1); ² =	77%			+ + + + +
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.29	9 (P < 0.	0001)							-2 -1 0 1 2
Test for subaroup differences:	Chi ² = ().26. d	f = 1 (P	= 0.61). ² = ()%			Favours [PDD] Favours [PD-ND]

(C) Total WMH in ethnicity subgroup

1926

		PDD		P	D-ND		:	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
9.1.1 Asian									
Hideto Jokia2018	3.32	1.01	50	2.77	0.65	50	14.2%	0.64 [0.24, 1.05]	
Jaeseung Shin2012	3.1	1.9	19	2.3	1.6	44	12.1%	0.47 [-0.08, 1.01]	
Jee Hyun Ham2014	2.8	3.4	36	1.41	1.8	41	13.4%	0.52 [0.06, 0.97]	
Kensuke Daida2018	2.57	1.03	21	1.32	0.61	103	12.4%	1.78 [1.26, 2.30]	$ \longrightarrow$
Seung-Jae Lee2010	12.5	10.1	35	4.6	5.5	11	9.9%	0.84 [0.14, 1.54]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			161			249	62.0%	0.84 [0.37, 1.32]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.22; C	hi² = 17.	24, df	= 4 (P =	= 0.002	; ² = 7	7%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.48	B (P = 0.	0005)							
9.1.2 Caucasian									
Jarosław Sławek2013	2.84	2.3	57	1.78	2.05	137	15.5%	0.50 [0.18, 0.81]	
Mona K. Beyer2005	11	5.55	16	6.3	2.84	19	9.7%	1.07 [0.35, 1.79]	$ \longrightarrow$
R. Gonza'lez-Redondo2012	6.7	6.2	26	5.7	7.6	39	12.8%	0.14 [-0.36, 0.64]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			99			195	38.0%	0.50 [0.09, 0.92]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; C	hi² = 4.4	2, df =	2 (P =	0.11); 1	2 = 559	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.37	7 (P = 0.	02)							
Total (95% CI)			260			444	100.0%	0.72 [0.39, 1.05]	
Hotorogonoity: $Tau^2 = 0.16$: C	hi2 - 25	54 df	- 7 (D -	- 0.000	s). 12 -	73%	100.070		
Test for overall effect: $7 = 4.2$	7/P < 0	0001)	- / (i	- 0.000	<i>)</i> , i =	1070			-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Test for subgroup differences:	Chi ² = 1	10001)	f = 1 (P	= 0.20	12 = 0	2%			Favours [PDD] Favours [PD-ND]
rescior suburoub dillerences.	GII	i. i0. d	- 1 (P	- 0.29		7.2.70			
(D) Total WMH with	volu	metr	ic me	ethod					
	חחם			DD N			Std	Moon Difforence	Std Moon Difference

		PDD		P	D-ND			Std. Mean Difference		Std. M	Aean Differe	ence	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, R	andom, 95	% CI	
Tanja Stojkovic2018	2.01	2.41	23	0.43	0.61	46	49.9%	1.06 [0.53, 1.60]					
Tracy R. Melzer2013	10.5	17.9	18	1	19.6	63	50.1%	0.49 [-0.04, 1.02]					
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	0.09; Ch Z = 2.70	i² = 2.2 (P = 0	41 25, df = .007)	1 (P =	0.13);	109 ² = 56%	100.0% %	0.78 [0.21, 1.34]	-4	-2 Favours [F	0 PDD] Favor	2 urs [PD-ND	4

Figure 3. Forest plot showing the Std. mean difference and 95% confidence intervals of differences in WMHs between the PDD and PD-ND patients. (A) Total WMH with the visual measurement between the PDD and PD-ND groups; (B) Subgroup analysis of total WMH according to whether age-matched or not; (C) Subgroup analysis of total WMH in Asians and Caucasians; (D) Total WMH with volumetric method between the PDD and PD-ND groups.

(A) DWMH				_					
		PDD		P	D-ND			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Hideto Jokia2018	1.54	0.58	50	1.38	0.6	50	22.3%	0.27 [-0.12, 0.66]	
Jarosław Sławek2013	1.62	1.3	57	0.88	1.06	137	34.6%	0.65 [0.33, 0.97]	
Kensuke Dalda2018	1.14	0.91	21	0.72	0.66	103	15.3%	0.59 [0.12, 1.07]	
Mona K. Beyer2005	7.1	5	16	3.3	2.5	19	6.9%	0.97 [0.26, 1.67]	· · · ·
R. Gonza lez-Redondo2012	6.16	5.68	26	4.06	5.38	39	13.8%	0.38 [-0.12, 0.88]	
Seung-Jae Lee2010	6.3	5	35	2.9	3.8	11	1.2%	0.70 [0.01, 1.40]	
Total (95% CI)			205			359	100.0%	0.54 [0.36, 0.73]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.33, df = 5 (P = 0.50); l ² = 0%									-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.74	4 (P < 0.	00001)						Favours [PDDI] Favours [PD-ND]
(B) PVH									
		PDD		P	D-ND			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random. 95% CI
Hideto Jokia2018	1.78	0.74	50	1.4	0.53	50	19.5%	0.59 [0.19, 0.99]	
Jarosław Sławek2013	1.24	1.25	57	0.88	1.2	137	21.9%	0.30 [-0.02, 0.61]	
Kensuke Daida2018	1.43	0.68	21	0.6	0.7	103	17.1%	1.18 [0.69, 1.68]	
Mona K. Beyer2005	3.9	1.4	16	3	1	19	12.7%	0.73 [0.04, 1.42]	
R. Gonza'lez-Redondo2012	0.75	1.56	26	0.35	0.76	39	16.9%	0.34 [-0.16, 0.84]	
Seung-Jae Lee2010	3.4	1.8	35	1.1	0.8	11	11.8%	1.39 [0.65, 2.13]	
Total (95% CI)			205			359	100.0%	0.70 [0.36, 1.04]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.11; Chi ² = 14.62, df = 5 (P = 0.01); l ² = 66%									
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.01 (P < 0.0001)									
(C) BGH									
		PDD		F	PD-ND)		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Tota	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Mona K. Bever2005	1.2	1.8	16	0.9	2	19	26.8%	0.15 [-0.51, 0.82]	
R. Gonza'lez-Redondo2012	0.44	0.98	26	0.71	1.53	39	48.0%	-0.20 [-0.70, 0.30]	
Seung-Jae Lee2010	2.1	3.3	35	0.5	1	11	25.2%	0.53 [-0.15, 1.22]	
Total (05% Ch						00	100.00/	COL 0 20 0 1 00 0	
	- 0 / 0	- 0.00	11	00/		69	100.0%	0.08 [-0.26, 0.42]	
Heterogeneity: $Chi^{+} = 2.94$, $df = 2$ (P = 0.23); $I^{+} = 32\%$									-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.4$	6 (P = 0	.65)							Favours [PDD] Favours [PD-ND]
(D) WMH of the infratentorial areas									
	PDD PD-ND Std. Mean Differer							Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Mona K. Beyer2005	0.5	1.2	16	0.3	1.1	19	51.1%	0.17 [-0.50, 0.84]	
R. Gonza'lez-Redondo2012	0.08	0.19	26	0	0	39		Not estimable	
Seung-Jae Lee2010	0.6	1.4	35	0.2	0.4	11	48.9%	0.32 [-0.37, 1.00]	
Total (95% CI)			77			69	100.0%	0.24 [-0.23, 0.72]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.09 df = 1 (P = 0.77); $l^2 = 0\%$									
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.99$ (P = 0.32)									-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
(F = 0.32)									Favours (PDD) Favours (PD-ND)

Figure 4. Forest plot showing the Std. mean difference and 95% confidence interval of differences in different locations of WMHs between PDD and PD-ND patients. (A) DWMH between-group comparisons; (B) PVH in PDD versus PD-ND patients; (C) Basal ganglia hyperintensity (BGH) in PDD versus PD-ND patients; (D) WMH in the infratentorial areas in PDD versus PD-ND patients.

severity of PVH in PDD patients was significantly higher (SMD = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.36 to 1.04, p < 0.0001), with a heterogeneity of 66% (p = 0.01) (Fig. 4B). A sensitivity analysis was conducted by removing every article one by one, and the heterogeneity still existed. We also found that a significant difference remained during the sensitivity analysis, suggesting that the result was stable.

Basal ganglia hyperintensity (BGH) in PDD versus PD-ND

Three studies^{80–82} presented data related to WMHs in the basal ganglia region. However, there were no significant results for the PDD versus PD-ND comparisons (p = 0.65) (Fig. 4C). After removing one trial by Seung-

Jae 2010, an identical result was demonstrated between the two groups without heterogeneity. (SMD = -0.07, 95% CI: -0.47 to 0.33, p = 0.72; $I^2 = 0\%$, p = 0.41).

WMH of the infratentorial areas in PDD versus PD-ND

Three studies^{80–82} were pooled to evaluate the effects of the WMH of infratentorial areas, with no significant differences between the PDD and PD-ND groups (SMD = 0.24, 95% CI: -0.23 to 0.72, p = 0.32; $I^2 = 0\%$, p = 0.77) (Fig. 4D).

Publication bias

To assess publication bias in meta-analyses of recruited studies, Begg's funnel plot and egger's test were conducted. In the volumetric studies of PD-MCI and PD-NC comparison, the Begg's funnel plot did not show significant asymmetry (p = 0.881) (Fig. 5A), and no small-study effects existed (t = -0.84, p = 0.438) (Fig. 5B) through egger's test. In the visual studies between PDD and PD-ND comparison, the distribution of each study was basically symmetrical in Begg's funnel plot

(p = 0.386) (Fig. 5C). In addition, egger's tests did not reveal evidence for bias in the homogeneous studies. (t = 0.73, p = 0.494) (Fig. 5D).

Discussion

It is well known that cognitive impairment and even dementia may occur in PD patients, which would aggravate the condition and reduce the quality of life.⁸⁶ WMHs are associated with cognitive impairment in the general population.^{11,30} Moreover, previous reports^{53,87}demonstrated that WMHs might exacerbate some motor symptoms or cognitive deficits in PD patients. Accumulating evidence suggests that WMHs independently contribute to postural and gait disturbances. However, the relationship between WMHs and the severity of cognition impairment in PD is still inconclusive.

In the PD-MCI and PD-NC groups with the volumetric method, WMH severity was significantly different. However, subgroup analysis indicated the opposite results when studies were separated by whether they were agematched. In the matched-age subgroup analysis, compared to PD-NC, a correlation was not observed in the



Figure 5. Begg's funnel plot and egger's test of publication bias in the selection of studies. (A) In the volumetric studies of PD-MCI and PD-NC comparison, the Begg's funnel plot is basically symmetrical; (B) Egger's method showed that the publication bias was small; (C) and (D) In the visual studies of PDD and PD-ND comparison, Begg's funnel plot (C), and egger's method (D) did not reveal publication bias.

PD-MCI. In the two matched-age studies with visual methods, the difference was not observed as well. In a previous study,⁴⁰ WMHs were inherently age-related and age was prone to generate false positives. In addition, a study reported that WMH-related cognitive and affective functions decreased with age in PD patients.⁸⁸ Consequently, no significant difference in WMHs was observed between the PD-MCI and PD-NC groups after adjusting for age, suggesting that the effect of WMHs may be inconspicuous in the early stage of PD. Similar to our results, a study⁵⁴ found that WMHs are not involved in cognitive impairment in the early stage of PD. Furthermore, another study⁵³ found that the WMH burden was not significantly different between PD patients and agematched individuals in the cross-sectional stage; however, the progression of WMHs still aggravated cognitive dysfunction in PD patients. Therefore, the above-mentioned results indicated that the influence of WMHs on cognition might be apparent in the later stage of PD, such as in PDD but not in PD-MCI. This finding needs further confirmation in larger prospective studies. Several following-up studies^{89,90} revealed that WMH on longitudinal changes may increase the risks for cognitive decline in PD. The greater baseline WMH burden showed, the more significantly cognitive decline in Parkinson's patients, suggesting baseline WMH burden could be the risk for future cognitive decline.

In our present meta-analysis, we confirmed that WMHs might be correlated with cognitive impairment in patients with PDD, the severe cognitive status of PD. A significant difference was confirmed in the total WMH scores by visual methods (SMD = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.44 to 1.71, p < 0.0001), and by volumetric method as well (SMD = 0.78, 95% CI: 0.21 to 1.34, p = 0.007). Only one longitudinal study by R. Gonza'lez-Redondo⁸² in the pooled studies showed no difference in the total WMH between the two groups of patients. However, the authors found that the progression of WMHs may have a mild impact on cognition in follow-up. We performed an agematched subgroup analysis of visual studies in PDD and PD-ND comparison, and we not only found significant differences in age-matched subgroups (SMD = 0.91,p < 0.00001), but also in age-unmatched subgroups between comparisons (SMD = 0.71, p = 0.03). The outcome may indicate that WMH burden in PDD patients is more severe than that in PD-ND, regardless of age. Moreover, in the PDD versus PD without dementia comparison, cerebrovascular risk factors (hypertension and diabetes mellitus) did not differ across groups, suggesting that vascular risk factors might not be related to WMH development. After controlling for vascular risk factors, WMHs were significantly related to cognitive impairment in PD patients,^{80,85} suggesting that WMHs might be a reliable and independent risk factor for PDD. A previous study⁹¹ illustrated that WMHs were associated with PDD, independent of age and vascular risk factors, which is consistent with our pooled results.

Visual and volumetric methods are the main approaches to evaluate the severity of WMH. Each method has pros and cons. The visual rating methods are more convenient, while the volumetric method is more sensitive.⁹² In our study, the visual rating method was usually used in the comparative researches between PDD and PD-ND due to wide application in the studies with large differences between groups. In contrast, the volumetric method was time-consuming, but sensitive and reliable; and it was more suitable for studies with small differences between groups, such as comparisons between PD-NC and PD-MCI. Our results are consistent in the comparisons regardless of different methods.

To our knowledge, small vessel disease is more common among Asians. Considering race might be a confounding variable, we performed subgroup analysis according to different ethnicities, Asian versus Caucasian. In the PD-MCI versus PD-NC comparison by two measurements, no significant difference was observed both in the Caucasian and Asian after adjustment for age. Meanwhile, WMH severity was significantly different between Asian and Caucasian in the PDD and PD-ND groups, regardless of age-matched or not. The severity of WMH in different degrees of PD might be similar in Asians and Caucasians.

The localization of WMHs presented specific effects on cognitive impairment.⁹³ In our study, the PDD group presented significant differences in DWMHs and PVHs but not in WMHs in the basal ganglia and infratentorial areas. In the pooled analysis of PVHs in comparison groups, five of six studies showed a significant difference, while another study (R. Gonza'lez-Redondo 2012) showed that the progression of PVH had a mild impact on cognition. Four of six studies had significantly more severe DWMHs than those in the PD-ND group. Few data have suggested that WMHs in the basal ganglia and infratentorial areas are associated with cognition in PDD. The present study confirmed that PVHs and DWMHs negatively influence cognitive impairment in PDD. WMH locations are correlated with domain-specific cognitive dysfunction in people with PD, including executive, attention, memory, speed learning, and visuospatial function. Previous studies^{93,94} reported that PVHs might have a significantly more negative effect on cognitive impairment than DWMHs, especially on executive function and processing speed. Moreover, a meta-analysis⁹⁵ concluded that PVHs, DWMHs, and the progression of WMHs may be involved in the impairment of domain-specific cognition, including attention and executive function. Diverse locations of WMHs disrupt the connection of cortical and subcortical structures, resulting in cognitive function damage. Several theories⁶¹ propose that DWMHs may destroy arcuate u-fibers of short cortex-cortical connections, while the PVHs have a stronger effect on the long-term high-density area connecting the distant cortical regions⁹⁶ and appear to have a larger effect on cognition than DWMHs. WMHs may damage nerve transmission and connections between neurons, leading to exacerbated speed and executive dysfunction.

WMHs, as typical signs of cerebral small vessel disease, may exacerbate cognitive impairment in PD through a variety of hypothetical mechanisms. Blood-brain barrier leakage and endothelial dysfunction are the predominant mechanisms.97 Recent studies¹⁰ pathophysiological demonstrated that inflammatory, metabolic, and vascular factors are involved in PDD patients with diabetes and may be biomarkers for PD diagnosis. In addition, genetic variation may influence the immediate tissues surrounding microvessels or the risk of microvasculature injury, leading to the deterioration of PVHs or DWMHs.98 It has been reported that WMHs, as markers of cerebral small vessel disease, could be alleviated through the treatment of modifiable vascular risk factors and lifestyle modification.⁹⁹ Moreover, previous longitudinal studies⁹⁰ demonstrated that baseline WMH burden was a significant predictor of future cognitive decline in PD, especially for the conversion from PD-MCI to PDD.

The results of our meta-analysis show that WMHs associated with cognitive dysfunction in PDD might offer opportunities for treatment and prevention. WMHs and the cerebrovascular structure can benefit from managing vascular risk factors in young patients (<50 years).¹⁰⁰ Vascular risk elements might be correlated with WMHs in early PD patients with cognitive decline.99 WMHs might accelerate brain atrophy throughout adulthood in the general population, which is due to vascular risk factors but also exists independently.¹⁰¹ A previous study reported that high blood pressure was independently associated with the progression of WMHs.¹⁰² The literature has demonstrated that cerebrovascular risk factors, especially hypertension, may be related to WMHs in adulthood¹⁰³ or early-stage of the PD but not PDD.⁹⁰ This result is consistent with our finding that vascular risk factors did not show an important role in the deterioration of WMHs in PDD independently, suggesting that vascular factors may result in the disease progression in young patients or those with PD-MCI and that the other nonvascular factors might contribute to the progression of PDD. Therefore, it is beneficial to decrease WMHs at an early stage by treating cerebrovascular disease. In addition, orthostatic hypotension (OH) is correlated to both WMHs and cognitive decline in PD patients. One

hypothesis is that OH may contribute to cognitive decline through cerebral hypoperfusion, resulting in WMH; another hypothesis indicated that OH and cognitive decline in PD may share the underlying identical asynuclein-related pathology.¹⁰⁴

Several limitations and advantages should be acknowledged in our study. First, WMH quantification methods (visual and volumetric measurements) vary, which might contribute to the variability in our results and induce heterogeneity. Therefore, we performed meta-analysis in volumetric and visual measurements to identify WMH data separately and got identical results. Second, data in different studies vary, and data conversion might induce errors. Third, an inherent limitation and statistical bias might exist because of the limited number of studies and small samples. However, Begg's funnel plot and egger's test showed that the publication bias was small, suggesting that the results were reliable. Fourth, the relation between WMH location and specific cognitive domains in PD (particularly in PD-MCI) has not been perfectly demonstrated as a result of the scarce data available. Fifth, the relationship between the progression of WMHs and the cognitive deterioration in long-term follow-up is more reliable. Consequently, further longitudinal studies are needed. The confirmation of the possible role of WMHs in cognitive impairment in PD may be crucial for physicians not only for understanding the underlying mechanism but also for the formulation of treatment strategies.

Conclusion

WMH severity might play a crucial role in cognition in patients with PDD, regardless of age race, and vascular risk factors, especially DWMHs and PVHs, which might be imaging markers for PDD. Further prospective studies in large populations are warranted to validate the conclusions.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (Grant NO: 2017YFC1310200), National Natural Science Foundation of China (NO: 81873777, 82071414), Initiated Foundation of Zhujiang Hospital (NO: 02020318005), Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong of China (NO: 2017A030311010), and Science and Technology Program of Guangdong of China (NO: 2020A0505100037) to Q.W; this work was supported by the Medical Scientific Research Foundation of Guangdong Province (NO: C2019120) to X.H.Y; the High-level Hospital Construction Research Project of Maoming People's Hospital to H.L.L; and Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (NO: 2018A030313952) to X.Y.H.

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the study: H.L.L, B.D., Y.H.C, Z.C.X, S.Z.Z, and Q.W. Performed the study: H.L.L, B.D., Y.H.C, Z.C.X, F.X, Z.Y., and Q.W. Revised the paper for intellectual content: X.H.Y, X.Y.H, S.Z.Z, and B.D. Data statistics and analysis: H.L.L, B.D., Y.H.C, and Q.W. Wrote the paper: H.L.L, B.D., S.Z.Z, and Q.W. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

These authors declare no conflict of interest.

Consent Statement

As this is a systematic review and did not include original patient data, the informed consent was not required.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

- 1. Aarsland D, Creese B, Politis M, et al. Cognitive decline in Parkinson's disease. Nat Rev Neurol 2017;13:217–231.
- Barone P, Aarsland D, Burn D, et al. Cognitive impairment in nondemented Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord 2011;26:2483–2495.
- Baschi R, Restivo V, Nicoletti A, et al. Mild behavioral impairment in Parkinson's disease: data from the Parkinson's Disease Cognitive Impairment Study (PACOS). J Alzheimer's Dis 2019;68:1603–1610.
- Chaudhary S, Kumaran SS, Kaloiya GS, et al. Domain specific cognitive impairment in Parkinson's patients with mild cognitive impairment. J Clin Neurosci 2020;75:99–105.
- 5. Hoogland J, Boel JA, de Bie RMA, et al. Mild cognitive impairment as a risk factor for Parkinson's disease dementia. Mov Disord 2017;32:1056–1065.
- 6. McDermott KL, Fisher N, Bradford S, Camicioli R. Parkinson's disease mild cognitive impairment classifications and neurobehavioral symptoms. Int Psychogeriatr 2018;30:253–260.
- 7. Zhu S, Li H, Deng B, et al. Various diseases and clinical heterogeneity are associated with "Hot Cross Bun". Front Aging Neurosci 2020;12:592212.
- 8. Lin A, Zheng W, He Y, et al. Gut microbiota in patients with Parkinson's disease in southern China. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2018;53:82–88.
- 9. Gao X, Huang Z, Feng C:, et al. Multimodal analysis of gene expression from postmortem brains and blood

identifies synaptic vesicle trafficking genes to be associated with Parkinson's disease. Brief Bioinform 2020;1–15.

- Wang T, Yuan F, Chen Z, et al. Vascular, inflammatory and metabolic risk factors in relation to dementia in Parkinson's disease patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Aging 2020;12:15682–15704.
- 11. Zhu S, Wei X, Yang X, et al. Plasma lipoproteinassociated phospholipase A2 and superoxide dismutase are independent predicators of cognitive impairment in cerebral small vessel disease patients: diagnosis and assessment. Aging Dis 2019;10:834–846.
- 12. Zhu S, Deng B, Huang Z, et al. "Hot cross bun" is a potential imaging marker for the severity of cerebellar ataxia in MSA-C. NPJ Parkinsons Dis 2021;7:15.
- Baiano C, Barone P, Trojano L, Santangelo G. Prevalence and clinical aspects of mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: a meta-analysis. Mov Disord 2020;35:45–54.
- Wu L, Liu FT, Ge JJ, et al. Clinical characteristics of cognitive impairment in patients with Parkinson's disease and its related pattern in (18) F-FDG PET imaging. Hum Brain Mapp 2018;39:4652–4662.
- Martinez-Horta S, Kulisevsky J. Mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. J Neural Transm 1996;2019:897–904.
- Monastero R, Cicero CE, Baschi R, et al. Mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: the Parkinson's disease cognitive study (PACOS). J Neurol 2018;265:1050–1058.
- Svenningsson P, Westman E, Ballard C, Aarsland D. Cognitive impairment in patients with Parkinson's disease: diagnosis, biomarkers, and treatment. Lancet Neurol 2012;11:697–707.
- Petkus AJ, Filoteo JV, Schiehser DM, et al. Mild cognitive impairment, psychiatric symptoms, and executive functioning in patients with Parkinson's disease. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2020;35:396–404.
- Poletti M, Emre M, Bonuccelli U. Mild cognitive impairment and cognitive reserve in Parkinson's disease. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2011;17:579–586.
- 20. Weil RS, Costantini AA, Schrag AE. Mild cognitive impairment in parkinson's disease-what is it? Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep 2018;18:17.
- Saredakis D, Collins-Praino LE, Gutteridge DS, et al. Conversion to MCI and dementia in Parkinson's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2019;65:20–31.
- Domellöf ME, Ekman U, Forsgren L, Elgh E. Cognitive function in the early phase of Parkinson's disease, a five-year follow-up. Acta Neurol Scand 2015;132: 79–88.
- 23. Gasca-Salas C, García-Lorenzo D, Garcia-Garcia D, et al. Parkinson's disease with mild cognitive impairment:

severe cortical thinning antedates dementia. Brain Imaging Behav 2019;13:180–188.

- 24. Nicoletti A, Luca A, Baschi R, et al. Incidence of mild cognitive impairment and dementia in Parkinson's disease: the Parkinson's disease cognitive impairment study. Front Aging Neurosci 2019;11:21.
- 25. Tajiri Y, Wada-Isoe K, Tanaka K, et al. A singleinstitution study on predictors of short-term progression from mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease to Parkinson's disease with dementia. Yonago Acta Med 2020;63:28–33.
- Wood K-L, Myall DJ, Livingston L, et al. Different PD-MCI criteria and risk of dementia in Parkinson's disease: 4-year longitudinal study. NPJ Parkinsons Dis 2016;2:15027.
- 27. Risacher SL, Saykin AJ. Neuroimaging in aging and neurologic diseases. Handb Clin Neurol 2019;167:191–227.
- Veitch DP, Weiner MW, Aisen PS, et al. Understanding disease progression and improving Alzheimer's disease clinical trials: recent highlights from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. Alzheimers Dement 2019;15:106–152.
- 29. Wardlaw JM, Smith EE, Biessels GJ, et al. Neuroimaging standards for research into small vessel disease and its contribution to ageing and neurodegeneration. Lancet Neurol 2013;12:822–838.
- 30. Beheshti I, Mishra S, Sone D, et al. T1-weighted MRIdriven brain age estimation in Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease. Aging Dis 2020;11:618–628.
- 31. Jia X, Wang Z, Yang T, et al. Entorhinal cortex atrophy in early, drug-naive Parkinson's disease with mild cognitive impairment. Aging Dis 2019;10:1221–1232.
- Lin YU, Fu Y, Zeng Y-F, et al. Six visual rating scales as a biomarker for monitoring atrophied brain volume in Parkinson's disease. Aging Dis 2020;11:1082–1090.
- 33. Yamanaka T, Uchida Y, Sakurai K, et al. Anatomical links between white matter hyperintensity and medial temporal atrophy reveal impairment of executive functions. Aging Dis 2019;10:711–718.
- 34. Aracil-Bolaños I, Sampedro F, Marín-Lahoz J, et al. A divergent breakdown of neurocognitive networks in Parkinson's disease mild cognitive impairment. Hum Brain Mapp 2019;40:3233–3242.
- Fereshtehnejad SM, Zeighami Y, Dagher A, Postuma RB. Clinical criteria for subtyping Parkinson's disease: biomarkers and longitudinal progression. Brain 2017;140:1959–1976.
- Fiorenzato E, Strafella AP, Kim J, et al. Dynamic functional connectivity changes associated with dementia in Parkinson's disease. Brain 2019;142:2860–2872.
- Hall JM, Lewis SJG. Neural correlates of cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: a review of structural MRI findings. Int Rev Neurobiol 2019;144:1–28.

- Li Y, Wang C, Wang J, et al. Mild cognitive impairment in de novo Parkinson's disease: a neuromelanin MRI study in locus coeruleus. Mov Disord 2019;34:884–892.
- Schulz J, Pagano G, Fernández Bonfante JA, et al. Nucleus basalis of Meynert degeneration precedes and predicts cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. Brain 2018;141:1501–1516.
- Wardlaw JM, Smith EE, Biessels GJ, et al. Neuroimaging standards for research into small vessel disease and its contribution to ageing and neurodegeneration. Lancet Neurol 2013;12:822–838.
- Goldman JG, Holden SK, Litvan I, et al. Evolution of diagnostic criteria and assessments for Parkinson's disease mild cognitive impairment. Mov Disord 2018;33:503–510.
- 42. Xie F, Gao X, Yang W, et al. Advances in the research of risk factors and prodromal biomarkers of Parkinson's disease. ACS Chem Neurosci 2019;10:973–990.
- 43. Delgado-Alvarado M, Gago B, Navalpotro-Gomez I, et al. Biomarkers for dementia and mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord 2016;31:861–881.
- 44. Wang A, Wang R, Cui D, et al. The drainage of interstitial fluid in the deep brain is controlled by the integrity of myelination. Aging Dis 2019;10:937–948.
- 45. Yu P, Venkat P, Chopp M, et al. Deficiency of tPA exacerbates white matter damage, neuroinflammation, glymphatic dysfunction and cognitive dysfunction in aging mice. Aging Dis 2019;10:770–783.
- 46. Xue Y, Zhang Z, Wen C, et al. Characterization of Alzheimer's disease using ultra-high b-values apparent diffusion coefficient and diffusion Kurtosis imaging. Aging Dis 2019;10:1026–1036.
- 47. Habes M, Erus G, Toledo JB, et al. White matter hyperintensities and imaging patterns of brain ageing in the general population. Brain 2016;139:1164–1179.
- 48. Ascherio A, Schwarzschild MA. The epidemiology of Parkinson's disease: risk factors and prevention. Lancet Neurol 2016;15:1257–1272.
- 49. Samii A, Nutt JG, Ransom BR. Parkinson's disease. Lancet 2004;363:1783–1793.
- 50. Tysnes OB, Storstein A. Epidemiology of Parkinson's disease. J Neural Transm 1996;2017:901–905.
- Sunwoo MK, Jeon S, Ham JH, et al. The burden of white matter hyperintensities is a predictor of progressive mild cognitive impairment in patients with Parkinson's disease. Eur J Neurol 2014;21:922-e50.
- 52. Jones JD, Tanner JJ, Okun M, et al. Are Parkinson's patients more vulnerable to the effects of cardiovascular risk: a neuroimaging and neuropsychological study. J Int Neuropsychol Soc 2017;23:322–331.
- Dadar M, Gee M, Shuaib A, et al. Cognitive and motor correlates of grey and white matter pathology in Parkinson's disease. Neuroimage Clin 2020;27:102353.

- 54. Hanning U, Teuber A, Lang E, et al. White matter hyperintensities are not associated with cognitive decline in early Parkinson's disease - the DeNoPa cohort. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2019;69:61–67.
- 55. Biesbroek JM, Weaver NA, Biessels GJ. Lesion location and cognitive impact of cerebral small vessel disease. Clin Sci 2017;131:715–728.
- 56. Brugulat-Serrat A, Salvadó G, Sudre CH, et al. Patterns of white matter hyperintensities associated with cognition in middle-aged cognitively healthy individuals. Brain Imaging Behav 2020;14:2012–2023.
- Cannistraro RJ, Badi M, Eidelman BH, et al. CNS small vessel disease: a clinical review. Neurology 2019;92:1146– 1156.
- De Guio F, Vignaud A, Chabriat H, Jouvent E. Different types of white matter hyperintensities in CADASIL: insights from 7-Tesla MRI. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 2018;38:1654–1663.
- 59. Hilal S, Biesbroek JM, Vrooman H, et al. The impact of strategic white matter hyperintensity lesion location on language. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2021;29:156–165.
- Leeuwis AE, Weaver NA, Biesbroek JM, et al. Impact of white matter hyperintensity location on depressive symptoms in memory-clinic patients: a lesion–symptom mapping study. J Psychiatry Neurosci 2019;44:E1–E10.
- 61. Linortner P, McDaniel C, Shahid M, et al. White matter hyperintensities related to Parkinson's disease executive function. Mov Disord Clin Pract 2020;7:629–638.
- 62. Wang ML, Zhang XX, Yu MM, et al. Prevalence of white matter hyperintensity in young clinical patients. Am J Roentgenol 2019;213:667–671.
- 63. Wang B, Zhang J, Pan W, et al. Differential influence of location-specific white-matter hyperintensities on attention subdomains measured using the attention network test. Med Sci Monitor 2020;26:e921874.
- 64. Dubois B, Burn D, Goetz C, et al. Diagnostic procedures for Parkinson's disease dementia: recommendations from the movement disorder society task force. Mov Disord 2007;22:2314–2324.
- Litvan I, Goldman JG, Tröster AI, et al. Diagnostic criteria for mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: Movement Disorder Society Task Force guidelines. Mov Disord 2012;27:349–356.
- 66. Uysal-Cantürk P, Hanağası HA, Bilgiç B, et al. An assessment of Movement Disorder Society Task Force diagnostic criteria for mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. Eur J Neurol 2018;25:148–153.
- 67. Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. Eur J Epidemiol 2010;25:603–605.
- Lee YH. An overview of meta-analysis for clinicians. Korean J Intern Med 2018;33:277–283.
- 69. Copas J, Shi JQ. Meta-analysis, funnel plots and sensitivity analysis. Biostatistics 2000;1:247–262.

- 70. Egger M, Smith GD, Phillips AN. Meta-analysis: principles and procedures. BMJ 1997;315:1533–1537.
- Kandiah N, Mak E, Ng A, et al. Cerebral white matter hyperintensity in Parkinson's disease: a major risk factor for mild cognitive impairment. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2013;19:680–683.
- 72. Melzer TR, Watts R, MacAskill MR, et al. White matter microstructure deteriorates across cognitive stages in Parkinson's disease. Neurology 2013;80:1841–1849.
- Amboni M, Tessitore A, Esposito F, et al. Resting-state functional connectivity associated with mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. J Neurol 2015;262:425–434.
- Baggio H-C, Segura B, Sala-Llonch R, et al. Cognitive impairment and resting-state network connectivity in Parkinson's disease. Hum Brain Mapp 2015;36:199–212.
- 75. Mak E, Dwyer MG, Ramasamy DP, et al. White matter hyperintensities and mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. J Neuroimaging 2015;25:754–760.
- Stojkovic T, Stefanova E, Soldatovic I, et al. Exploring the relationship between motor impairment, vascular burden and cognition in Parkinson's disease. J Neurol 2018;265:1320–1327.
- Huang X, Wen M-C, Ng SY-E, et al. Periventricular white matter hyperintensity burden and cognitive impairment in early Parkinson's disease. Eur J Neurol 2020;27:959–966.
- 78. Shin J, Choi S, Lee JE, et al. Subcortical white matter hyperintensities within the cholinergic pathways of Parkinson's disease patients according to cognitive status. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2012;83:315–321.
- Ham JH, Yi H, Sunwoo MK, et al. Cerebral microbleeds in patients with Parkinson's disease. J Neurol 2014;261:1628–1635.
- Beyer MK, Aarsland D, Greve OJ, Larsen JP. Visual rating of white matter hyperintensities in Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord 2006;21:223–229.
- Lee SJ, Kim JS, Yoo JY, et al. Influence of white matter hyperintensities on the cognition of patients with Parkinson's disease. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2010;24:227–233.
- González-Redondo R, Toledo J, Clavero P, et al. The impact of silent vascular brain burden in cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. Eur J Neurol 2012;19:1100–1107.
- 83. Slawek J, Roszmann A, Robowski P, et al. The impact of MRI white matter hyperintensities on dementia in Parkinson's disease in relation to the homocysteine level and other vascular risk factors. Neurodegener Dis 2013;12:1–12.
- Daida K, Tanaka R, Yamashiro K, et al. The presence of cerebral microbleeds is associated with cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. J Neurol Sci 2018;393:39–44.

- 85. Joki H, Higashiyama Y, Nakae Y, et al. White matter hyperintensities on MRI in dementia with Lewy bodies, Parkinson's disease with dementia, and Alzheimer's disease. J Neurol Sci 2018;385:99–104.
- Zhao RC, Stambler I. The urgent need for international action for anti-aging and disease prevention. Aging Dis 2020;11:212–215.
- 87. Lee Y, Ko J, Choi YE, et al. Areas of white matter hyperintensities and motor symptoms of Parkinson's disease. Neurology 2020;95:e291–e298.
- Tokuchi R, Hishikawa N, Sato K, et al. Age-dependent cognitive and affective differences in Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases in relation to MRI findings. J Neurol Sci 2016;365:3–8.
- 89. Dadar M, Zeighami Y, Yau Y, et al. White matter hyperintensities are linked to future cognitive decline in de novo Parkinson's disease patients. Neuroimage Clin 2018;20:892–900.
- Nicoletti A, Luca A, Baschi R, et al. Vascular risk factors, white matter lesions and cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: the PACOS longitudinal study. J Neurol 2021;268:549–558.
- de Schipper LJ, Hafkemeijer A, Bouts MJRJ, et al. Ageand disease-related cerebral white matter changes in patients with Parkinson's disease. Neurobiol Aging 2019;80:203–209.
- 92. van Straaten ECW, Fazekas F, Rostrup E, et al. Impact of white matter hyperintensities scoring method on correlations with clinical data: the LADIS study. Stroke 2006;37:836–840.
- 93. Veselý B, Rektor I. The contribution of white matter lesions (WML) to Parkinson's disease cognitive impairment symptoms: a critical review of the literature. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2016;22(Suppl 1):S166–S170.
- Bolandzadeh N, Davis JC, Tam R, et al. The association between cognitive function and white matter lesion location in older adults: a systematic review. BMC Neurol 2012;12:126.
- 95. Kloppenborg RP, Nederkoorn PJ, Geerlings MI, van den Berg E. Presence and progression of white matter hyperintensities and cognition: a meta-analysis. Neurology 2014;82:2127–2138.
- 96. Chu J-S, Liu T-H, Wang K-L, et al. The metabolic activity of caudate and prefrontal cortex negatively

correlates with the severity of idiopathic Parkinson's disease. Aging Dis 2019;10:847–853.

- 97. Cuadrado-Godia E, Dwivedi P, Sharma S, et al. Cerebral small vessel disease: a review focusing on pathophysiology, biomarkers, and machine learning strategies. J Stroke 2018;20:302–320.
- Armstrong NJ, Mather KA, Sargurupremraj M, et al. Common genetic variation indicates separate causes for periventricular and deep white matter hyperintensities. Stroke 2020;51:2111–2121.
- 99. Chahine LM, Dos Santos C, Fullard M, et al. Modifiable vascular risk factors, white matter disease and cognition in early Parkinson's disease. Eur J Neurol 2019;26:246-e18.
- 100. Williamson W, Lewandowski AJ, Forkert ND, et al. Association of cardiovascular risk factors with MRI indices of cerebrovascular structure and function and white matter hyperintensities in young adults. JAMA 2018;320:665–673.
- 101. Habes M, Erus G, Toledo JB, et al. Regional tract-specific white matter hyperintensities are associated with patterns to aging-related brain atrophy via vascular risk factors, but also independently. Alzheimer's Dement 2018;10:278–284.
- 102. van Middelaar T, Richard E, Moll van Charante EP, et al. Visit-to-visit blood pressure variability and progression of white matter hyperintensities among older people with hypertension. J American Medical Directors Association 2019;20:1175–1177.e1.
- 103. Arntz RM, van den Broek SMA, van Uden IWM, et al. Accelerated development of cerebral small vessel disease in young stroke patients. Neurology 2016;87:1212–1219.
- 104. McDonald C, Newton JL, Burn DJ. Orthostatic hypotension and cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: causation or association? Mov Disord 2016;31:937–946.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

Table S1. Search strategy in PubMed, Web of Science,EMBASE databases, Ovid, and Cochrane Library.