Received: 10 September 2024 | Revised: 21 November 2024 | Accepted: 6 December 2024

DOI: 10.1002/alz.14528

Alzheimer's & Dementia®
THE JOURNAL OF THE ALZHEIMER'S ASSOCIATION

REVIEW ARTICLE

Considerations in the clinical use of amyloid PET and CSF biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease

Antoine Leuzy[1,2,3,4] | **Ariane Bollack**[5,6] | **Daniela Pellegrino**[7] | **Charlotte E. Teunissen**[8] | **Renaud La Joie**[9] | **Gil D. Rabinovici**[9,10] | **Nicolai Franzmeier**[3,11,12] | **Keith Johnson**[13,14] | **Frederik Barkhof**[15,16,17] | **Leslie M. Shaw**[18] | **Alexander Arkhipenko**[19] | **Suzanne E. Schindler**[20] | **Lawrence S. Honig**[21] | **Alexis Moscoso Rial**[2,3,22] | **Michael Schöll**[2,3,4,23] | **Henrik Zetterberg**[3,24,25,26,27,28] | **Kaj Blennow**[3,24,29,30] | **Oskar Hansson**[1,31] | **Gill Farrar**[5]

Correspondence
Antoine Leuzy, Clinical Memory Research Unit, Department of Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Sölvegatan 19, 221 84 Lund, Sweden.
Email: antoine.leuzy@med.lu.se

Antoine Leuzy and Ariane Bollack shared the first authors.

Abstract

Amyloid-β (Aβ) positron emission tomography (PET) imaging and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) biomarkers are now established tools in the diagnostic workup of patients with Alzheimer's disease (AD), and their use is anticipated to increase with the introduction of new disease-modifying therapies. Although these biomarkers are comparable alternatives in research settings to determine Aβ status, biomarker testing in clinical practice requires careful consideration of the strengths and limitations of each modality, as well as the specific clinical context, to identify which test is best suited for each patient. This article provides a comprehensive review of the pathologic processes reflected by Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers, their performance, and their current

Funding information: Research of the European Commission; Marie Curie International Training Network, Grant/Award Number: 860197; Innovative Medicines Initiatives 3TR, Grant/Award Number: 831434; Joint Undertaking, Grant/Award Number: 101034344; National MS Society; Alzheimer Drug Discovery Foundation; Alzheimer Association; Health Holland, the Dutch Research Council, Grant/Award Number: 10510032120003; Dutch National Dementia Strategy; The Selfridges Group Foundation; Alzheimer Netherlands; NIH; NIA, Grant/Award Numbers: R35 AG072362, P30-AG062422, U01-AG057195, P01-AG019724; National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke; American College of Radiology; Rainwater Charitable Foundation; Shanendoah Foundation; Deutsche Parkinson Gesellschaft; Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft; Munich Cluster for Systems Neurology, Grant/Award Numbers: EXC 2145 SyNergy, ID 390857198; Harvard Aging Brain Study, Grant/Award Numbers: P01 AG036694, R01 AG046396, U19 ADNI4, U19AG024904, ADRC P30-AG-072979, R01 AG070941, R01AG072474, R01 AG059013, R01 AG066107, R21AG070768; NINDS, Grant/Award Numbers: U01NS100600, P30AG066462, U19AG063893; Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, Grant/Award Numbers: KAW2014.0363, KAW 2023.0371; Swedish Research Council, Grant/Award Numbers: 2017-02869, 2021-02678, 2021-06545, 2023-06188; European Union's Horizon Europe, Grant/Award Numbers: 101132933, 101112145, R01 AG081394-01; National Research Foundation of Korea, Grant/Award Number: RS-2023-00263612; County Councils, the ALF-agreement, Grant/Award Numbers: ALFGBG-813971, ALFGBG-965326; Swedish Brain Foundation, Grant/Award Number: FO2021-0293; Swedish Alzheimer Foundation, Grant/Award Number: AF-994900; Sahlgrenska Academy at the University of Gothenburg; Västra Götaland Region R&D, Grant/Award Number: VGFOUREG-995510; National Institute for Health and Care Research University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre, Grant/Award Numbers: 2022-01018, 2019-02397, 101053962, ALFGBG-71320, 201809-2016862; AD Strategic Fund, and Alzheimer's Association, Grant/Award Numbers: ADSF-21-831376-C, ADSF-21-831381-C, ADSF-21-831377-C; Bluefield Project, Olav Thon Foundation, Erling-Persson Family Foundation, Grant/Award Number: FO2022-0270; Marie Skłodowska-Curie, Grant/Award Number: 860197; European Union Joint Programme; Neurodegenerative Disease Research, Grant/Award Numbers: JPND2021-00694, UKDRI-1003, 2017-00915, 2022-00732, AF-930351, AF-939721, AF-968270; Hjärnfonden, Sweden, Grant/Award Numbers: FO2017-0243, ALZ2022-0006; Swedish state under the agreement between the Swedish government and the County Councils, ALF-agreement, Grant/Award Numbers: ALFGBG-715986, ALFGBG-965240; European Union Joint Program for Neurodegenerative Disorders, Grant/Award Number: JPND2019-466-236; Alzheimer's Association 2021 Zenith Award, Grant/Award Number: ZEN-21-848495; Alzheimer's Association 2022–2025, Grant/Award Number: SG-23-1038904; National Institute of Aging, Grant/Award Number: R01AG083740; European Research Council, Grant/Award Number: ADG-101096455; Alzheimer's Association, Grant/Award Numbers: ZEN24-1069572, SG-23-1061717; GHR Foundation, Swedish Research Council, Grant/Award Number: 2022-00775; ERA PerMed, Grant/Award Number: ERAPERMED2021-184; Knut and Alice Wallenberg foundation, Grant/Award Number: 2022-0231; Strategic Research Area MultiPark (Multidisciplinary Research in Parkinson's disease) at Lund University, Swedish Alzheimer Foundation, Grant/Award Number: AF-980907; Parkinson foundation of Sweden, Grant/Award Number: 1412/22; Cure Alzheimer's fund, Rönström Family Foundation; Konung Gustaf V:s och Drottning Victorias Frimurarestiftelse, Skåne University Hospital Foundation, Grant/Award Number: 2020-O000028; Regionalt Forskningsstöd, Grant/Award Number: 2022-1259; Swedish Federal Government under the ALF agreement, Grant/Award Number: 2022-Projekt0080; GE Healthcare

and future applications and contexts of use. The primary aim is to assist clinicians in making better-informed decisions about the suitability of each biomarker in different clinical situations, thereby reducing the risk of misdiagnosis or incorrect interpretation of biomarker results.

KEYWORDS
Alzheimer, Aβ-PET, biomarkers, CSF, diagnosis

Highlights

- Recent advances have positioned Aβ PET and CSF biomarkers as pivotal in AD diagnosis.
- It is crucial to understand the differences in the clinical use of these biomarkers.
- A team of experts reviewed the state of Aβ PET and CSF markers in clinical settings.
- Differential features in the clinical application of these biomarkers were reviewed.
- We discussed the role of Aβ PET and CSF in the context of novel plasma biomarkers.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is a neurodegenerative disease clinically characterized by cognitive decline, memory loss, and behavioral changes.[1] AD is the leading cause of dementia, affecting more than 55 million people worldwide.[2] The pathophysiological hallmark of AD is the accumulation of amyloid-β (Aβ) plaques and tau neurofibrillary tangles in the brain,[3] which precede clinical symptoms by years, if not decades.[4,5] Early and accurate diagnosis of AD is crucial for patient management, therapeutic intervention, and the development of disease-modifying treatments. Traditional diagnostic approaches, relying on clinical assessment including neuropsychological testing, often identify AD at a relatively late stage when significant neuronal damage has already occurred.[6] Moreover, neuropathological studies show that Aβ plaques and neurofibrillary tangles are found in only about 85% of cases who have a clinical diagnosis of AD dementia,[7–9] highlighting the limited specificity of clinical criteria in detecting AD neuropathology. Hence, there is an increasing emphasis on the clinical use of biomarkers to facilitate early and specific diagnosis of AD pathophysiology.[10–12]

Two biomarker modalities are now well-validated and approved components in the diagnostic workup of AD patients in specialized clinical settings: Aβ positron emission tomography (PET) imaging and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) biomarkers[10,13] These diagnostic tools allow for in vivo detection of cerebral Aβ pathology and have provided critical insights into the underlying disease mechanisms, enabling the identification of AD pathological changes even at the preclinical or mild cognitive impairment (MCI) stages of AD.[14–18]

Aβ-PET imaging uses radiolabeled tracers that bind selectively to fibrillar Aβ, allowing for visualization and quantification of these pathologic protein deposits.[19] This minimally invasive imaging technique thus offers direct visualization of regional cerebral Aβ deposition, which was previously only possible through histopathological examination.

CSF biomarkers reflect biochemical changes associated with AD pathology, providing an indirect measure of the presence of Aβ plaques.[20] Key CSF biomarkers for the detection of Aβ pathology in AD are $A\beta_{42}$ and the $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio, as well as hybrid ratios combining measures of phosphorylated tau or total tau with $A\beta_{42}$ (p-tau181/$A\beta_{42}$ and t-tau/$A\beta_{42}$).[12] A reduction in CSF $A\beta_{42}$ levels or the $A\beta_{42}/A\beta_{40}$ ratio, along with elevated t-tau and p-tau levels, constitute the biochemical signature of AD in CSF.[21–23] These biomarkers, though requiring a lumbar puncture, provide an accessible and cost-effective method for the in vivo detection of Aβ pathology.

Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers have significantly transformed the diagnostic workup of AD in specialized memory clinics, improving the accuracy of the etiological diagnosis of dementia. These biomarkers have caused a shift from a clinical diagnosis based only on symptoms and cognitive testing to one that is increasingly supported by biomarkers.[10,11,24,25] Current clinical applications include aiding in the diagnosis of patients with cognitive impairment of uncertain etiology,[26,27] differential diagnosis,[28] prognosis,[16,17,29] and to establish the presence of abnormal Aβ required prior to the anti-Aβ therapy initiation,[30] among other uses.[31] Only Aβ-PET has thus far been used as the primary endpoint for the assessment of target engagement in pivotal clinical trials of anti-Aβ antibodies.[32,33] With the advent of novel disease-modifying therapies for AD, the use of these biomarkers is expected to increase,[34] as their assessment is critical for identifying suitable individuals for treatment. In the near future, AD biomarkers will be used for assessing treatment response and making decisions about ongoing therapeutic strategies.[35]

Here, we provide a comprehensive narrative review of Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers, highlighting their commonalities but also their key differences with regard to the pathologic processes they reflect, the performance for detection of Aβ pathology, as well as their

interchangeability in current clinical practice. Additionally, we discuss the future role of these established biomarkers in the context of emerging blood-based tests for AD pathophysiology. The objective of this narrative review is to provide clinicians with a comprehensive understanding of the pathologic processes measured by Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers, along with their strengths and limitations, enabling them to make more informed decisions on their appropriateness depending on the specific context of use.

RESEARCH IN CONTEXT

1. **Systematic review**: Using conventional search engines, we performed a comprehensive review of the published literature on clinically approved amyloid-β (Aβ) biomarkers, specifically Aβ positron emission tomography (PET) and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) biomarkers. We focused on available evidence on the pathological processes reflected by these markers, their diagnostic accuracy, as well as their current applications and potential future uses.
2. **Interpretation**: A strong body of literature supports the reliability of Aβ PET and CSF biomarkers in detecting Aβ pathology in clinical practice. However, careful selection based on clinical context is essential to minimize inaccuracies.
3. **Future directions**: Emerging clinical applications of Aβ biomarkers, including longitudinal monitoring of treatment effects, underscore the importance of further studying the unique features of each biomarker.

2 | NEUROPATHOLOGIC PROCESSES REFLECTED BY Aβ-PET AND CSF BIOMARKERS

Although the main purpose of both Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers is to detect the presence of Aβ plaques, these markers reflect inherently different—yet closely related—neuropathologic processes. In this section, we review the specific biological changes measured by each biomarker and describe their relationship.

2.1 | Aβ PET

Despite being clinically used as a binary test, Aβ-PET is an imaging technique that can be used to quantify the regional deposition of fibrillar Aβ in the brain. The development of Aβ-specific radiotracers is based mostly on conjugated dyes such as Thioflavin-T and Congo red, which have been used by neuropathologists for the staining of Aβ fibrils.[36] Therefore, Aβ-PET imaging allows for the in vivo visualization and quantification of the accumulated burden of diffuse and neuritic plaques in gray matter[37–40] (Figure 1A), with the latter being one of the neuropathologic hallmarks of AD.[3] Given their more fibrillar structure, neuritic plaques contribute more than diffuse plaques to the overall magnitude of the Aβ-PET signal.[41]

Aβ-PET radiotracers also show affinity for vascular Aβ deposits characteristic of cerebral amyloid angiopathy (CAA).[42,43] The contribution from these deposits to the overall PET signal remains challenging to assess, but appears to be modest,[44] and the clinical utility of Aβ-PET in CAA remains unclear.[45] In addition, Aβ-PET tracers exhibit elevated uptake throughout white matter, regardless of the presence or absence of cortical Aβ (Figure 1A). This signal in the white matter does not reflect Aβ deposition. Although the mechanism of this nonspecific binding is not well understood, it has been hypothesized that Aβ-PET tracers bind to beta-sheets in the myelin basic protein.[46]



FIGURE 1 Schematic representation of the biological processes captured by Aβ-PET and CSF Aβ and p-tau. Panel (A) shows schematic representations of the spatial progression of Aβ pathology (upper panels) alongside the corresponding Bielschowsky silver staining (BSS) of neuritic plaques (mid panels) and exemplar Aβ-PET ([^{18}F]flutemetamol) scans (middle and bottom panels, respectively), across CERAD scores of "None," "Sparse," "Moderate," and "Frequent." A negative Aβ-PET scan reflects CERAD scores of "None" or "Sparse," while a positive Aβ-PET scan reflects CERAD scores of "Moderate" or "Frequent." Reprinted with permission from Dr. Christopher Rowe. Panel (B) represents the Aβ aggregation process in patients with AD, resulting in reduced Aβ and increased p-tau in the CSF (lower part of the figure, below the dashed line). This is contrasted with the process in normal aging (upper part of the figure, above the dashed line).

2.2 | CSF biomarkers

The theoretical foundation for CSF biomarkers is that molecular changes in the brain's extracellular and interstitial environments are reflected through the communication of these spaces with CSF.[47] Thus, CSF biomarkers are not direct markers of either Aβ plaques or tau neurofibrillary tangles, but instead, measure dynamic biochemical correlates of these brain changes (Figure 1B). The CSF protein signature of AD shows whether Aβ plaque formation is actively ongoing but does not quantify the amount of plaques in the brain.[4, 48–51]

CSF in AD patients is characterized by a marked reduction in the concentration of the 42 amino acid-long and aggregation-prone form of Aβ ($A\beta_{42}$).[52] $A\beta_{42}$ is a fragment produced by the cleavage of the amyloid precursor protein (APP) that is usually released and transported from the brain's interstitial fluid into the CSF and blood.[53] One hypothesis for the decrease in CSF $A\beta_{42}$ observed in AD patients is that this hydrophobic peptide aggregates and becomes sequestered in neuritic plaques, leading to reduced amounts of soluble $A\beta_{42}$ being released in the brain interstitial fluid and CSF.[20] Thus, reductions in CSF $A\beta_{42}$ indirectly reflect the presence of Aβ plaques. An alternative theory is that lower CSF $A\beta_{42}$ levels are due to the propensity of $A\beta_{42}$ to form soluble oligomers and protofibrils that are stuck in the brain and not released into the CSF and blood.

Another relevant Aβ peptide species in CSF is $A\beta_{40}$. Although the concentration of $A\beta_{40}$ is reported to be unchanged in AD,[54] the ratio of $A\beta_{42}$ to $A\beta_{40}$ ($A\beta_{42/40}$) is more effective than the concentration of $A\beta_{42}$ alone in distinguishing between Aβ-positive and Aβ-negative individuals on PET.[55–57] The reason for the improved performance of the $A\beta_{42/40}$ ratio remains unclear but may relate in part to pre-analytical factors, blood-brain barrier permeability, and other interindividual variations in the transport of proteins from the brain into CSF as well as the volume and clearance of CSF.[58, 59]

In addition to the Aβ-related biomarkers CSF $A\beta_{42}$ and $A\beta_{42/40}$, the concentrations of total tau (t-tau) and phosphorylated tau at threonine residues 181 (p-tau181), 205, 217, and 231 in CSF are also increased in AD.[12, 52] Measurements of p-tau181 (also referred to as p-tau in previous publications) have been most frequently used in clinical assays, and while elevations in t-tau are believed to reflect neuronal damage,[60] elevations in phosphorylated tau may reflect secretion of truncated tau fragments that is more closely related to Aβ than neurofibrillary tangle pathology.[61–67] Further, increases in p-tau levels have been shown to mediate the relationship between Aβ plaques and tau tangles.[68–70] This led to the evaluation of the CSF p-tau181/$A\beta_{42}$ and t-tau/$A\beta_{42}$ ratios as biomarkers of Aβ pathology,[71, 72] which demonstrated superior concordance with Aβ-PET compared to $A\beta_{42}$ alone. Of note, clinical interpretation of these ratios, particularly t-tau/$A\beta_{42}$, may benefit from the evaluation in conjunction with the individual biomarker concentrations, as cerebrovascular insults, traumatic brain injury, and encephalitis may result in sharp increases in tau markers and their corresponding ratios in a non-Aβ-dependent manner.[73]

2.3 | Relationship between Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers

Several autopsy studies have consistently demonstrated that the intensity of *ante mortem* Aβ-PET signal strongly correlates with the *post mortem* density of neuritic plaques.[40, 74, 75] Similarly, CSF $A\beta_{42}$ concentrations decrease rapidly with increasing Aβ-PET signal, but in contrast, there is a strong floor effect within the Aβ-positive range in which the correlation between these two biomarkers is almost non-existent (Figure 2).[76–78] In addition, longitudinal studies showed very weak correlations between longitudinal changes in CSF $A\beta_{42}$ levels and Aβ-PET signal over time.[79] These results highlight that variations in CSF $A\beta_{42}$ concentration within the abnormal range reflect aspects of Aβ pathology other than neuritic plaque density. Thus, CSF $A\beta_{42}$ represents a "state" marker[80] reflecting the presence or absence of Aβ pathology, rather than a marker of the amount of neuritic plaques. However, low levels of these biomarkers within the normal range are predictive of cognitive decline.[81, 82]

The associations of CSF p-tau181 and t-tau with Aβ-PET signal are weaker than those observed for CSF $A\beta_{42}$ or CSF $A\beta_{42/40}$,[83, 84] and these CSF tau markers showed no or minimal change over time in previous longitudinal studies.[85, 86] Similar to CSF $A\beta_{42}$, these results indicate that elevations in these CSF tau markers are associated with a pathologic state that is characterized by the presence of Aβ plaques but is not directly reflective of their cumulative amount.

Although several longitudinal studies have found that CSF $A\beta_{42}$ concentrations reach abnormal levels a few years before Aβ pathology is evident on Aβ-PET,[4, 48–51, 87] the timing of the biological processes measured by Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers is similar (Figure 3).[11]

3 | PERFORMANCE FOR THE DETECTION OF CEREBRAL Aβ

In the following section, we provide an overview of the performance of Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers for detecting Aβ pathology, reviewing the methods used to validate each biomarker as well as highlighting the factors that may influence their performance.

3.1 | Aβ-PET as predictor of Aβ at autopsy

Aβ-PET is a well-validated biomarker for AD. As required by regulatory agencies for clinical approval, the validation of Aβ-PET was based on "PET-to-autopsy" phase III studies, in which individuals underwent PET imaging within a short period before death (~1 year), and imaging findings were compared with Aβ burden at autopsy. These studies set the highest standard for biomarker validation in the field of AD, which resulted in the approval of several Aβ-PET radiotracers for clinical use by many regulatory agencies worldwide including the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), European Medicines Agency (EMA), as well as by several local agencies in Asia, North and South



FIGURE 2 Relationship of Aβ-PET Centiloids with CSF Aβ_{42} and p-tau181. Data shown is from 562 participants from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) with available Aβ-PET and CSF Aβ_{42} (A) and p-tau181 (B) (Elecsys) at the baseline visit. ρ represents Spearman correlations.



FIGURE 3 Schematic representation of the temporal course of Aβ-PET and CSF Aβ_{42} biomarker changes in AD. Shown are the hypothetical temporal trajectories of Aβ-PET and CSF Aβ_{42} changes, together with other AD biomarkers, and the corresponding clinical stages of AD, as proposed by Refs. 88, 89.

America, and Australia.[90] Due to its ability to directly measure Aβ plaque burden and the extensive validation, Aβ-PET is being used as the gold standard for clinical validation of other biomarkers, including those from CSF.

Though Aβ-PET is an imaging technique that can quantify the amount of fibrillar Aβ in the brain, clinically approved methods for the assessment of Aβ-PET rely on the binary classification (negative/positive) of the scans using visual reads. In PET-to-autopsy studies, visual reads proved highly accurate in discriminating older adults with CERAD neuritic plaque scores of "absent" or "sparse" from those with "moderate" to "frequent" scores, exhibiting sensitivities of 88–98% and specificities of 88–100% (Table 1).[38–40] Importantly, quantitative measures (see Section 3.7) which are increasingly being used to supplement visual read methodology derived from Aβ-PET also demonstrated high accuracy discriminating between individuals with "absent/sparse" and "moderate/frequent" CERAD scores, as well as between "none-low" and "intermediate-high" AD neuropathologic change.[74, 91, 92]

TABLE 1 Performance of Aβ PET radiotracers in "PET-to-autopsy" studies for discriminating between "none/sparse" and "moderate/frequent" CERAD scores.

Radiotracer	Clinical approval by FDA, EMA, and other agencies	Method	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)
[^{18}F]florbetapir (Amyvid)[38]	Yes	Visual read	92% (78% to 98%)	100% (80% to 100%)
[^{18}F]florbetaben (Neuraceq)[40]	Yes	Visual read	98% (94% to 100%)	89% (77% to 100%)
[^{18}F]flutemetamol (Vizamyl™)[39, 92]	Yes	Visual read	86% (72% to 95%)[39] and 91% (82% to 96%)[92]	92% (74% to 99%)[39] and 90% (74% to 98%)[92]
Pittsburgh Compound B (^{11}C-PiB)[74]	No	Quantification	89% (82% to 94%)	86% (75% to 94%)

3.2 | CSF biomarkers as predictors of Aβ at autopsy

A large number of research studies have reported high accuracy of CSF biomarkers for detecting Aβ pathology ("absent/sparse" vs. "moderate/frequent" CERAD scores) and relevant AD neuropathologic changes ("none-low" and "intermediate-high" AD neuropathologic change) at autopsy, supporting the validity of CSF biomarkers for AD.[93–101] Yet, no prospective phase III clinical study has validated the accuracy of *ante mortem* CSF biomarkers to predict Aβ plaque burden at autopsy. The primary limitation of these "CSF-to-autopsy" studies is the lack of prespecified cutoff values for establishing biomarker positivity, with most of the studies reporting sensitivities and specificities based on post-hoc research-driven values, which are generally not applicable in clinical settings. Furthermore, "CSF-to-autopsy" studies were usually not based on end-of-life cohorts, unlike "PET-to-autopsy" studies, leading to significantly longer intervals between CSF biomarker measurements and *post mortem* neuropathologic evaluations. For these reasons, clinical studies have primarily focused on the evaluation of the concordance between CSF biomarkers and Aβ-PET visual reads and, more recently, adjunct quantitative measures.

3.3 | CSF biomarkers versus Aβ-PET as predictors of Aβ at autopsy

There are only a few studies comparing head-to-head *ante mortem* CSF biomarkers with Aβ-PET as predictors of Aβ pathology at autopsy, reporting similar accuracies for both biomarkers.[99, 102–104] Concordance between both markers was also high (80–90%). A relatively small study (n = 21) comparing CSF biomarkers and Aβ-PET with neuropathology provided a detailed description of the biomarker-discordant cases.[99] The study reported three cases with discordant Aβ-PET and CSF biomarker results: two cases with non-AD neuropathological diagnosis and "none-low" AD neuropathologic change (A0B0C0 and A2B1C1)[3] exhibited positive CSF biomarkers but negative Aβ PET; the remaining discordant case had "high" AD neuropathologic change (A3B3C3) and displayed a positive Aβ-PET scan but negative CSF biomarkers. In addition, two cases had both positive CSF biomarkers and Aβ-PET but had a neuropathologic diagnosis of non-AD and exhibited "none-low" AD neuropathologic changes (A3B1C1 and A1B1C0). Together, these results demonstrate that several factors may account for discordant Aβ-PET and CSF biomarker results, and even positivity in both markers does not always indicate a neuropathological diagnosis of AD. This highlights the importance of considering comorbidities and the presence of other neurodegenerative disorders when interpreting Aβ biomarkers for clinical diagnosis. Larger head-to-head studies using a neuropathologically confirmed standard of truth would be valuable to better understand the differential performance of Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers.

3.4 | CSF biomarkers as surrogates of Aβ PET

CSF biomarkers have proven accurate predictors of Aβ-PET results. Table 2 summarizes percent concordance metrics between Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers measured using different fully automated platforms.[71, 72, 105–115] The reported sensitivities for CSF $A\beta_{42}$ were in general higher (from 79.5% to 100%) than the specificities (from 51% to 81%). This finding may be explained by the different timing in the onset of abnormal changes in soluble $A\beta_{42}$ and fibrillar Aβ, but also by the influence of other factors potentially leading to false positives on CSF markers (see Section 3.8). The use of the CSF biomarker ratios $A\beta_{42/40}$, p-tau181/$A\beta_{42}$, and t-tau/$A\beta_{42}$ resulted in generally better specificities than $A\beta_{42}$ alone (from 77% to 94% for $A\beta_{42/40}$, from 80% to 94% for p-tau181/$A\beta_{42}$, from 83% to 97% for t-tau/$A\beta_{42}$). Minimizing the number of false positive cases is important in the context of novel disease-modifying therapies, as a positive biomarker result may lead to inappropriate initiation of anti-Aβ therapy in patients who are Aβ-negative.

Overall, the reasonably high concordance between CSF biomarkers and Aβ-PET supports the use of both modalities in clinical practice to establish Aβ status. However, clinical interpretation of each individual biomarker modality should consider that a non-negligible fraction of cases may present with discordant biomarker results. When considering the clinical use of CSF biomarkers, clinicians must carefully assess each individual case to exclude the possibility of factors other than AD pathology potentially leading to positive CSF biomarker results (see Section 3.8). This is particularly important when these results could lead to significant changes in management or treatment decisions.[116]

TABLE 2 Reported performance of FDA- and EMA-approved fully automated CSF biomarker assays for predicting Aβ PET status.

Platform	Study	$A\beta_{42}$ (Sens/Spec)	p-tau181 (Sens/Spec)	t-tau (Sens/Spec)	$A\beta_{42/40}$ (Sens/Spec)	p-tau181/$A\beta_{42}$ (Sens/Spec)	t-tau/$A\beta_{42}$ (Sens/Spec)
Lumipulse G[a]	Alcolea et al.[105]	95/51	80/83	75/83	88/77	93/80	81/83
	Kaplow et al.[c], [106]	97/68	NA	74/84	NA	NA	92/85
	Moon et al.[107]	80/88	80/79	59/89	85/92	85/93	85/88
	Campbell et al.[108]	NA	NA	NA	77/98	79/99	NA
	Willemse et al.[109]	91/73	NA	NA	99/83	97/91	91/90
	Keshavan et al.[110]	74/100	66/100	82/54	94/100	94/100	90/92
	Nisenbaum et al.[111]	90/81	83/83	74/76	94/88	95/83	92/82
Elecsys[b]	Schindler et al.[72]	90/73	82/76	68/83	96/82	92/89	92/85
	Hansson et al.[c71]	86/81	NA	NA	NA	89/92	87/93
	Shaw et al.[112]	98/93	NA	NA	NA	97/100	97/100
	Doecke et al.[113]	81/81	81/77		90/90	90/91	83/97
	Campbell et al.[108]	NA	NA	NA	NA	77/98	NA
	Willemse et al.[109]	91/75	NA	NA	NA	96/89	89/90
	Amft et al.[114]	93/57	69/80	87/63	94/82	96/69	92/69
	Van Harten et al.[115]	86/76	NA	NA	NA	92/92	94/91

[a] *Note* that Aβ42/40 is the only clinically approved measure for the Lumipulse G platform.
[b] *Note* that p-tau181/$A\beta_{42}$ and t-tau/$A\beta_{42}$ are the only clinically approved for the Elecsys platform.
[c] Results were averaged (weighted average) across the different datasets presented in the study.

3.5 | Longitudinal Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers

With the advent of novel anti-Aβ therapies, serial measurements of Aβ biomarkers will be necessary not only for identifying suitable candidates for these therapies but could also be valuable for monitoring Aβ clearance and determining when to discontinue therapy.

As previously discussed, the intensity of the Aβ-PET signal in a cortical brain region provides a measure of the density of Aβ plaques therein.[75] Thus, Aβ-PET signal changes over time allow for monitoring the accumulation or removal of Aβ plaques. The ability of Aβ-PET signal intensity to track changes in Aβ plaque burden has been consistently demonstrated, showing increased rates of Aβ accumulation in individuals who were positive on their baseline Aβ-PET scan.[117–119] Moreover, a recent study demonstrated that individuals who are negative on their baseline scan but who will show significant Aβ accumulation over time (Aβ accumulators) can be reliably identified based on their baseline Aβ-PET levels, allowing for more efficient recruitment for secondary prevention trials.[120]

By contrast, the limited correlation between CSF biomarkers and Aβ-PET signal within the Aβ-positive range,[76–78, 121] indicative of limited correlation with the amount of Aβ plaques, together with the fact that CSF biomarker levels exhibit only small changes over time,[79, 122] makes these markers less useful for monitoring treatment-related reductions in cerebral Aβ burden. However, CSF biomarkers do change over time with several anti-Aβ and anti-tau therapies and, thus, can provide additional evidence of disease-modifying effects.[32, 123, 124]

3.6 | Variability in Aβ-PET measurements

Clinical use of Aβ-PET primarily relies on visual interpretation of the scans as negative or positive according to standardized procedures.[125–127] These visual interpretation methods have shown high inter-reader agreement, with Cohen's or Fleiss' κ values ranging from 0.63 to 0.94.[128–134] Of note, methodological factors such as the injected radiotracer dose and scan duration were found to have minimal impact on visual assessments of Aβ-PET images.[129, 134] These features indicate that visual interpretation methods for Aβ-PET represent a reliable and standardized way of assessing the presence of relevant Aβ pathology across different settings. This allowed the use of multiple tracers in several multicenter clinical trials that successfully enrolled participants on the basis of a visually positive Aβ-PET scan. Yet, it is also important to highlight factors that can reduce the robustness of visual reads to minimize the number of erroneous interpretations of an Aβ-PET scan in clinical practice. First, inter-rater variability appears to be correlated with the readers' experience interpreting Aβ-PET images[135]; second, in preclinical and prodromal stages, Aβ deposition may be emerging or focal,[136] complicating visual assessments, particularly for less experienced readers; third, partial volume effects due to either cortical atrophy or spill-in signal from the white matter, can result in false negative and false positive scans, respectively[137]; fourth, comorbidities such as normal pressure hydrocephalus, other neurodegenerative conditions and other brain abnormalities can complicate visual interpretation of Aβ-PET images[138–141]; fifth, the color scales and visual interpretation guidelines are different for each radiotracer,

which requires clinicians to be trained in the assessment of different tracers if switching between tracers is necessary.

Apart from visual reads, Aβ-PET can also be evaluated in a fully semi-quantitative manner. The advantage of a continuous rather than binary assessment of Aβ pathology, however, may be offset by an increased susceptibility of quantitative measures to variability. There are several biological and methodological factors that could influence the test-retest repeatability of PET-derived quantitative measurements.[142] An example of a common biological factor influencing Aβ-PET quantification is cortical atrophy. Severe cortical atrophy can result in relevant partial volume effects leading to an artificial decrease of the Aβ-PET signal in the affected cortical region.[143] This effect can have a significant impact on serial Aβ-PET measurements if severe atrophy develops over follow-up.[144] In addition, other biological factors, such as changes in cerebral blood flow, can also influence radiotracer delivery and uptake, resulting in signal variations and reducing the accuracy of longitudinal measurements[142, 145, 146] (see Ref. 120 for a detailed review).

In addition to these intra-subject sources of variability, several methodological factors can also affect quantitative PET measures. At the image acquisition level, these include the specific radiotracer used to image Aβ pathology, as well as differences in scanning time window,[147] delays between radiotracer injection and scan acquisition, patient motion in the scanner,[148] scanner resolution,[149] and image reconstruction parameters,[150] among others (see Refs. 137, 142 for a detailed review). The impact of other technical factors, such as scanner type and reconstruction algorithms, remains unclear. Given the significant changes in both hardware and software in the latest generation of digital PET/computed tomography (CT) scanners, these advancements could affect previous harmonization approaches, like the Centiloid[151] scale, which was primarily validated using older scanners. Additional studies are needed to investigate the impact of these recent developments on PET scanner performance. Another important source of variability across laboratories could be the specific quantification pipeline used, which typically involves different choices of reference regions, target regions of interest, cut-point values for establishing Aβ-PET positivity in a fully quantitative manner, and use (or not) of partial volume effects correction.[152] Overall, when consistently managing methodological factors, test-retest variabilities in quantitative Aβ-PET measures are relatively low, ranging from 1% to 8%,[117, 129, 153–155] allowing for the reliable detection of early treatment-related Aβ removal.[32, 33, 156, 157]

3.7 | Standardization of Aβ-PET measurements

A recent study has proposed a standardized visual interpretation method for all the available Aβ-PET radiotracers,[158] but this method has not yet been approved for clinical use. Despite the lack of a standardized visual method for all tracers, tracer-specific visual reads are generally considered highly interchangeable due to their high accuracy, robustness against methodological variations, and high reproducibility across different settings. Standardization is more important for quantitative measures derived from Aβ PET. Initial efforts focused on reducing between-scanner variability by applying a three-dimensional smoothing to achieve a uniform resolution, an approach that proved effective in large multicenter studies such as the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI)[159] or AMYPAD.[160] More recently, a novel methodology (PEACE) has shown better performance than three-dimensional smoothing,[161] though additional validation is needed in multicenter studies. In addition, the use of different quantification methods across laboratories did not allow for merging quantification results measured at different sites with varying tracers and quantification pipelines. This lack of standardization prevented the establishment of universal cut-points for clinically relevant normal/abnormal ranges and complicated the comparison of longitudinal changes in the Aβ-PET burden across laboratories. These limitations ultimately hinder the widespread use of quantification methods for Aβ-PET as an adjunct to visual reads in clinical practice and trials. For this reason, significant efforts have been made to develop a universal quantification scale, the Centiloid scale,[151] that harmonizes quantitative results across different radiotracers and quantification pipelines.

The Centiloid scale relies on reference data from a publicly available dataset from the Global Alzheimer Association Interactive Network (GAAIN) repository in which individuals were scanned with the Aβ-PET tracer Pittsburgh compound B ([^{11}C]PiB). Quantitative results are anchored from 0 (high certainty of the absence of Aβ based on the average Aβ burden of young healthy controls) to 100 (average Aβ burden of a group of patients with mild-moderate AD dementia), resulting in the Centiloid scale. By referencing additional Aβ-PET tracers and quantification methods to this reference data, any Aβ-PET quantitative measurement can be transformed to the Centiloid scale.[151] This scale has proven useful for establishing cut-points for Aβ-PET status, yielding sensitivities and specificities[74, 91] comparable to those in previous "PET-to-autopsy" studies using visual reads.[38–40] These Centiloid (CL) cut-points also showed high concordance with clinically approved visual reads,[162, 163] most of them ranging from 20 to 30 CL for distinguishing between visually positive and negative reads.[91, 162, 164–167] A detailed description of the Centiloid cut-points published in the literature can be found in.[168] In addition, the Centiloid scale has also proven robust against changes in effective image resolution and quantification pipelines.[152]

Though the Centiloid approach has significantly contributed to solve standardization problems, recent evidence suggests that the robustness of this method could be further enhanced by selecting methodological approaches that minimize bias and variability, such as specific reference and cortical regions of interest, quantification pipeline, or scanning time.[169–172] Adoption of these methodological guidelines will further increase the robustness and reliability of the Centiloid approach, but further studies are needed to determine the specific set of methods that allow for optimal reproducibility.

Previous studies have proposed alternative methods to the Centiloid approach for between-tracer harmonization of Aβ-PET scans.[173, 174] Despite results suggesting superior performance, none

of these methods have been further validated in external multicenter studies.

3.8 | Variability in CSF biomarkers measurements

The presence of comorbidities and other neurodegenerative disorders has been reported to be associated with abnormal levels of different CSF biomarkers. For instance, abnormal levels of CSF Aβ_{42} can be detected in a proportion of cases with Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease without Aβ plaques,[175] as well as in neuroinflammatory conditions[176, 177] and in CSF dynamics disorders such as normal pressure hydrocephalus.[178, 179] White matter hyperintensity burden is also associated with reduced CSF Aβ_{42} levels in both AD[180] and in non-demented individuals, independent of Aβ status.[181] Patients with neuroinflammatory conditions and subcortical small vessel disease also show reductions in CSF Aβ_{42} levels.[177, 182] However, as Aβ_{40} is similarly affected, the Aβ_{42}/$_{40}$ ratio results in fewer false-positives for Aβ plaques in these diseases.[58] CSF t-tau can be abnormally increased in conditions involving acute neuronal injury, such as stroke,[183] head trauma,[184] or Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease.[73] Even CSF p-tau181 levels, considered to be largely specific for AD,[185] have been reported to be elevated in patients with neuronal intranuclear inclusion disease and negative Aβ biomarkers.[186] The robustness of the CSF p-tau181/Aβ_{42} and t-tau/Aβ_{42} ratios against biological variations is less clear, although several studies suggest that the use of these ratios may result in improved performance.[59, 187] Further studies are needed to fully understand the impact of co-pathologies on the performance of CSF biomarker ratios.

In addition to the biological factors, there are a number of preanalytical and analytical factors that can influence CSF biomarker measurements. Preanalytical factors account for differences in the collection, handling, and storage of CSF, representing an important source of variability in CSF analyses of AD biomarkers.[188–190] Although a large number of factors influencing CSF measurements were previously studied, some factors have been consistently identified as relevant in several reports, which were the type of sampling tube, and aliquot tube volume,[191] among others (see Refs. 192–194 for detailed reviews). Of note, CSF biomarker measurements derived using clinically approved fully automated platforms are also sensitive to these preanalytical factors.[195] Analytical factors considered for manual assays were variations in technician expertise, local best practices, and lot-to-lot variability of kits and/or kit components.[196, 197]

3.9 | Standardization of CSF biomarkers measurements

The lack of standardized preanalytical and analytical procedures had hindered the use of universal cut-points for CSF biomarkers across different settings and impeded the decentralized analysis of CSF biomarkers in multicenter studies.[198] Therefore, the development of global strategies for the standardization of preanalytical and analytical factors was considered crucial for the successful implementation of CSF biomarkers in clinical settings and trials.

To minimize variability due to preanalytical factors, a simplified and standardized preanalytical protocol for CSF collection and handling before analysis in clinical settings was developed.[191, 194] This protocol includes specific recommendations on the materials and methods employed for CSF extraction, handling of contaminated samples, transport, and storage. Given that commercially available assays explicitly prescribe this preanalytical protocol, adherence to it in clinical practice is important to minimize the rate of patients with false positive/negative results.

Significant progress has also been made in reducing variability attributable to analytic factors. The International Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine Working Group for Biomarkers for Neurodegenerative Diseases (WG-BND), together with the Alzheimer's Association Global Biomarker Standardization Consortium (GBSC), has developed certified reference materials and methods for CSF Aβ_{42}, which has significantly reduced batch-to-batch variability and bias between results from different assays.[199] Similar work is in progress for CSF t-tau and p-tau markers. In addition, the development of fully automated assays has resulted in significant reductions in across-laboratory analytical variation by providing highly accurate measurements together with increased reliability and reproducibility due to its automation.[200]

The use of fully automated platforms, together with the standardization initiatives for AD CSF biomarkers, has successfully reduced the degree of variability in CSF biomarker measurements across laboratories. As reported by the Alzheimer's Association quality control program for CSF biomarkers, an external quality control program involving more than 85 laboratories across 20 countries, between-laboratory variability in clinically approved CSF biomarkers was lower than 5%.[201] These results support the reliability of these markers when used in clinical practice.

3.10 | Performance in underrepresented populations

The study of the performance of Aβ biomarkers in underrepresented populations is currently a focus of active research efforts. Recent studies have found that dementia prevalence is higher among self-identified Black or African American and Hispanic adults compared to non-Hispanic White individuals.[202–204] This observation has motivated further AD biomarker studies to determine whether the increased prevalence in these groups reflects a higher rate of positive Aβ biomarkers or is driven by conditions other than AD, such as cerebrovascular disease. Interestingly, the majority of these studies reported lower levels of abnormal CSF biomarkers and Aβ-PET findings in Black adults compared to Non-Hispanic White adults,[205–211] while other studies have found no significant differences[212] or have observed an increase in Aβ-PET signal.[213] These results may indicate differences in the etiology of dementia among underrepresented groups, such as underlying cerebrovascular disease, but also social

factors that can impact health and worsen dementia symptoms. In line with this hypothesis, Black[214–217] and Hispanic[214,218] individuals exhibit higher rates of hypertension and diabetes, both of which are associated with white matter pathology and cortical and lacunar infarcts.[219–222]

A previous study reported weaker associations of CSF $A\beta_{42/40}$ with CSF tau markers, Aβ PET, and cognitive decline in Black compared to Non-Hispanic White participants.[211] Notably, the associations of Aβ-PET with cognition were consistent across the studied racial groups. Further clinical studies comparing the performance of Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers are necessary to understand whether these biomarker modalities perform differently in underrepresented groups.

4 | INTERPRETATION OF BIOMARKER FINDINGS

In this section, we review the interpretation and applications of Aβ biomarkers as binary and continuous measures of cerebral Aβ burden.

4.1 | Binary versus continuous measures of Aβ burden

Binary assessment of the presence or absence of cerebral Aβ is the most used method for interpreting Aβ biomarkers in clinical practice. However, continuous measures of Aβ burden are valuable for detecting intermediate levels (the so-called "gray-" or "indeterminant" zone[11,223]) and monitoring changes over time. This might be relevant for early intervention, as individuals who are negative on an Aβ biomarker may nevertheless have incipient Aβ pathology that has not progressed enough to yield a positive biomarker result. Cognitively normal individuals with emerging levels of Aβ have been shown to have higher rates of Aβ accumulation over time and a higher risk of cognitive decline[224–226] compared to individuals without Aβ, which highlights the relevance of detecting these early pathologic changes (e.g., for possible future early therapeutic intervention).

An advantage of a continuous rather than binary assessment of Aβ pathology is that it provides a more detailed picture of the pathologic course of the disease. Previous studies have identified a set of CL values associated with relevant biological stages of AD: Aβ levels < 12 CL are indicative of the absence of Aβ plaques[74,227]; Aβ levels > 24 CL reflect the presence of moderate or frequent Aβ plaques (according to the CERAD scale) and therefore represents the common definition of Aβ positivity[74]; Aβ levels > 60 CL were found to be associated with significantly faster rates of aggregated tau accumulation as measured with tau PET.[228] Furthermore, although the associations between Aβ and cognition are generally weak, previous studies have derived minimum Centiloid values associated with the onset of cognitive decline in both preclinical[229] and symptomatic[167] stages of AD.

Aβ-PET quantification has also allowed for the establishment of a window of Centiloid values around the definition of Aβ positivity, known as the gray zone,[223] which represents the transition from the absence of pathologic changes to fully established pathology. This gray zone, typically defined as the range between 10 and 30 CL (EMADOC-1700519818-1200791[230]), includes individuals who may not be detected using the standard definition of Aβ positivity but who have intermediate levels of Aβ pathology. These intermediate levels could be relevant for identifying Aβ accumulators in the earliest stages of the disease (range between 10 and 20 CL[120]) or to detect the presence of established Aβ pathology with high confidence (Aβ > 40 CL).[74]

The value of CSF biomarkers beyond the binary classification of Aβ status remains uncertain. As discussed previously (see Section 2.3), CSF biomarkers concentrations exhibit poor associations with continuous Aβ-PET within the Aβ-positive range, which indicates that variations in this range do not reflect changes in the amount of Aβ plaques in the brain. This, together with the lack of standardized metrics across CSF assays, has prevented the derivation of a "gray-zone" or other cut-point values associated with biologically or clinically relevant endpoints. However, recent studies point toward the feasibility of implementing a "gray-zone" for CSF biomarkers.[231–234] In addition, previous evidence indicates that CSF p-tau181 concentrations are associated with longitudinal tau deposition as measured with tau PET in Aβ-positive, tau-PET-negative individuals,[69,70,235] suggesting that p-tau181 elevations in CSF could be reflective of early tau deposition not detectable on PET. Further studies are needed to understand the utility of CSF biomarkers beyond binary classification. Centiloid-like approaches for harmonized CSF biomarker interpretation are now being explored.[236]

4.2 | Discordance between Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers

Although Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers generally show good correspondence with each other, discordant results occur in approximately 10%–20% of patients in clinical settings.[232,237] Identifying the biological and methodological factors that contribute to discrepancies between CSF and PET Aβ has been a key objective of numerous comparative studies[237–239] and is important for the correct interpretation of conflicting results. One of the biological factors that could lead to discordant results is the temporal offset between Aβ-PET and CSF biomarker changes. As discussed in Section 2.3, changes in CSF $A\beta_{42}$ concentrations appear to precede PET-detectable fibrillar Aβ deposition and neuritic plaques, thus a fraction of discordant cases could be reflecting early stages of Aβ deposition. This hypothesis is supported by previous studies showing a larger proportion of individuals with a CSF-positive/Aβ-PET-negative profile than those with a CSF-negative/Aβ-PET-positive profile,[105,232,237] as well as by longitudinal studies indicating faster rates of Aβ accumulation on PET among those with a CSF-positive/Aβ-PET-negative profile.[50,239,240] Another potential biological explanation for isolated positivity in CSF biomarkers could be the presence of concomitant neurological disorders as discussed in Section 3.8. In addition, although relatively rare, some genetic forms of AD can present with negative Aβ-PET scans but clearly abnormal CSF biomarkers.[241,242] Finally, analytical and preanalytical factors

in CSF biomarker measurements (Section 3.8), together with variability in the visual assessment or quantification of Aβ PET, may also account for a fraction of the discordant cases.

While discordant results in the form of abnormal CSF $A\beta_{42}$ levels together with normal p-tau181 can be expected due to the different temporal offset between abnormalities in these markers (Section 2.3), high CSF p-tau181 concentrations in combination with normal CSF $A\beta_{42}$ are more difficult to interpret.[243] This is because CSF p-tau181 elevations are believed to be relatively specific for AD[244,245] and therefore would not be expected in the absence of Aβ. The frequency of CSF p-tau181 levels with normal $A\beta_{42}$ is approximately 4%–5% in real-world clinical settings, with increasing prevalence for older age groups.[246] To date, the aetiology of this biomarker profile is unclear. Previous data suggest that p-tau elevations in the absence of Aβ could be driven by non-AD conditions that present with AD-like tau pathology, such as tangle-dominant dementia or primary age-related tauopathy (PART),[247–249] but other studies do not support this hypothesis.[68,250] As discussed previously (Section 3.8), other potential causes of discordant CSF $A\beta_{42}$ and p-tau181 results might be the presence of age-related comorbidities or methodological variability. Further studies are needed to understand the aetiologic substrate of the CSF p-tau181-positive/$A\beta_{42}$-negative profile.

The clinical outcomes associated with discordant biomarker profiles are not particularly clear. While previous studies report that the presence of a positive Aβ-PET scan with normal CSF biomarkers is associated with faster rates of clinical decline,[239] others found no significant differences.[238,246] Similarly, discordance between CSF $A\beta_{42}$ and p-tau181 does not seem to indicate a higher risk of clinical progression, leading to recommendations to interpret this biomarker profile in the same way as fully negative CSF biomarker results.[246,251]

5 | CONTEXT OF USE

In this section, we review the current and future contexts of use of Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers in clinical practice and trials.

5.1 | Regulations and current practices for Aβ PET

To date, three Aβ-PET radiotracers, [^{18}F]florbetapir (Amyvid; Eli Lilly and Company), [^{18}F]florbetaben (NeuraCeq; Life Molecular Imaging), and [^{18}F]flutemetamol (Vizamyl; GE HealthCare) have been approved for clinical use by the US FDA, the EMA, and other regulatory agencies around the globe.[90,252] For clinical use in the United States, current Aβ-PET radiotracers are required to be evaluated using radiotracer-specific visual interpretation methods. Quantification of Aβ-PET can be used to support visual reads in clinical practice in Europe. A Biomarker Qualification Opinion (BQO) issued by the EMA for the use of the Centiloid scale in clinical practice was also recently adopted by the EMA reinforcing the value of quantification to supplement image interpretation (EMADOC-1700519818-1200791[230]). However, widespread access to reliable quantification pipelines in clinical settings remains limited. This may change in the coming years with the emergence of new commercially available Centiloid pipelines certified for clinical use.[162,253–255] Centiloid quantification is presently not approved for clinical use in the United States.

Current use of Aβ-PET in clinical settings in the United States is largely consistent with the Appropriate Use Criteria (AUC) published in 2013 and updated in 2024.[31] These guidelines recommend the use of Aβ-PET for patients with cognitive impairment of uncertain etiology confirmed by a dementia specialist, and when Aβ-PET results are expected to increase diagnostic certainty and influence patient management. Clinical scenarios in which amyloid PET would typically be considered appropriate include: patients of any age presenting with MCI or dementia in whom AD is suspected (including amnestic and non-amnestic phenotypes associated with underlying AD neuropathology), to inform prognosis in patients with MCI due to clinically suspected AD, patients with MCI/dementia with inconclusive CSF biomarkers, and to determine eligibility and monitor response to approved anti-Aβ therapies. Aβ-PET is considered to have uncertain value in patients with subjective cognitive decline who are deemed at heightened risk of AD based on age, known APOE4 genotype, or multi-generational family history. Aβ-PET is also of uncertain value for informing prognosis of patients with dementia due to suspected AD. Inappropriate scenarios include the use of Aβ-PET in cognitively unimpaired individuals and individuals with subjective cognitive decline who are at low risk for AD, for assessing the severity of dementia or tracking disease progression in patients with biomarker-confirmed AD, for patients presenting with prodromal Lewy body dementia (LBD) or dementia with Lewy bodies (DLB), for patients with recent conclusive CSF biomarkers (positive or negative), for nonmedical use (e.g., insurance coverage, employment screening) and in lieu of genotyping for suspected autosomal dominant mutation carriers.[256]

Other patient-centered guidelines for the appropriate use of biomarkers in diagnosing neurodegenerative disorders have recently been proposed and endorsed by a majority of experts across various European scientific societies.[24] Panelists recommended using Aβ-PET as a second-line test following inconclusive CSF biomarker results, prioritizing CSF biomarkers as the first-line test for detecting Aβ and soluble tau pathology. Of note, AD biomarker testing is only recommended in patients with an AD-typical or atypical phenotype. In this proposed diagnostic workflow, CSF biomarkers and Aβ-PET are deemed appropriate only for individuals with objective evidence of cognitive impairment suspected to be caused by AD.[10] A positive Aβ-PET scan is considered sufficient for the establishment of a final causal diagnosis of AD in this patient population.

5.2 | Contraindications, adverse events, and patient-clinician experience with Aβ PET

Current limitations that hamper the use of Aβ-PET in clinical settings include limited availability, relatively high costs, and radiation exposure. PET is only contraindicated in a few patients with known hypersensitivity to the radiotracer or other excipients (specific to

[^{18}F]flutemetamol). Adverse events are rare and mild, and include injection site pain, increased blood pressure, and headache. Although PET imaging sessions are generally well tolerated by patients, some individuals may be unable to undergo PET imaging due to severe claustrophobia, particularly when scanned using PET/MR cameras.[257] Other patients may be reluctant to undergo PET imaging due to radiation exposure, although some studies indicate that radiation exposure could be significantly reduced.[258] Aβ-PET imaging is restricted to centers equipped with a PET scanner that have access to a cyclotron facility capable of producing and shipping the required radiotracer on the same day. Additionally, tracer production failures are common and often lead to significant delays in PET imaging, thereby increasing the burden on patients. Differences in reimbursement policies across different countries have created additional barriers to the use of this imaging technique. The approval of new anti-Aβ therapies may have prompted a change in this situation, as the US Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) revised their non-coverage policy in October 2023 and started reimbursing for Aβ PET, contributing to increased accessibility of this imaging technique.[259] However, current reimbursement rates do not fully compensate for the actual costs of Aβ-PET imaging, resulting in additional barriers to the use of this biomarker and disincentivizing its use by healthcare providers.

5.3 | Regulations and current practices for CSF biomarkers

Several CSF assays have been approved for clinical use in Europe over the last two decades, and CSF biomarkers have been routinely used in European memory clinics to aid in the diagnostic workup of AD patients for more than a decade.[116, 260, 261] Approval in the United States has come more recently with the introduction of fully automated CSF assays.[252] To date, only two of these automated assays have been approved by both the FDA and the EMA, namely the Lumipulse G (Fujirebio, Tokyo, Tapan) and the Elecsys (Roche Diagnostics, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) platforms. In clinical practice, CSF biomarker results are categorized as positive/negative using prespecified cut-points provided by the vendor. These cut-points were derived by maximizing concordance with Aβ-PET visual reads in independent cohorts.[262–264] Thus, positive/negative CSF biomarker results must be interpreted as proxies of positive/negative Aβ-PET visual reads. Of note, the Lumipulse assay provides a range of intermediate CSF A$\beta_{42/40}$ ratio values (0.058 to 0.073) in which a positive Aβ-PET scan is the most likely result but the uncertainty increases, thus results falling in this gray zone should be interpreted with caution.[264] This is not the case for the Elecsys assay that provides a single cut-point for the p-tau181/Aβ_{42} and t-tau/Aβ_{42} ratios for the definition of positive/negative results.[262, 263] Interpretation of continuous levels of CSF biomarkers is currently not recommended for the diagnostic workup of patients with AD.

Current use cases for CSF biomarkers in clinical practice in the United States are similar to those for Aβ-PET and also reflect previously published AUC.[265] A notable difference between the AUC for CSF biomarkers and the 2013 AUC for Aβ-PET was the indication for CSF biomarker testing in patients meeting core clinical criteria for probable AD with a typical age of onset, which is now recognized as appropriate in the 2024 update of the AUC for Aβ-PET.[256]

In Europe, several guidelines for the clinical use of CSF biomarkers have been proposed over the last decade.[261, 266, 267] The most recent European consensus guidelines recommend, whenever possible, prioritizing the use of CSF biomarkers as a first-line test in patients with objective evidence of cognitive impairment suspected to be caused by AD.[10, 24] Of note, a diagnosis of AD can be concluded in these patients if CSF biomarker results are unequivocally indicative of brain Aβ (based on either CSF Aβ_{42} or the CSF A$\beta_{42/40}$ ratio) and tau pathology (based on elevated CSF p-tau), thus incorporating the notion that AD is a clinical-biological disorder defined by the presence of both Aβ and tau.[10] Evidence of isolated abnormal CSF Aβ in the absence of elevated CSF p-tau is generally not sufficient for establishing an AD diagnosis and would require second-line biomarker testing.

5.4 | Contraindications, adverse events, and patient-clinician experience with CSF biomarkers

Despite the increased accessibility and lower costs of CSF biomarkers, there are also a number of limitations that can complicate its use in clinical practice. Lumbar punctures are contraindicated in patients with an intracranial space-occupying lesion or Arnold-Chiari malformation. Additionally, patients on anticoagulation medications must have therapy temporarily discontinued (as for other procedures), and patients with coagulopathies, other bleeding diatheses, certain spine abnormalities, spinal cord compression, or local skin diseases at the puncture site may not be eligible for CSF extraction.[268] Apart from these contraindications, a fraction of eligible individuals might be unwilling to undergo a lumbar puncture due to a lack of familiarity with the procedure, especially in certain countries such as the United States.[269] Side effects, principally post lumbar puncture headache syndrome, have been reported as occurring in 2% to 30% of patients[270–275]; use of atraumatic needles, as well as smaller needle diameters, result in much lower side effects, but not all practitioners are trained in their use; overall there are fewer side-effects in elderly individuals.[260] Rare side-effects include bleeding or infection.[268] CSF extraction requires qualified and trained clinicians to minimize the risk of complications. Although CSF biomarkers are covered by insurance in the United States, the rate of reimbursement for these tests may not match the actual costs.[276] As a result, healthcare providers may be disincentivized to perform lumbar punctures, resulting in reduced accessibility to CSF biomarker testing and potential delays in treatment initiation with anti-Aβ drugs.

5.5 | Diagnostic guidelines and recommendations

Although the previously discussed AUC for Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers currently guide the appropriate use and interpretation of these

biomarkers in clinical settings, new criteria for the diagnosis of AD based on biomarkers have been recently proposed.[11] The 2024 Revised Criteria for Diagnosis and Staging of AD (2024 Revised Criteria for short), developed by a workgroup convened by the Alzheimer's Association, represent the most recent efforts to update the previous 2018 National Institute on Aging (NIA) and Alzheimer's Association (AA) Research Framework for AD.[13] The core principle of the 2018 NIA-AA Research Framework is the definition of AD as a biological rather than a syndromic construct. The disease is conceptualized as a continuum that manifests with the first detectable neuropathologic changes in asymptomatic individuals and progresses with incremental neuropathologic changes, finally leading to neurodegeneration and the onset of clinical symptoms. AD can, therefore, be diagnosed in vivo, independent of the presence of symptoms, through the use of biomarkers that detect its hallmark biological features, namely Aβ plaques and neurofibrillary tangles.[3] The 2018 NIA-AA Research Framework was intended for use in research settings, not in clinical practice. Its main aim was to provide a common framework for guiding biomarker research. However, the 2024 Revised Criteria aims to advance the clinical implementation of the framework, providing criteria that inform the diagnosis and staging of AD based on available knowledge, but it is not meant to replace specific clinical practice guidelines. We also note that a biological definition of AD, independent of clinical symptoms as proposed in the 2024 Revised Criteria, is not universally accepted by the scientific community. Alternative criteria based on biomarkers and clinical symptoms have also been proposed.[10]

In the 2024 Revised Criteria, biomarkers are grouped into three categories, namely Core AD biomarkers, non-specific biomarkers that reflect AD-related neuropathologic process, and biomarkers of non-AD pathologies typically associated with aging. An important concept is that Core AD biomarkers are further classified into Core 1 and Core 2 based on the timing of abnormal changes. Core 1 biomarkers become abnormal approximately at the same time as Aβ PET, and include CSF Aβ_{42} and p-tau181, as well as p-tau217 and p-tau231, together with their plasma counterparts. Thus, in this framework, Aβ-PET and these fluid biomarkers are considered interchangeable with regard to the type of biomarker (Core 1). An abnormality in specific Core 1 biomarkers (Aβ-PET or CSF A$\beta_{42/40}$, p-tau181/Aβ_{42}, t-tau/Aβ_{42}, or their equivalent plasma biomarkers) is considered sufficient for a diagnosis of AD. This is a major change compared to the 2018 NIA-AA Research Framework, which required the presence of abnormal levels in both Aβ and tau biomarkers.[3] The rationale for this change is that a positive Aβ biomarker is reflective not only of Aβ plaques but is also strongly associated with the presence of tau neurofibrillary tangles (Braak stages $\geq$ III) and thus with "moderate/frequent" AD neuropathologic changes.[11] It is important to note that the association between Aβ positivity and "moderate/frequent" AD neuropathologic changes is stronger in symptomatic individuals, while a fraction of asymptomatic individuals with a positive Aβ biomarker will not have "moderate/frequent" AD neuropathologic change (13%–26%). Although a positive Core 1 biomarker confirms a diagnosis of AD, clinical judgment, together with other biomarker information, is essential to determine whether AD pathology is a dominant contributor to a patient's clinical symptoms. Core 2 biomarkers include tau PET and novel CSF tau biomarkers, namely, p-tau205, microtubule-binding region- (MTBR) tau 243, and non-phosphorylated mid-region tau fragments.[277, 278] These biomarkers become abnormal later in the disease process representing tau proteinopathy and are more closely associated with neurodegeneration and clinical symptoms than Core 1 biomarkers. Therefore, the intended use of Core 2 biomarkers is to stage AD progression after a positive Core 1 biomarker has confirmed the presence of AD pathology. A positive Core 2 biomarker would, for instance, support that a patient's clinical syndrome is caused by AD pathology. Currently, Core 2 biomarkers are not meant to be used as standalone tests for AD.

To date, the 2024 Revised Criteria do not specify how to interpret biomarker findings that are not uncommon in clinical practice, such as discordant results between Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers. For additional details on non-core biomarkers and clinical staging, we refer the reader to the publication of the Revised Criteria.[11]

It should be noted that the biomarker-centric approach proposed in the Revised Criteria is not universally accepted by the AD scientific community. The 2021 report from the International Working Group (IWG)[10] highlights the limitations of using a purely biological definition of AD in clinical practice and suggests that a clinical-biological approach, rather than a strictly biological one, offers a more useful diagnostic framework. Another key difference between the two frameworks is that the IWG requires biomarker evidence of both Aβ and tau pathology for an AD diagnosis, whereas the Revised Criteria allow a diagnosis based on a positive Aβ biomarker alone.[11] A 2024 response from the IWG to the Revised Criteria further emphasized their position that AD should be interpreted as a clinical-biological entity, where individuals with an established clinical phenotype are tested for biomarkers of AD pathology, including now also newly-developed plasma biomarkers.[279]

It is also important to emphasize that, in clinical practice, a biomarker-based diagnosis of AD should not be restricted to identifying individuals eligible for anti-Aβ therapies. Knowledge of Aβ status can be relevant in many clinical scenarios independent of the patient's eligibility for anti-Aβ therapies. Approximately 15%–20% of older patients with clinically diagnosed AD dementia exhibit negative Aβ-PET scans, and this proportion increases up to 50% for persons with MCI. A negative Aβ-PET scan allows clinicians to confidently rule out AD pathology as the cause of the patient's cognitive symptoms, even when the patient presents with a typical AD clinical syndrome, thus directing clinicians to focus additional diagnostic efforts on non-AD aetiologies. Moreover, although Aβ-PET or CSF Aβ biomarker positivity is prevalent in cognitively normal older individuals[14] and those with non-AD dementias (particularly in dementia with Lewy bodies),[280] a positive Aβ-PET scan in patients with MCI or AD dementia can strengthen diagnostic certainty and influence management options, as demonstrated in large studies evaluating the clinical utility of Aβ-PET in the United States and Europe.[26, 281] In patients with MCI due to suspected AD pathology, a positive Aβ-PET scan can inform the risk of incident AD dementia. Knowledge of Aβ status can also be valuable in the diagnostic workup of complex dementia cases presenting with atypical features. Overall, these findings highlight the utility of

TABLE 3 Use of Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers in current phase 3 clinical trials of disease-modifying drugs in patients with symptomatic AD.[282]

Agent	Aβ PET for inclusion	CSF biomarkers for inclusion	Aβ PET as endpoint	CSF biomarkers as endpoint
Aducanumab (NCT05310071)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Lecanemab (NCT03887455)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Donanemab (NCT04437511, NCT05738486, and NCT05508789)	Yes	No	Yes	No
AR1001 (NCT05531526)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Buntanetap (NCT05686044)	No	No	No	No
Fosgonimeton (NCT04488419 and NCT04886063)	No	No	No	No
Levetiracetam (NCT05986721)	Yes	No	No	No
Masitinib (NCT05564169)	Yes	Yes	No	No
Metformin (NCT04098666)	No	No	Yes	No
Nilotinib BE (NCT05143528)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Piromelatine (NCT05267535)	No	No	No	No
Remternetug (NCT05463731)	Yes	No	Yes	No
Semaglutide (NCT04777396 and NCT04777409)	Yes	Yes	No	No
Simufilam (NCT04994483 and NCT05026177)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Valiltramiprosate (NCT04770220)	No	No	No	Yes

Abbreviations: AD, Alzheimer's disease; CSF, cerebrospinal fluid; PET, positron emission tomography

Aβ biomarkers beyond identifying candidates for anti-Aβ therapies, indicating their potential clinical value even among those who do not qualify for these treatments.

5.6 | Clinical trials

Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers have played a pivotal role in the design and implementation of clinical trials for AD. These markers have been successfully used to select participants for trials using disease-modifying drugs, including the approved drugs aducanumab, lecanemab, and donanemab, allowing for the exclusion of patients with clinical AD but who do not have biomarker evidence for Aβ pathology, and thus would not benefit from interventions targeting AD pathology. Participant selection is typically based on Aβ-PET visual reads, and some trials consider visual reads interchangeable with CSF biomarkers (for instance, the lecanemab CLARITY AD trial[32]) (Table 3).

Aβ-PET quantification has also proven useful in clinical trials. Recruitment in trials such as donanemab trials TRAILBLAZER-ALZ,[157] TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2,[33] and lecanemab trial AHEAD 3-45[283] have been based on a specific set of Centiloid values (37 CL for TRAILBLAZER trials and 20 and 40 CL for the prevention-based AHEAD 3-45 studies), which differed from the standard definition of Aβ positivity and better aligned with the goals of each trial. In addition, quantitative measures in the Centiloid scale have been successfully used to monitor treatment-related changes in Aβ burden and assess target engagement.[33, 123, 156, 157, 284, 285] As discussed previously, direct monitoring of changes in Aβ plaque burden is challenging with CSF biomarkers (Section 3.5), although clinical trials have used CSF or plasma biomarkers to investigate disease-modifying effects of anti-Aβ therapies on these markers.[32, 33, 123]

In clinical settings, Aβ-PET quantification may become relevant for the objective assessment of Aβ clearance in AD patients undergoing anti-Aβ therapies, supporting treatment discontinuation decisions particularly for therapies which are thought to be effective only against neuritic plaque forms of Aβ.[35, 286] This novel potential application is motivated by recent findings from donanemab's TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2 trial, which demonstrate a sustained benefit throughout the trial duration after treatment completion.[287] Treatment completion was defined based on quantitative measures from Aβ-PET as either (1) a follow-up Aβ-PET scan (performed every 6 months) showing a value lower than 11 CL, or (2) two consecutive Aβ-PET scans with values between 11 and 25 CL.[33] After 12 months of treatment with donanemab, approximately 66% of the participants had Centiloid values consistent with a negative Aβ-PET scan (<24.1 CL).[287] Yet, additional research is needed to confirm the appropriateness of this approach in clinical practice, as well as to study the feasibility of implementing this approach in memory clinics, which currently have limited access to Aβ-PET quantification pipelines. Additionally, baseline Centiloid values were predictive of the time required to achieve a negative Aβ-PET scan (<24.1 CL), which may help clinicians determine the timing of follow-up Aβ-PET scans to confirm Aβ plaque clearance.[287] Baseline Centiloid values may also be useful to predict long-term progression to dementia in patients attending memory clinics.[167]

6 | FUTURE ROLE OF PLASMA BIOMARKERS FOR AD

Recent advances have been made in the development and clinical validation of blood-based biomarkers (BBMs) for AD. $Aβ_{42/40}$ can be quantified with mass-spectrometry and immunoassay techniques,[288–290]

the former being the only method that has proven sufficiently accurate for determining Aβ positivity on PET.[291] Several plasma p-tau immunoassays were also developed, targeting p-tau181, p-tau217, and p-tau231, with somewhat higher accuracies for detecting Aβ status.[292–298] Among these, p-tau217 has emerged as the most promising for clinical implementation due to the large effect size in mean levels measured in cognitively impaired Aβ-positive patients versus Aβ-negative controls,[250, 299] where certain p-tau217 blood tests exhibit similar or even superior performance to clinically approved CSF tests in research settings.[231] Such a blood test has recently been shown to have excellent performance even in primary care, showing a great potential to improve the diagnostic work-up of AD also in this context.[300]

Head-to-head studies comparing different BBM assays have been performed. In one study, a comparison of eight plasma $A\beta_{42/40}$ assays showed that mass spectrometry-based assays were the best performing, with discriminative abilities of around 85% for detecting Aβ-positivity determined by CSF or PET and mean reductions ranging from ~8% to 14% in Aβ-positive versus Aβ-negative groups.[291] Similar results were observed in another head-to-head study comparing six different assays in participants from the ADNI.[301] In head-to-head studies comparing plasma p-tau biomarkers to detect Aβ-positivity determined by either CSF or PET, the best-performing assays were usually those targeting p-tau217, with discriminative abilities reaching 90%–95% or higher, and their mean increases in Aβ-positive groups were around 100%–300%.[302, 303] Contrary to $A\beta_{42/40}$, both mass spectrometry-based methods and immunoassays for p-tau217 demonstrated high performance. The superior agreement with gold-standard Aβ-positivity for p-tau217 biomarkers, compared to the lower-magnitude reductions of plasma $A\beta_{42/40}$ motivated a debate on whether p-tau variants would have better performance properties to withstand biological and analytical sources of variation frequently seen in clinical chemistry laboratories.[304, 305] Furthermore, it was previously shown that plasma p-tau exhibit less problems than $A\beta_{42/40}$ with test-retest variability affecting the biomarker classification of the patients.[306]

While fluid measures of p-tau were initially placed within the tau biomarker category in the NIA-AA Research Framework,[13] it was later suggested that they could be more reflective of biomarker-confirmed Aβ pathology due to the higher correlations with Aβ-PET and high diagnostic accuracy for Aβ-positivity.[61, 302, 303] Studies with *post mortem* data indicated that plasma p-tau231 and p-tau181 indeed showed a higher association with Aβ plaques, but p-tau217, the most clinically promising biomarker, seemed to reflect both Aβ plaques and neurofibrillary tangle (NFT) burden.[68, 231, 297] This further raised the need for NFT-specific biofluid-based biomarkers. Candidates such as CSF p-tau205, ptau217 occupancy ratio, and other forms of tau such as assays for MTBR such as MTBR-tau 243, or truncated tau368/t-tau ratio have been proposed in CSF.[277, 278, 307, 308] Although some of these candidate fluid biomarkers appear more closely associated with tau PET, they have not yet been validated across multiple cohorts, compared with *post mortem* NFT pathology, or assayable in plasma. Thus, there remains a significant need for validated NFT-specific BBMs.

Despite these advances, practical aspects of BBMs' use, including sources of significant inter-laboratory variability, need to be addressed before widespread clinical implementation. Blood is a more complex fluid in composition than CSF, and, except for some mass-spectrometry methods,[231] the accuracy of plasma biomarkers and robustness against comorbidities may be lower compared to that provided by CSF biomarkers or Aβ-PET.[309, 310] Thus, although some plasma biomarkers have shown promising performance,[231] it is still unclear whether they can be used as standalone biomarkers, completely replacing CSF biomarkers and PET, in clinical practice. Given the currently available evidence, it is likely that the immediate clinical utility of BBMs will lie in screening for Aβ-positivity patients with cognitive impairment, where those with equivocal results may especially benefit from further CSF or PET testing.[251]

Importantly, BBMs may also have utility in clinical trials. One of their logical applications involves optimizing the cost-efficiency of trial recruitment.[311] For example, the TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2 donanemab trial demonstrated that pre-screening with plasma p-tau181 before Aβ- and tau-PET scans could effectively identify candidates with both proteinopathies, improving recruitment efficiency. Based on this, TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 3 adopted plasma p-tau217 as the sole enrollment criterion for asymptomatic older adults, bypassing Aβ-PET. This approach, while innovative, raises concerns of potentially including an undesirable rate of Aβ-negative patients in the trial. Results from these and future trials will aid in determining the role of BBMs in trial recruitment and enrollment. Additionally, BBMs may be useful in monitoring treatment effects.[312] Recent anti-Aβ trials indicated substantial and early reductions in plasma levels of p-tau181 and p-tau217 in the treatment arms.[156, 313] However, these reductions were evident at the group level, and it is still unknown whether BBM changes associate, at the individual-patient level, with Aβ clearance or with clinical benefits. For example, plasma p-tau217 did not prove to be accurate in monitoring Aβ plaque clearance in donanemab's TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2 trial.[287]

Currently, there are no BBMs fully approved for clinical use by the FDA. In the United States, C2N Diagnostics and Roche have obtained a Breakthrough Device Designation from the FDA and are currently validating their BBMs and associated algorithms with promising results.[314–319]

A recent position paper proposed that BBMs used in clinical practice need to have accuracies for the classification of Aβ-PET status similar to that of CSF biomarkers.[320] This concept prompts interest in comparisons between BBMs and CSF biomarkers in research and real-world clinical cohorts. In addition, potential factors influencing or confounding BBM results have already been identified. Plasma p-tau levels have been associated with chronic kidney disease (CKD), though its clinical relevance remains uncertain.[251, 321–323] Plasma $A\beta_{42/40}$ levels have been suggested to be more vulnerable to analytical sources of variation and are substantially affected by a commonly used cardiovascular drug.[304, 305, 324] Additionally, a serial-sampling study evaluating BBMs weekly over 10 weeks indicated that biological fluctuations must be considered, as unexpectedly high BBM values can yield false-positive results.[325] Most importantly, studies prospectively evaluating

TABLE 4 Summary of factors potentially influencing selection between Aβ PET and CSF biomarkers.

Factors affecting biomarker selection	Aβ PET	CSF biomarkers
Clinical use		
• Direct measure of the target pathology	Yes	No
• Tau-related biomarkers available with the same test	Not available	CSF p-tau isoforms
• Neuronal injury biomarkers available with the same test	Possible with early phase imaging but unclear value	CSF t-tau and Neurofilament light chain
• Differential diagnosis	Can be useful for the differential diagnosis of frontotemporal dementia[28]	Different CSF biomarker measurements can support the diagnosis of a non-AD disorder[326]
• Interpretation of biomarker results beyond binary classification	Possible with quantification	Not possible
• Longitudinal assessment of treatment-related changes in Aβ burden	Possible with quantification	Not possible
• Use for inclusion in clinical trials	Yes, allowing for inclusion with different Aβ burden levels	Yes, but only possible with standard Aβ positivity
• Use as endpoint in clinical trials	Yes, allowing for the assessment of target engagement	Yes, for the assessment of downstream therapeutic effects on different pathologic markers.
Patient-driven factors		
• Presence of comorbidities	CAA may result in small elevation in Aβ PET signal	A number of comorbidities may lead to a positive CSF biomarker result (see Section 3.8).
• Contraindications	Hypersensitivity to the radiotracer of any other excipient (only for [^{18}F]flutemetamol[125])	Treatment with anticoagulants, spinal defects, intracranial masses, among others (see Section 5.4)
• Adverse events	Rare events include injection site pain, increased blood pressure, and headache	1 out of 3 patients report headache and/or back pain. Severe headache is more rare. Other rare events include infection and bleeding.
• Patient concerns about the procedure	Severe claustrophobia. Radiation exposure.	A fraction of the patients refuses lumbar puncture.
Region-specific factors		
• Costs	High	Relatively low, but requires highly trained clinicians
• Availability	Limited to centers with convenient access to a cyclotron	Widely available
• Reimbursement	Limited reimbursement in some countries.	Typically reimbursed in most countries, but reimbursement rated do not match costs in the United States (see Section 5.4)
• Preference in current practice	Preferred in the United States due to patients' reluctance to lumbar punctures	Preferred in Europe due to higher availability and reduced costs

Abbreviations: CAA, cerebral amyloid angiopathy; CSF, cerebrospinal fluid; PET, positron emission tomography.

pre-defined cut-points considering real-world analytical variations (e.g., different instruments, batch-to-batch variations) are still needed.

7 | CONCLUSIONS

Despite reflecting different aspects of Aβ, converging evidence indicates that both Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers have excellent performance for the detection of Aβ pathology. Standardization efforts have resulted in a high degree of repeatability across different settings, which allowed the reliable implementation of these diagnostic tools in clinical settings. Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers will be even more important in clinical practice as new disease-modifying therapies become available. Current evidence suggests that plasma biomarkers for AD could also play an important role as an adjunct to these markers, rather than completely replace them.

The increased use of Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers in clinical practice underscores the need for a thorough understanding of their strengths, but also their key differences and limitations. Prompted by their excellent accuracy for detecting Aβ and high concordance, some researchers have suggested that Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers could be considered fully interchangeable biomarkers. Although this assumption can

be reasonably valid in conceptual frameworks or to address specific research questions, the situation is likely more complex in clinical practice. The present narrative review highlights a number of situations that, although relatively infrequent, can result in a significant number of misdiagnosed patients, particularly if the use of these biomarkers escalates. Persistent issues such as discordant biomarker results, occurring in approximately 10%–20% of the patients, false positives driven by comorbidities, or practical limitations emphasize the necessity for careful selection of the most appropriate biomarker for each clinical scenario, rather than assuming complete interchangeability (Table 4),[28, 125, 326] The accuracy of biomarker results is now even more critical, as inaccuracies can lead to the inappropriate initiation of disease-modifying therapies for AD in individuals who do not have AD pathology. Currently, the public health consequences of inaccurate biomarker results in persons treated with disease-modifying therapies remain unclear.

The advent of anti-Aβ therapies is likely to expand the clinical applications of Aβ biomarkers beyond the traditional binary assessment of Aβ for treatment eligibility. Previous clinical trials (TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2) have based treatment discontinuation decisions on quantitative Aβ-PET measurements of changes in Aβ burden and are now included in the FDA-approved donanemab therapy. Therefore, it is plausible that, when these drugs become widely available, clinicians will also request repeat Aβ-PET scans to confirm Aβ removal and decide on treatment discontinuation. It is important to note that, currently, reliable assessment of treatment-related Aβ plaque clearance is only possible with Aβ PET, which again underscores the differential applications of Aβ-PET compared to fluid biomarkers.

In summary, this narrative review provides substantial evidence demonstrating the high reliability of Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers for detecting Aβ pathology in clinical practice. However, rather than being fully interchangeable, current evidence suggests that careful consideration of the specific clinical context is necessary to select the most appropriate biomarker and minimize inaccurate results. New clinical applications of Aβ biomarkers beyond binary classification, such as longitudinal monitoring of treatment-related effects, further highlight the need to delineate the specific capabilities of each biomarker. The field of fluid biomarkers, particularly BBMs, is rapidly evolving, likely resulting in novel applications of these markers as standalone tools or in synergy with Aβ-PET imaging. Overall, current literature suggests that both Aβ-PET and CSF biomarkers will continue to play an increasingly important role in the diagnostic workup of patients with AD.

AFFILIATIONS

[1]Clinical Memory Research Unit, Department of Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

[2]Wallenberg Centre for Molecular and Translational Medicine, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

[3]The Sahlgrenska Academy, Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, Department of Psychiatry and Neurochemistry, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

[4]Department of Neuropsychiatry, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Region Västra Götaland, Gothenburg, Sweden

[5]The Grove Centre, White Lion Road Buckinghamshire, GE HealthCare, Amersham, UK

[6]Department of Medical Physics and Bioengineering, Centre for Medical Image Computing (CMIC), University College London, London, UK

[7]Pharmaceutical Diagnostics, GE HealthCare, Via Privata Galeno, Milan, Italy

[8]Neurochemistry Laboratory, Department of Laboratory Medicine, Amsterdam Neuroscience, Neurodegeneration, Amsterdam UMC Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

[9]Department of Neurology, Memory and Aging Center, Weill Institute for Neurosciences, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA

[10]Department of Radiology and Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA

[11]Institute for Stroke and Dementia Research (ISD), University Hospital, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany

[12]Munich Cluster for Systems Neurology (SyNergy), Munich, Germany

[13]Gordon Center for Medical Imaging, Department of Radiology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

[14]Center for Alzheimer Research and Treatment, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

[15]Department of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

[16]Amsterdam Neuroscience, Brain imaging, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

[17]UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology and Center for Medical Image Computing, University College London, London, UK

[18]Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

[19]Pharmaceutical Diagnostics, GE HealthCare, Marlborough, Massachusetts, USA

[20]Department of Neurology, Knight Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri, USA

[21]Department of Neurology, Taub Institute for Research on Alzheimer's Disease and Aging Brain, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, New York, USA

[22]Nuclear Medicine Department and Molecular Imaging Group, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain

[23]Dementia Research Centre, Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK

[24]Clinical Neurochemistry Laboratory, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, MölIndal, Sweden

[25]Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, Queen Square Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK

[26]UK Dementia Research Institute, University College London, London, UK

[27]Hong Kong Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases, Science Park, Hong Kong, China

[28]Wisconsin Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA

[29]Paris Brain Institute, ICM, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, Sorbonne University, Paris, France

[30]Neurodegenerative Disorder Research Center, Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, and Department of Neurology, Institute on Aging and Brain Disorders, University of Science and Technology of China and First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Hefei, China

[31]Memory Clinic, Skåne University Hospital, Malmö, Sweden

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Charlotte E. Teunissen received grants or contracts for Research of the European Commission (Marie Curie International Training Network, grant agreement no. 860197; MIRIADE), Innovative Medicines Initiatives 3TR (Horizon 2020, grant no. 831434) EPND (IMI 2 Joint Undertaking (JU), grant no. 101034344) and JPND (bPRIDE), National MS Society (Progressive MS alliance), Alzheimer Drug Discovery Foundation, Alzheimer Association, Health Holland, the Dutch Research Council (ZonMW), including TAP-dementia, a ZonMw funded project (#10510032120003) in the context of the Dutch National Dementia Strategy, Alzheimer Drug Discovery Foundation, The Selfridges Group Foundation, and Alzheimer Netherlands. Gil D. Rabinovici receives research support from the NIH/NIA (R35 AG072362, P30-AG062422, U01-AG057195, and P01-AG019724). Other support to G.D.R. includes the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, the Alzheimer's Association, the American College of Radiology, Rainwater Charitable Foundation, Shanendoah Foundation, Avid Radiopharmaceuticals, GE Healthcare, Life Molecular Imaging, and Genentech. Nicolai Franzmeier was funded by the Deutsche Parkinson Gesellschaft (DPG) and by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under Germany's Excellence Strategy within the framework of the Munich Cluster for Systems Neurology (EXC 2145 SyNergy—ID 390857198). Keith Johnson was supported by the Harvard Aging Brain Study P01 AG036694 and NIH grant R01 AG046396. Frederik Barkhof is supported by EPSRC, EU-JU (IMI), NIHR-BRC, GEHC, ADDI (paid to institution), and by AMYPAD (IMI 115952). Leslie M. Shaw receives funding from the NIH (grants U19 ADNI4 and U19AG024904 and Penn ADRC P30-AG-072979). Suzanne E. Schindler is supported by NIH (R01 AG070941). Lawrence S. Honig is supported by NIA/NIH R01AG072474, NIA/NIH R01 AG059013, NIA/NIH R01 AG066107, NIA/NIH R21AG070768, NINDS/NIH U01NS100600, NIA/NIH R44AG071388, NIA/NIH P30AG066462, and NIA/NIH U19AG063893. Michael Schöll receives funding from the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation (KAW2014.0363 and KAW 2023.0371), the Swedish Research Council (2017-02869, 2021-02678, 2021-06545 and 2023-06188), the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation program under grant agreement no. 101132933 (AD-RIDDLE) and 101112145 (PROMINENT), the National Institute of Health (R01 AG081394-01), Gates Ventures, the National Research Foundation of Korea (RS-2023-00263612), the Swedish state under the agreement between the Swedish government and the County Councils, the ALF-agreement (ALFGBG-813971 and ALFGBG-965326), the Swedish Brain Foundation (FO2021-0311), the Swedish Alzheimer Foundation (AF-994900), the Sahlgrenska Academy at the University of Gothenburg, the Västra Götaland Region R&D (VGFOUREG-995510), and Innovation platforms, Sahlgrenska Science Park and the National Institute for Health and Care Research University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre. Henrik Zetterberg is a Wallenberg Scholar supported by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2022-01018 and 2019-02397), European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme (grant agreement 101053962), Swedish State Support for Clinical Research (ALFGBG-71320), Alzheimer Drug Discovery Foundation (201809-2016862), AD Strategic Fund, and Alzheimer's Association (ADSF-21-831376-C, ADSF-21-831381-C, and ADSF-21-831377-C), Bluefield Project, Olav Thon Foundation, Erling-Persson Family Foundation, Stiftelsen för Gamla Tjänarinnor, Hjärnfonden, Sweden (FO2022-0270), European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement 860197, MIRIADE), European Union Joint Programme—Neurodegenerative Disease Research (JPND2021-00694), National Institute for Health and Care Research University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre, and UK Dementia Research Institute at UCL (UKDRI-1003). Kaj Blennow is supported by the Swedish Research Council (2017-00915 and 2022-00732), Swedish Alzheimer Foundation (AF-930351, AF-939721, and AF-968270), Hjärnfonden, Sweden (FO2017-0243 and ALZ2022-0006), Swedish state under the agreement between the Swedish government and the County Councils, ALF-agreement (ALFGBG-715986 and ALFGBG-965240), European Union Joint Program for Neurodegenerative Disorders (JPND2019-466-236), Alzheimer's Association 2021 Zenith Award (ZEN-21-848495), and Alzheimer's Association 2022–2025 grant (SG-23-1038904 QC). Oskar Hansson was supported by the National Institute of Aging (R01AG083740), European Research Council (ADG-101096455), Alzheimer's Association (ZEN24-1069572, SG-23-1061717), GHR Foundation, Swedish Research Council (2022-00775), ERA PerMed (ERAPERMED2021-184), Knut and Alice Wallenberg foundation (2022-0231), Strategic Research Area MultiPark (Multidisciplinary Research in Parkinson's disease) at Lund University, Swedish Alzheimer Foundation (AF-980907), Swedish Brain Foundation (FO2021-0293), Parkinson foundation of Sweden (1412/22), Cure Alzheimer's fund, Rönström Family Foundation, Konung Gustaf V:s och Drottning Victorias Frimurarestiftelse, Skåne University Hospital Foundation (2020-O000028), Regionalt Forskningsstöd (2022-1259), and Swedish Federal Government under the ALF agreement (2022-Projekt0080). Ariane Bollack, Daniella Pellegrino, Alexander Arkhipenko, and Gill Farrar were supported by GE Healthcare.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

H.Z. has served at scientific advisory boards and/or as a consultant for Abbvie, Acumen, Alector, Alzinova, ALZPath, Amylyx, Annexon, Apellis, Artery Therapeutics, AZTherapies, Cognito Therapeutics, CogRx, Denali, Eisai, LabCorp, Merry Life, Nervgen, Novo Nordisk, Optoceutics, Passage Bio, Pinteon Therapeutics, Prothena, Red Abbey Labs, reMYND, Roche, Samumed, Siemens Healthineers, Triplet Therapeutics, and Wave, has given lectures in symposia sponsored by Alzecure, Biogen, Cellectricon, Fujirebio, Lilly, Novo Nordisk, and Roche, and is a co-founder of Brain Biomarker Solutions in Gothenburg AB (BBS), which is a part of the GU Ventures Incubator Program (outside submitted work). G.D.R. has received grant support (to his institution) from Avid Radiopharmaceuticals, GE Healthcare, Life Molecular Imaging, and Genentech. He has served on scientific advisory boards for Alector, Eli Lilly, and Merck. He serves on a data safety monitoring board for Johnson & Johnson. He is an Associate Editor for *JAMA Neurology*. O.H. has acquired research support (for the institution) from AVID Radio-

pharmaceuticals, Biogen, C2N Diagnostics, Eli Lilly, Eisai, Fujirebio, GE Healthcare, and Roche. In the past 2 years, he has received consultancy/speaker fees from Alzpath, BioArctic, Biogen, Bristol Meyer Squibb, Eisai, Eli Lilly, Fujirebio, Merck, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Roche, Sanofi and Siemens. A.L. serves as a consultant to Enigma Biomedical Group. A.B., D.P., A.A., and G.F. are full-time employees of GE Healthcare. The other authors did not report any conflict of interest. Author disclosures are available in the Supporting Information.

REFERENCES

1. Scheltens P, De Strooper B, Kivipelto M, et al. Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet*. 2021;397:1577-1590.
2. 2023 Alzheimer's disease facts and figures. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:1598-1695.
3. Hyman BT, Phelps CH, Beach TG, et al. National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association guidelines for the neuropathologic assessment of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2012;8:1-13.
4. Bateman RJ, Xiong C, Benzinger TL, et al. Clinical and biomarker changes in dominantly inherited Alzheimer's disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;367:795-804.
5. Villemagne VL, Burnham S, Bourgeat P, et al. Amyloid beta deposition, neurodegeneration, and cognitive decline in sporadic Alzheimer's disease: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Neurol*. 2013;12:357-367.
6. Visser PJ, Scheltens P, Verhey FR. Do MCI criteria in drug trials accurately identify subjects with predementia Alzheimer's disease? *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2005;76:1348-1354.
7. Serrano-Pozo A, Qian J, Monsell SE, et al. Mild to moderate Alzheimer dementia with insufficient neuropathological changes. *Ann Neurol*. 2014;75:597-601.
8. Schneider JA, Arvanitakis Z, Leurgans SE, Bennett DA. The neuropathology of probable Alzheimer disease and mild cognitive impairment. *Ann Neurol*. 2009;66:200-208.
9. Beach TG, Monsell SE, Phillips LE, Kukull W. Accuracy of the clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer disease at National Institute on Aging Alzheimer Disease Centers, 2005-2010. *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol*. 2012;71:266-273.
10. Dubois B, Villain N, Frisoni GB, et al. Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: recommendations of the International Working Group. *Lancet Neurol*. 2021;20:484-496.
11. Jack CR Jr, Andrews JS, Beach TG, et al. Revised criteria for diagnosis and staging of Alzheimer's disease: Alzheimer's Association Workgroup. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20(8):5143-5169.
12. Hansson O. Biomarkers for neurodegenerative diseases. *Nat Med*. 2021;27:954-963.
13. Jack CR Jr, Bennett DA, Blennow K, et al. NIA-AA Research Framework: toward a biological definition of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14:535-562.
14. Jansen WJ, Ossenkoppele R, Knol DL, et al. Prevalence of cerebral amyloid pathology in persons without dementia: a meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2015;313:1924-1938.
15. Jansen WJ, Janssen O, Tijms BM, et al. Prevalence estimates of amyloid abnormality across the Alzheimer Disease Clinical Spectrum. *JAMA Neurol*. 2022;79:228-243.
16. Hansson O, Zetterberg H, Buchhave P, Londos E, Blennow K, Minthon L. Association between CSF biomarkers and incipient Alzheimer's disease in patients with mild cognitive impairment: a follow-up study. *Lancet Neurol*. 2006;5:228-234.
17. Buchhave P, Minthon L, Zetterberg H, Wallin AK, Blennow K, Hansson O. Cerebrospinal fluid levels of beta-amyloid 1-42, but not of tau, are fully changed already 5 to 10 years before the onset of Alzheimer dementia. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2012;69:98-106.
18. Salvado G, Larsson V, Cody KA, et al. Optimal combinations of CSF biomarkers for predicting cognitive decline and clinical conversion in cognitively unimpaired participants and mild cognitive impairment patients: a multi-cohort study. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:2943-2955.
19. Nordberg A. PET imaging of amyloid in Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet Neurol*. 2004;3:519-527.
20. Blennow K, Zetterberg H. Biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease: current status and prospects for the future. *J Intern Med*. 2018;284:643-663.
21. Andreasen N, Hesse C, Davidsson P, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid beta-amyloid(1-42) in Alzheimer disease: differences between early- and late-onset Alzheimer disease and stability during the course of disease. *Arch Neurol*. 1999;56:673-680.
22. Blennow K, Wallin A, Agren H, Spenger C, Siegfried J, Vanmechelen E. Tau protein in cerebrospinal fluid: a biochemical marker for axonal degeneration in Alzheimer disease? *Mol Chem Neuropathol*. 1995;26:231-245.
23. Vanmechelen E, Vanderstichele H, Davidsson P, et al. Quantification of tau phosphorylated at threonine 181 in human cerebrospinal fluid: a sandwich ELISA with a synthetic phosphopeptide for standardization. *Neurosci Lett*. 2000;285:49-52.
24. Frisoni GB, Festari C, Massa F, et al. European intersocietal recommendations for the biomarker-based diagnosis of neurocognitive disorders. *Lancet Neurol*. 2024;23:302-312.
25. Leuzy A, Ashton NJ, Mattsson-Carlgren N, et al. 2020 update on the clinical validity of cerebrospinal fluid amyloid, tau, and phospho-tau as biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease in the context of a structured 5-phase development framework. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2021;48:2121-2139.
26. Rabinovici GD, Gatsonis C, Apgar C, et al. Association of amyloid positron emission tomography with subsequent change in clinical management among medicare beneficiaries with mild cognitive impairment or dementia. *JAMA*. 2019;321:1286-1294.
27. Ceccaldi M, Jonveaux T, Verger A, et al. Added value of (18)F-florbetaben amyloid PET in the diagnostic workup of most complex patients with dementia in France: a naturalistic study. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14:293-305.
28. Rabinovici GD, Rosen HJ, Alkalay A, et al. Amyloid vs FDG-PET in the differential diagnosis of AD and FTLD. *Neurology*. 2011;77:2034-2042.
29. van der Veere PJ, Hoogland J, Visser LNC, et al. Predicting cognitive decline in amyloid-positive patients with mild cognitive impairment or mild dementia. *Neurology*. 2024;103:e209605.
30. Cummings J, Apostolova L, Rabinovici GD, et al. Lecanemab: appropriate use recommendations. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis*. 2023;10:362-377.
31. Johnson KA, Minoshima S, Bohnen NI, et al. Appropriate use criteria for amyloid PET: a report of the Amyloid Imaging Task Force, the Society of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, and the Alzheimer's Association. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2013;9:e1-e16.
32. van Dyck CH, Swanson CJ, Aisen P, et al. Lecanemab in Early Alzheimer's Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2023;388:9-21.
33. Sims JR, Zimmer JA, Evans CD, et al. Donanemab in early symptomatic Alzheimer disease: the TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2023;330:512-527.
34. Verger A, Yakushev I, Albert NL, et al. FDA approval of lecanemab: the real start of widespread amyloid PET use?—the EANM Neuroimaging Committee perspective. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2023;50:1553-1555.
35. Cummings J, Kinney J. Biomarkers for Alzheimer's Disease: context of use, qualification, and roadmap for clinical implementation. *Medicina (Kaunas)*. 2022;58:952.
36. Uzuegbunam BC, Librizzi D, Hooshyar Yousefi B. PET radiopharmaceuticals for Alzheimer's Disease and Parkinson's Disease diagnosis, the current and future landscape. *Molecules*. 2020;25:977.

37. Klunk WE, Engler H, Nordberg A, et al. Imaging brain amyloid in Alzheimer's disease with Pittsburgh Compound-B. *Ann Neurol*. 2004;55:306-319.
38. Clark CM, Schneider JA, Bedell BJ, et al. Use of florbetapir-PET for imaging beta-amyloid pathology. *JAMA*. 2011;305:275-283.
39. Curtis C, Gamez JE, Singh U, et al. Phase 3 trial of flutemetamol labeled with radioactive fluorine 18 imaging and neuritic plaque density. *JAMA Neurol*. 2015;72:287-294.
40. Sabri O, Sabbagh MN, Seibyl J, et al. Florbetaben PET imaging to detect amyloid beta plaques in Alzheimer's disease: phase 3 study. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2015;11:964-974.
41. Ikonomovic MD, Buckley CJ, Abrahamson EE, et al. Post-mortem analyses of PiB and flutemetamol in diffuse and cored amyloid-beta plaques in Alzheimer's disease. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2020;140:463-476.
42. Greenberg SM, Grabowski T, Gurol ME, et al. Detection of isolated cerebrovascular beta-amyloid with Pittsburgh compound B. *Ann Neurol*. 2008;64:587-591.
43. Bacskai BJ, Frosch MP, Freeman SH, et al. Molecular imaging with Pittsburgh Compound B confirmed at autopsy: a case report. *Arch Neurol*. 2007;64:431-434.
44. McCarter SJ, Lesnick TG, Lowe V, et al. Cerebral amyloid angiopathy pathology and its association with amyloid-beta PET signal. *Neurology*. 2021;97:e1799-e808.
45. Charidimou A, Farid K, Baron JC. Amyloid-PET in sporadic cerebral amyloid angiopathy: a diagnostic accuracy meta-analysis. *Neurology*. 2017;89:1490-1498.
46. Stankoff B, Freeman L, Aigrot MS, et al. Imaging central nervous system myelin by positron emission tomography in multiple sclerosis using [methyl-(1)(1)C]-2-(4'-methylaminophenyl)- 6-hydroxybenzothiazole. *Ann Neurol*. 2011;69:673-680.
47. Blennow K, Zetterberg H. Cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2009;18:413-417.
48. Moscoso A, Grothe MJ, Ashton NJ, et al. Time course of phosphorylated-tau181 in blood across the Alzheimer's disease spectrum. *Brain*. 2021;144:325-339.
49. Insel PS, Donohue MC, Berron D, Hansson O, Mattsson-Carlgren N. Time between milestone events in the Alzheimer's disease amyloid cascade. *Neuroimage*. 2021;227:117676.
50. Palmqvist S, Mattsson N, Hansson O. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I. Cerebrospinal fluid analysis detects cerebral amyloid-beta accumulation earlier than positron emission tomography. *Brain*. 2016;139:1226-1236.
51. Li Y, Yen D, Hendrix RD, et al. Timing of Biomarker changes in sporadic Alzheimer's disease in estimated years from symptom onset. *Ann Neurol*. 2024;95:951-965.
52. Olsson B, Lautner R, Andreasson U, et al. CSF and blood biomarkers for the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Neurol*. 2016;15:673-684.
53. Rasmussen MK, Mestre H, Nedergaard M. The glymphatic pathway in neurological disorders. *Lancet Neurol*. 2018;17:1016-1024.
54. Shoji M, Matsubara E, Kanai M, et al. Combination assay of CSF tau, A beta 1-40 and A beta 1-42(43) as a biochemical marker of Alzheimer's disease. *J Neurol Sci*. 1998;158:134-140.
55. Lewczuk P, Matzen A, Blennow K, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid Abeta42/40 corresponds better than Abeta42 to amyloid PET in Alzheimer's Disease. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2017;55:813-822.
56. Janelidze S, Zetterberg H, Mattsson N, et al. CSF Abeta42/Abeta40 and Abeta42/Abeta38 ratios: better diagnostic markers of Alzheimer disease. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol*. 2016;3:154-165.
57. Janelidze S, Pannee J, Mikulskis A, et al. Concordance between different amyloid immunoassays and visual amyloid positron emission tomographic assessment. *JAMA Neurol*. 2017;74:1492-1501.
58. Hansson O, Lehmann S, Otto M, Zetterberg H, Lewczuk P. Advantages and disadvantages of the use of the CSF Amyloid beta (Abeta) 42/40 ratio in the diagnosis of Alzheimer's Disease. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2019;11:34.
59. Karlsson L, Vogel J, Arvidsson I, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid reference proteins increase accuracy and interpretability of biomarkers for brain diseases. *Nat Commun*. 2024;15:3676.
60. Zetterberg H, Blennow K. From cerebrospinal fluid to blood: the third wave of fluid biomarkers for Alzheimer's Disease. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2018;64:S271-S279.
61. Therriault J, Vermeiren M, Servaes S, et al. Association of phosphorylated tau biomarkers with amyloid positron emission tomography vs tau positron emission tomography. *JAMA Neurol*. 2023;80:188-199.
62. Mattsson N, Scholl M, Strandberg O, et al. F-AV-1451 and CSF T-tau and P-tau as biomarkers in Alzheimer's disease. *EMBO Mol Med*. 2017;9:1212-1223.
63. Gordon BA, Friedrichsen K, Brier M, et al. The relationship between cerebrospinal fluid markers of Alzheimer pathology and positron emission tomography tau imaging. *Brain*. 2016;139:2249-2260.
64. Chhatwal JP, Schultz AP, Marshall GA, et al. Temporal T807 binding correlates with CSF tau and phospho-tau in normal elderly. *Neurology*. 2016;87:920-926.
65. Sato C, Barthelemy NR, Mawuenyega KG, et al. Tau kinetics in neurons and the human central nervous system. *Neuron*. 2018;97:1284-1298.e7.
66. Mattsson-Carlgren N, Andersson E, Janelidze S, et al. Abeta deposition is associated with increases in soluble and phosphorylated tau that precede a positive Tau PET in Alzheimer's disease. *Sci Adv*. 2020;6:eaaz2387.
67. Barthelemy NR, Saef B, Li Y, et al. CSF tau phosphorylation occupancies at T217 and T205 represent improved biomarkers of amyloid and tau pathology in Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Aging*. 2023;3:391-401.
68. Mattsson-Carlgren N, Janelidze S, Bateman RJ, et al. Soluble P-tau217 reflects amyloid and tau pathology and mediates the association of amyloid with tau. *EMBO Mol Med*. 2021;13:e14022.
69. Pichet Binette A, Franzmeier N, Spotorno N, et al. Amyloid-associated increases in soluble tau relate to tau aggregation rates and cognitive decline in early Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13:6635.
70. Moscoso A, Karikari TK, Grothe MJ, et al. CSF biomarkers and plasma p-tau181 as predictors of longitudinal tau accumulation: implications for clinical trial design. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2022;18(12):2614-2262.
71. Hansson O, Seibyl J, Stomrud E, et al. CSF biomarkers of Alzheimer's disease concord with amyloid-beta PET and predict clinical progression: a study of fully automated immunoassays in BioFINDER and ADNI cohorts. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14:1470-1481.
72. Schindler SE, Gray JD, Gordon BA, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers measured by Elecsys assays compared to amyloid imaging. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14:1460-1469.
73. Skillback T, Rosen C, Asztely F, Mattsson N, Blennow K, Zetterberg H. Diagnostic performance of cerebrospinal fluid total tau and phosphorylated tau in Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease: results from the Swedish Mortality Registry. *JAMA Neurol*. 2014;71:476-483.
74. La Joie R, Ayakta N, Seeley WW, et al. Multisite study of the relationships between antemortem [(11)C]PIB-PET Centiloid values and postmortem measures of Alzheimer's disease neuropathology. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2019;15:205-216.
75. Seo SW, Ayakta N, Grinberg LT, et al. Regional correlations between [(11)C]PIB PET and post-mortem burden of amyloid-beta pathology in a diverse neuropathological cohort. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2017;13:130-137.
76. Salvado G, Molinuevo JL, Brugulat-Serrat A, et al. Centiloid cut-off values for optimal agreement between PET and CSF core AD biomarkers. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2019;11:27.
77. Fagan AM, Mintun MA, Mach RH, et al. Inverse relation between in vivo amyloid imaging load and cerebrospinal fluid Abeta42 in humans. *Ann Neurol*. 2006;59:512-519.

78. Landau SM, Lu M, Joshi AD, et al. Comparing positron emission tomography imaging and cerebrospinal fluid measurements of beta-amyloid. *Ann Neurol*. 2013;74:826-836.
79. Toledo JB, Bjerke M, Da X, et al. Nonlinear Association Between Cerebrospinal Fluid and Florbetapir F-18 beta-amyloid measures across the spectrum of Alzheimer Disease. *JAMA Neurol*. 2015;72:571-581.
80. Blennow K, Hampel H. CSF markers for incipient Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet Neurol*. 2003;2:605-613.
81. Tijms BM, Bertens D, Slot RE, et al. Low normal cerebrospinal fluid Abeta42 levels predict clinical progression in nondemented subjects. *Ann Neurol*. 2017;81:749-753.
82. van Harten AC, Visser PJ, Pijnenburg YA, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid Abeta42 is the best predictor of clinical progression in patients with subjective complaints. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2013;9:481-487.
83. Fagan AM, Mintun MA, Shah AR, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid tau and ptau(181) increase with cortical amyloid deposition in cognitively normal individuals: implications for future clinical trials of Alzheimer's disease. *EMBO Mol Med*. 2009;1:371-380.
84. Tolboom N, van der Flier WM, Yaqub M, et al. Relationship of cerebrospinal fluid markers to 11C-PiB and 18F-FDDNP binding. *J Nucl Med*. 2009;50:1464-1470.
85. Lleo A, Alcolea D, Martinez-Lage P, et al. Longitudinal cerebrospinal fluid biomarker trajectories along the Alzheimer's disease continuum in the BIOMARKAPD study. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2019;15:742-753.
86. Blennow K, Zetterberg H, Minthon L, et al. Longitudinal stability of CSF biomarkers in Alzheimer's disease. *Neurosci Lett*. 2007;419:18-22.
87. Palmqvist S, Insel PS, Stomrud E, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid and plasma biomarker trajectories with increasing amyloid deposition in Alzheimer's disease. *EMBO Mol Med*. 2019;11:e11170.
88. Jack CR, Jr, Knopman DS, Jagust WJ, et al. Tracking pathophysiological processes in Alzheimer's disease: an updated hypothetical model of dynamic biomarkers. *Lancet Neurol*. 2013;12:207-216.
89. Jack CR Jr, Holtzman DM. Biomarker modeling of Alzheimer's disease. *Neuron*. 2013;80:1347-1358.
90. Chapleau M, Iaccarino L, Soleimani-Meigooni D, Rabinovici GD. The role of amyloid PET in imaging neurodegenerative disorders: a review. *J Nucl Med*. 2022;63:13S-19S.
91. Amadoru S, Dore V, McLean CA, et al. Comparison of amyloid PET measured in Centiloid units with neuropathological findings in Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2020;12:22.
92. Salloway S, Gamez JE, Singh U, et al. Performance of [(18)F]flutemetamol amyloid imaging against the neuritic plaque component of CERAD and the current (2012) NIA-AA recommendations for the neuropathologic diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2017;9:25-34.
93. Tapiola T, Alafuzoff I, Herukka SK, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid {beta}-amyloid 42 and tau proteins as biomarkers of Alzheimer-type pathologic changes in the brain. *Arch Neurol*. 2009;66:382-389.
94. Engelborghs S, De Vreese K, Van de Casteele T, et al. Diagnostic performance of a CSF-biomarker panel in autopsy-confirmed dementia. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2008;29:1143-1159.
95. Grothe MJ, Moscoso A, Ashton NJ, et al. Associations of fully automated CSF and novel plasma biomarkers with Alzheimer disease neuropathology at autopsy. *Neurology*. 2021;97(12):e1229-e1242.
96. Mattsson-Carlgren N, Grinberg LT, Boxer A, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers in autopsy-confirmed Alzheimer disease and frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Neurology*. 2022;98:e1137-e1150.
97. Niemantsverdriet E, Feyen BFE, Le Bastard N, et al. Added diagnostic value of cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers for differential dementia diagnosis in an autopsy-confirmed cohort. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2018;63:373-381.
98. Shaw LM, Vanderstichele H, Knapik-Czajka M, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid biomarker signature in Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative subjects. *Ann Neurol*. 2009;65:403-413.
99. Reimand J, Boon BDC, Collij LE, et al. Amyloid-beta PET and CSF in an autopsy-confirmed cohort. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol*. 2020;7:2150-2160.
100. Bridel C, Somers C, Sieben A, et al. Associating Alzheimer's disease pathology with its cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers. *Brain*. 2022;145:4056-4064.
101. Vromen EM, de Boer SCM, Teunissen CE, et al. Biomarker A+T-: is this Alzheimer's disease or not? A combined CSF and pathology study. *Brain*. 2023;146:1166-1174.
102. Wang ZB, Tan L, Wang HF, et al. Differences between ante mortem Alzheimer's disease biomarkers in predicting neuropathology at autopsy. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:3613-3624.
103. Long JM, Coble DW, Xiong C, et al. Preclinical Alzheimer's disease biomarkers accurately predict cognitive and neuropathological outcomes. *Brain*. 2022;145:4506-4518.
104. Wang ZB, Tan L, Gao PY, et al. Associations of the A/T/N profiles in PET, CSF, and plasma biomarkers with Alzheimer's disease neuropathology at autopsy. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:4421-4435.
105. Alcolea D, Pegueroles J, Munoz L, et al. Agreement of amyloid PET and CSF biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease on Lumipulse. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol*. 2019;6:1815-1824.
106. Kaplow J, Vandijck M, Gray J, et al. Concordance of Lumipulse cerebrospinal fluid t-tau/Abeta42 ratio with amyloid PET status. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2020;16:144-152.
107. Moon S, Kim S, Mankhong S, et al. Alzheimer's cerebrospinal biomarkers from Lumipulse fully automated immunoassay: concordance with amyloid-beta PET and manual immunoassay in Koreans: CSF AD biomarkers measured by Lumipulse in Koreans. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2021;13:22.
108. Campbell MR, Ashrafzadeh-Kian S, Petersen RC, et al. P-tau/Abeta42 and Abeta42/40 ratios in CSF are equally predictive of amyloid PET status. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2021;13:e12190.
109. Willemse EAJ, Tijms BM, van Berckel BNM, et al. Comparing CSF amyloid-beta biomarker ratios for two automated immunoassays, Elecsys and Lumipulse, with amyloid PET status. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2021;13:e12182.
110. Keshavan A, Wellington H, Chen Z, et al. Concordance of CSF measures of Alzheimer's pathology with amyloid PET status in a preclinical cohort: a comparison of Lumipulse and established immunoassays. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2020;12:e12097.
111. Nisenbaum L, Martone R, Chen T, et al. CSF biomarker concordance with amyloid PET in Phase 3 studies of aducanumab. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:3379-3388.
112. Shaw LM, Waligorska T, Fields L, et al. Derivation of cutoffs for the Elecsys((R)) amyloid beta (1-42) assay in Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2018;10:698-705.
113. Doecke JD, Ward L, Burnham SC, et al. Elecsys CSF biomarker immunoassays demonstrate concordance with amyloid-PET imaging. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2020;12:36.
114. Amft M, Ortner M, Eichenlaub U, et al. The cerebrospinal fluid biomarker ratio Abeta42/40 identifies amyloid positron emission tomography positivity better than Abeta42 alone in a heterogeneous memory clinic cohort. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2022;14:60.
115. van Harten AC, Wiste HJ, Weigand SD, et al. Detection of Alzheimer's disease amyloid beta 1-42, p-tau, and t-tau assays. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2022;18:635-644.
116. Bouwman FH, Frisoni GB, Johnson SC, et al. Clinical application of CSF biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease: from rationale to ratios. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2022;14:e12314.
117. Landau SM, Fero A, Baker SL, et al. Measurement of longitudinal beta-amyloid change with 18F-florbetapir PET and standardized uptake value ratios. *J Nucl Med*. 2015;56:567-574.

118. Bourgeat P, Dore V, Burnham SC, et al. beta-amyloid PET harmonisation across longitudinal studies: application to AIBL, ADNI and OASIS3. *Neuroimage*. 2022;262:119527.
119. Hatashita S, Wakebe D, Kikuchi Y, Ichijo A. Longitudinal assessment of amyloid-beta deposition by [18F]-Flutemetamol PET imaging compared with [11C]-PIB across the spectrum of Alzheimer's Disease. *Front Aging Neurosci*. 2019;11:251.
120. Bollack A, Collij LE, Garcia DV, et al. Investigating reliable amyloid accumulation in Centiloids: results from the AMYPAD Prognostic and Natural History Study. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20:3429-3441.
121. Wisch JK, Gordon BA, Boerwinkle AH, et al. Predicting continuous amyloid PET values with CSF and plasma Abeta42/Abeta40. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2023;15:e12405.
122. McDade E, Wang G, Gordon BA, et al. Longitudinal cognitive and biomarker changes in dominantly inherited Alzheimer disease. *Neurology*. 2018;91:e1295-e306.
123. Salloway S, Farlow M, McDade E, et al. A trial of gantenerumab or solanezumab in dominantly inherited Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Med*. 2021;27:1187-1196.
124. Teng E, Manser PT, Pickthorn K, et al. Safety and efficacy of semorinemab in individuals with prodromal to mild Alzheimer disease: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Neurol*. 2022;79:758-767.
125. Food and Drug Administration. Flutemetamol F 18 Injection (Vizamyl). Published online February 2017. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2017/203137s008lbl.pdf
126. Food and Drug Administration. Florbetaben F 18 Injection (Neuraceq). Published online March 2014. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2014/204677s000lbl.pdf
127. Food and Drug Administration. Florbetapir F 18 Injection (Amyvid). Published online April 2012. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2012/202008s000lbl.pdf
128. Hatashita S, Yamasaki H, Suzuki Y, Tanaka K, Wakebe D, Hayakawa H. [18F]flutemetamol amyloid-beta PET imaging compared with [11C]PIB across the spectrum of Alzheimer's disease. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2014;41:290-300.
129. Joshi AD, Pontecorvo MJ, Clark CM, et al. Performance characteristics of amyloid PET with florbetapir F 18 in patients with alzheimer's disease and cognitively normal subjects. *J Nucl Med*. 2012;53:378-384.
130. Mountz JM, Laymon CM, Cohen AD, et al. Comparison of qualitative and quantitative imaging characteristics of [11C]PiB and [18F]flutemetamol in normal control and Alzheimer's subjects. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2015;9:592-598.
131. Nayate AP, Dubroff JG, Schmitt JE, et al. Use of standardized uptake value ratios decreases interreader variability of [18F] florbetapir PET brain scan interpretation. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2015;36:1237-1244.
132. Payoux P, Delrieu J, Gallini A, et al. Cognitive and functional patterns of nondemented subjects with equivocal visual amyloid PET findings. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2015;42:1459-1468.
133. Seibyl J, Catafau AM, Barthel H, et al. Impact of training method on the robustness of the visual assessment of 18F-Florbetaben PET scans: results from a Phase-3 Study. *J Nucl Med*. 2016;57:900-906.
134. Tiepolt S, Barthel H, Butzke D, et al. Influence of scan duration on the accuracy of beta-amyloid PET with florbetaben in patients with Alzheimer's disease and healthy volunteers. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2013;40:238-244.
135. Pontecorvo MJ, Arora AK, Devine M, et al. Quantitation of PET signal as an adjunct to visual interpretation of florbetapir imaging. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2017;44:825-837.
136. Fantoni E, Collij L, Lopes Alves I, Buckley C, Farrar G, consortium A. The spatial-temporal ordering of amyloid pathology and opportunities for PET imaging. *J Nucl Med*. 2020;61:166-171.
137. Pemberton HG, Collij LE, Heeman F, et al. Quantification of amyloid PET for future clinical use: a state-of-the-art review. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2022;49:3508-3528.
138. Rinne JO, Wong DF, Wolk DA, et al. [(18)F]Flutemetamol PET imaging and cortical biopsy histopathology for fibrillar amyloid beta detection in living subjects with normal pressure hydrocephalus: pooled analysis of four studies. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2012;124:833-845.
139. Pontecorvo MJ, Siderowf A, Dubois B, et al. Effectiveness of florbetapir PET imaging in changing patient management. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord*. 2017;44:129-143.
140. Matsuda H, Ito K, Ishii K, et al. Quantitative evaluation of (18)F-Flutemetamol PET in patients with cognitive impairment and suspected Alzheimer's disease: a multicenter study. *Front Neurol*. 2020;11:578753.
141. Akamatsu G, Ikari Y, Ohnishi A, et al. Voxel-based statistical analysis and quantification of amyloid PET in the Japanese Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (J-ADNI) multi-center study. *EJNMMI Res*. 2019;9:91.
142. Schmidt ME, Chiao P, Klein G, et al. The influence of biological and technical factors on quantitative analysis of amyloid PET: points to consider and recommendations for controlling variability in longitudinal data. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2015;11:1050-1068.
143. Su Y, Blazey TM, Snyder AZ, et al. Partial volume correction in quantitative amyloid imaging. *Neuroimage*. 2015;107:55-64.
144. Brendel M, Hogenauer M, Delker A, et al. Improved longitudinal [(18)F]-AV45 amyloid PET by white matter reference and VOI-based partial volume effect correction. *Neuroimage*. 2015;108:450-459.
145. Cselenyi Z, Farde L. Quantification of blood flow-dependent component in estimates of beta-amyloid load obtained using quasi-steady-state standardized uptake value ratio. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab*. 2015;35:1485-1493.
146. Heeman F, Yaqub M, Lopes Alves I, et al. Simulating the effect of cerebral blood flow changes on regional quantification of [(18)F]flutemetamol and [(18)F]florbetaben studies. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab*. 2021;41:579-589.
147. Heeman F, Yaqub M, Lopes Alves I, et al. Optimized dual-time-window protocols for quantitative [(18)F]flutemetamol and [(18)F]florbetaben PET studies. *EJNMMI Res*. 2019;9:32.
148. Schwarz CG, Jones DT, Gunter JL, et al. Contributions of imprecision in PET-MRI rigid registration to imprecision in amyloid PET SUVR measurements. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2017;38:3323-3336.
149. Ruwanpathirana GP, Williams RC, Masters CL, Rowe CC, Johnston LA, Davey CE. Impact of PET reconstruction on amyloid-beta quantitation in cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. *J Nucl Med*. 2024;65:781-787.
150. Akamatsu G, Ikari Y, Nishio T, et al. Optimization of image reconstruction conditions with phantoms for brain FDG and amyloid PET imaging. *Ann Nucl Med*. 2016;30:18-28.
151. Klunk WE, Koeppe RA, Price JC, et al. The Centiloid Project: standardizing quantitative amyloid plaque estimation by PET. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2015;11:1-15.e1-e4.
152. Jagust WJ, Mattay VS, Krainak DM, et al. Quantitative Brain Amyloid PET. *J Nucl Med*. 2024;65:670-678.
153. Golla SS, Verfaillie SC, Boellaard R, et al. Quantification of [(18)F]florbetapir: a test-retest tracer kinetic modelling study. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab*. 2019;39:2172-2180.
154. Vandenberghe R, Van Laere K, Ivanoiu A, et al. 18F-flutemetamol amyloid imaging in Alzheimer disease and mild cognitive impairment: a phase 2 trial. *Ann Neurol*. 2010;68:319-329.
155. Miki T, Shimada H, Kim JS, et al. Brain uptake and safety of Flutemetamol F 18 injection in Japanese subjects with probable Alzheimer's disease, subjects with amnestic mild cognitive impairment and healthy volunteers. *Ann Nucl Med*. 2017;31:260-272.

156. Budd Haeberlein S, Aisen PS, Barkhof F, et al. Two randomized phase 3 studies of aducanumab in early Alzheimer's disease. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis*. 2022;9:197-210.
157. Mintun MA, Lo AC, Duggan Evans C, et al. Donanemab in early Alzheimer's disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384:1691-1704.
158. Bischof GN, Bartenstein P, Barthel H, et al. Toward a universal readout for (18)F-labeled amyloid tracers: the CAPTAINs Study. *J Nucl Med*. 2021;62:999-1005.
159. Joshi A, Koeppe RA, Fessler JA. Reducing between scanner differences in multi-center PET studies. *Neuroimage*. 2009;46:154-159.
160. Shekari M, Verwer EE, Yaqub M, et al. Harmonization of brain PET images in multi-center PET studies using Hoffman phantom scan. *EJNMMI Phys*. 2023;10:68.
161. Bilgel M. Probabilistic estimation for across-batch compatibility enhancement for amyloid PET. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2023;15:e12436.
162. Jovalekic A, Roe-Vellve N, Koglin N, et al. Validation of quantitative assessment of florbetaben PET scans as an adjunct to the visual assessment across 15 software methods. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2023;50:3276-3289.
163. Cho SH, Choe YS, Kim YJ, et al. Concordance in detecting amyloid positivity between (18)F-florbetaben and (18)F-flutemetamol amyloid PET using quantitative and qualitative assessments. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10:19576.
164. Collij LE, Salvado G, Shekari M, et al. Visual assessment of [(18)F]flutemetamol PET images can detect early amyloid pathology and grade its extent. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2021;48:2169-2182.
165. Royse SK, Minhas DS, Lopresti BJ, et al. Validation of amyloid PET positivity thresholds in centiloids: a multisite PET study approach. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2021;13:99.
166. Iaccarino L, La Joie R, Koeppe R, et al. rPOP: robust PET-only processing of community acquired heterogeneous amyloid-PET data. *Neuroimage*. 2022;246:118775.
167. Hanseeuw BJ, Malotaux V, Dricot L, et al. Defining a Centiloid scale threshold predicting long-term progression to dementia in patients attending the memory clinic: an [(18)F] flutemetamol amyloid PET study. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2021;48:302-310.
168. Collij LE, Bollack A, La Joie R, et al. Centiloid recommendations for clinical context-of-use from the AMYPAD consortium. *Alzheimer's Dement*. 2024;20:9037-9048. doi:10.1002/alz.14336
169. Shekari M, Vallez Garcia D, Collij LE, et al. Stress testing the Centiloid: precision and variability of PET quantification of amyloid pathology. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20(8):5102-5113.
170. Johns E, Vossler HA, Young CB, et al. Florbetaben amyloid PET acquisition time: influence on Centiloids and interpretation. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20(8):5299-5310.
171. Coath W, Modat M, Cardoso MJ, et al. Operationalizing the centiloid scale for [(18)F]florbetapir PET studies on PET/MRI. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2023;15:e12434.
172. Su Y, Flores S, Hornbeck RC, et al. Utilizing the Centiloid scale in cross-sectional and longitudinal PiB PET studies. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2018;19:406-416.
173. Properzi MJ, Buckley RF, Chhatwal JP, et al. Nonlinear Distributional Mapping (NoDiM) for harmonization across amyloid-PET radiotracers. *Neuroimage*. 2019;186:446-454.
174. Yang B, Earnest T, Kumar S, et al. Evaluation of ComBat harmonization for reducing across-tracer differences in regional amyloid PET analyses. *medRxiv*. 2024.
175. Wiltfang J, Esselmann H, Smirnov A, et al. Beta-amyloid peptides in cerebrospinal fluid of patients with Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease. *Ann Neurol*. 2003;54:263-267.
176. Sjogren M, Gisslen M, Vanmechelen E, Blennow K. Low cerebrospinal fluid beta-amyloid 42 in patients with acute bacterial meningitis and normalization after treatment. *Neurosci Lett*. 2001;314:33-36.
177. Augutis K, Axelsson M, Portelius E, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers of beta-amyloid metabolism in multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler*. 2013;19:543-552.
178. Jeppsson A, Zetterberg H, Blennow K, Wikkelso C. Idiopathic normal-pressure hydrocephalus: pathophysiology and diagnosis by CSF biomarkers. *Neurology*. 2013;80:1385-1392.
179. Graff-Radford J, Jones DT, Wiste HJ, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid dynamics and discordant amyloid biomarkers. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2022;110:27-36.
180. van Westen D, Lindqvist D, Blennow K, et al. Cerebral white matter lesions—associations with Abeta isoforms and amyloid PET. *Sci Rep*. 2016;6:20709.
181. Osborn KE, Liu D, Samuels LR, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid beta-amyloid(42) and neurofilament light relate to white matter hyperintensities. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2018;68:18-25.
182. Jeppsson A, Bjerke M, Hellstrom P, et al. Shared CSF biomarker profile in idiopathic normal pressure hydrocephalus and subcortical small vessel disease. *Front Neurol*. 2022;13:839307.
183. Hesse C, Rosengren L, Andreasen N, et al. Transient increase in total tau but not phospho-tau in human cerebrospinal fluid after acute stroke. *Neurosci Lett*. 2001;297:187-190.
184. Zetterberg H, Hietala MA, Jonsson M, et al. Neurochemical aftermath of amateur boxing. *Arch Neurol*. 2006;63:1277-1280.
185. Zetterberg H. Review: tau in biofluids—relation to pathology, imaging and clinical features. *Neuropathol Appl Neurobiol*. 2017;43:194-199.
186. Kurihara M, Komatsu H, Sengoku R, et al. CSF P-Tau181 and other biomarkers in patients with neuronal intranuclear inclusion disease. *Neurology*. 2023;100:e1009-e1019.
187. Guo T, Korman D, La Joie R, et al. Normalization of CSF pTau measurement by Abeta(40) improves its performance as a biomarker of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2020;12:97.
188. Bjerke M, Portelius E, Minthon L, et al. Confounding factors influencing amyloid Beta concentration in cerebrospinal fluid. *Int J Alzheimers Dis*. 2010;2010:986310.
189. Perret-Liaudet A, Pelpel M, Tholance Y, et al. Risk of Alzheimer's disease biological misdiagnosis linked to cerebrospinal collection tubes. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2012;31:13-20.
190. Schoonenboom NS, Mulder C, Vanderstichele H, et al. Effects of processing and storage conditions on amyloid beta (1-42) and tau concentrations in cerebrospinal fluid: implications for use in clinical practice. *Clin Chem*. 2005;51:189-195.
191. Algeciras-Schimnich A, Bornhorst JA. Importance of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) collection protocol for the accurate diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease when using CSF biomarkers. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20:3657-3658.
192. Hansson O, Mikulskis A, Fagan AM, et al. The impact of preanalytical variables on measuring cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease diagnosis: a review. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14:1313-1333.
193. Fourier A, Portelius E, Zetterberg H, Blennow K, Quadrio I, Perret-Liaudet A. Pre-analytical and analytical factors influencing Alzheimer's disease cerebrospinal fluid biomarker variability. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2015;449:9-15.
194. Hansson O, Batrla R, Brix B, et al. The Alzheimer's Association international guidelines for handling of cerebrospinal fluid for routine clinical measurements of amyloid beta and tau. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2021;17:1575-1582.
195. Jonaitis EM, Jeffers B, VandenLangenberg M, et al. CSF biomarkers in longitudinal Alzheimer disease cohorts: pre-analytic challenges. *Clin Chem*. 2024;70:538-550.
196. Teunissen CE, Petzold A, Bennett JL, et al. A consensus protocol for the standardization of cerebrospinal fluid collection and biobanking. *Neurology*. 2009;73:1914-1922.
197. Andreasson U, Kuhlmann J, Pannee J, et al. Commutability of the certified reference materials for the standardization of beta-amyloid

1-42 assay in human cerebrospinal fluid: lessons for tau and beta-amyloid 1-40 measurements. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2018;56:2058-2066.
198. Vanderstichele H, Bibl M, Engelborghs S, et al. Standardization of preanalytical aspects of cerebrospinal fluid biomarker testing for Alzheimer's disease diagnosis: a consensus paper from the Alzheimer's Biomarkers Standardization Initiative. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2012;8:65-73.
199. Kuhlmann J, Andreasson U, Pannee J, et al. CSF Abeta(1-42)—an excellent but complicated Alzheimer's biomarker—a route to standardisation. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2017;467:27-33.
200. Bittner T, Zetterberg H, Teunissen CE, et al. Technical performance of a novel, fully automated electrochemiluminescence immunoassay for the quantitation of beta-amyloid (1-42) in human cerebrospinal fluid. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2016;12:517-526.
201. Mattsson N, Andreasson U, Persson S, et al. The Alzheimer's Association external quality control program for cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2011;7(4):386-395.e6. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.05.2243
202. Mukadam N, Marston L, Lewis G, Mathur R, Rait G, Livingston G. Incidence, age at diagnosis and survival with dementia across ethnic groups in England: a longitudinal study using electronic health records. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:1300-1307.
203. Manly JJ, Jones RN, Langa KM, et al. Estimating the prevalence of dementia and mild cognitive impairment in the US: the 2016 Health and Retirement Study Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol Project. *JAMA Neurol*. 2022;79:1242-1249.
204. Power MC, Bennett EE, Turner RW, et al. Trends in relative incidence and prevalence of dementia across non-Hispanic Black and White individuals in the United States, 2000-2016. *JAMA Neurol*. 2021;78:275-284.
205. Howell JC, Watts KD, Parker MW, et al. Race modifies the relationship between cognition and Alzheimer's disease cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2017;9:88.
206. Morris JC, Schindler SE, McCue LM, et al. Assessment of racial disparities in biomarkers for Alzheimer disease. *JAMA Neurol*. 2019;76:264-273.
207. Garrett SL, McDaniel D, Obideen M, et al. Racial disparity in cerebrospinal fluid amyloid and tau biomarkers and associated cutoffs for mild cognitive impairment. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2:e1917363.
208. Deters KD, Napolioni V, Sperling RA, et al. Amyloid PET imaging in self-identified non-Hispanic Black participants of the anti-amyloid in asymptomatic Alzheimer's Disease (A4) Study. *Neurology*. 2021;96:e1491-e500.
209. Wilkins CH, Windon CC, Dilworth-Anderson P, et al. Racial and ethnic differences in amyloid PET positivity in individuals with mild cognitive impairment or dementia: a secondary analysis of the imaging dementia-evidence for amyloid scanning (IDEAS) cohort study. *JAMA Neurol*. 2022;79:1139-1147.
210. Schindler SE, Karikari TK, Ashton NJ, et al. Effect of race on prediction of brain amyloidosis by plasma Abeta42/Abeta40, phosphorylated tau, and neurofilament light. *Neurology*. 2022;99:e245-e57.
211. Bonomi S, Lu R, Schindler SE, et al. Relationships of cognitive measures with cerebrospinal fluid but not imaging biomarkers of Alzheimer disease vary between Black and White individuals. *Ann Neurol*. 2024;95:495-506.
212. Windon C, Iaccarino L, Mundada N, et al. Comparison of plasma and CSF biomarkers across ethnoracial groups in the ADNI. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2022;14:e12315.
213. Gottesman RF, Schneider AL, Zhou Y, et al. The ARIC-PET amyloid imaging study: brain amyloid differences by age, race, sex, and APOE. *Neurology*. 2016;87:473-480.
214. Dorans KS, Mills KT, Liu Y, He J. Trends in prevalence and control of hypertension according to the 2017 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) Guideline. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2018;7:e008888.
215. Fei K, Rodriguez-Lopez JS, Ramos M, et al. Racial and ethnic subgroup disparities in hypertension prevalence, New York City Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2013-2014. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2017;14:E33.
216. Al Kibria GM. Racial/ethnic disparities in prevalence, treatment, and control of hypertension among US adults following application of the 2017 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association guideline. *Prev Med Rep*. 2019;14:100850.
217. Thomas SJ, Booth JN, 3rd, Dai C, et al. Cumulative incidence of hypertension by 55 years of age in Blacks and Whites: the CARDIA Study. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2018;7:e007988.
218. Chen C, Zissimopoulos JM. Racial and ethnic differences in trends in dementia prevalence and risk factors in the United States. *Alzheimers Dement (N Y)*. 2018;4:510-520.
219. van Dijk EJ, Breteler MM, Schmidt R, et al. The association between blood pressure, hypertension, and cerebral white matter lesions: cardiovascular determinants of dementia study. *Hypertension*. 2004;44:625-630.
220. van Swieten JC, Geyskes GG, Derix MM, et al. Hypertension in the elderly is associated with white matter lesions and cognitive decline. *Ann Neurol*. 1991;30:825-830.
221. Mast H, Thompson JL, Lee SH, Mohr JP, Sacco RL. Hypertension and diabetes mellitus as determinants of multiple lacunar infarcts. *Stroke*. 1995;26:30-33.
222. Verhaaren BF, Vernooij MW, de Boer R, et al. High blood pressure and cerebral white matter lesion progression in the general population. *Hypertension*. 2013;61:1354-1359.
223. McRae-McKee K, Udeh-Momoh CT, Price G, et al. Perspective: clinical relevance of the dichotomous classification of Alzheimer's disease biomarkers: should there be a "gray zone". *Alzheimers Dement*. 2019;15:1348-1356.
224. Landau SM, Horng A, Jagust WJ. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I. Memory decline accompanies subthreshold amyloid accumulation. *Neurology*. 2018;90:e1452-e1460.
225. Farrell ME, Papp KV, Buckley RF, et al. Association of emerging beta-amyloid and tau pathology with early cognitive changes in clinically normal older adults. *Neurology*. 2022;98:e1512-e1524.
226. Kim HJ, Oh JS, Lim JS, et al. The impact of subthreshold levels of amyloid deposition on conversion to dementia in patients with amyloid-negative amnestic mild cognitive impairment. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2022;14:93.
227. Villeneuve S, Rabinovici GD, Cohn-Sheehy BI, et al. Existing Pittsburgh Compound-B positron emission tomography thresholds are too high: statistical and pathological evaluation. *Brain*. 2015;138:2020-2033.
228. Knopman DS, Lundt ES, Therneau TM, et al. Association of initial beta-amyloid levels with subsequent flortaucipir positron emission tomography changes in persons without cognitive impairment. *JAMA Neurol*. 2021;78:217-228.
229. Farrell ME, Jiang S, Schultz AP, et al. Defining the lowest threshold for Amyloid-PET to Predict future cognitive decline and amyloid accumulation. *Neurology*. 2021;96:e619-e631.
230. European Medicines Agency. Qualification opinion for Centiloid measure of Amyloid PET to quantify brain amyloid deposition. Published online June 25, 2024. https://www.ema.europa.eu/system/files/documents/other/qualification-opinion-centiloid-measure-amyloid-pet-quantify-brain-amyloid-deposition-en.pdf
231. Barthelemy NR, Salvado G, Schindler SE, et al. Highly accurate blood test for Alzheimer's disease is similar or superior to clinical cerebrospinal fluid tests. *Nat Med*. 2024;30:1085-1095.
232. Guillen N, Contador J, Buongiorno M, et al. Agreement of cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers and amyloid-PET in a multicenter study. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2023.

233. Leuzy A, Mattsson-Carlgren N, Cullen NC, et al. Robustness of CSF Abeta42/40 and Abeta42/P-tau181 measured using fully automated immunoassays to detect AD-related outcomes. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:2994-3004.
234. Brum WS, de Bastiani MA, Bieger A, et al. for the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI). A three-range approach enhances the prognostic utility of CSF biomarkers in Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's Dement*. 2022;8:e12270. doi:10.1002/trc2.12270
235. Groot C, Smith R, Stomrud E, et al. Phospho-tau with subthreshold tau-PET predicts increased tau accumulation rates in amyloid-positive individuals. *Brain*. 2023;146:1580-1591.
236. Wang G, Li Y, Xiong C, et al. The CentiMarker Project: Standardizing Quantitative Alzheimer's disease Fluid Biomarkers for Biologic Interpretation. *medRxiv*. Published online July 27, 2024: 2024.07.25.24311002. doi:10.1101/2024.07.25.24311002
237. de Wilde A, Reimand J, Teunissen CE, et al. Discordant amyloid-beta PET and CSF biomarkers and its clinical consequences. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2019;11:78.
238. Reimand J, Collij L, Scheltens P, Bouwman F, Ossenkoppele R. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I. Association of amyloid-beta CSF/PET discordance and tau load 5 years later. *Neurology*. 2020;95:e2648-e2657.
239. Guo T, Shaw LM, Trojanowski JQ, Jagust WJ, Landau SM. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I. Association of CSF Abeta, amyloid PET, and cognition in cognitively unimpaired elderly adults. *Neurology*. 2020;95:e2075-e2085.
240. Sala A, Nordberg A, Rodriguez-Vieitez E. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I. Longitudinal pathways of cerebrospinal fluid and positron emission tomography biomarkers of amyloid-beta positivity. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2021;26:5864-5874.
241. Scholl M, Wall A, Thordardottir S, et al. Low PiB PET retention in presence of pathologic CSF biomarkers in Arctic APP mutation carriers. *Neurology*. 2012;79:229-236.
242. Chhatwal JP, Schultz SA, McDade E, et al. Variant-dependent heterogeneity in amyloid beta burden in autosomal dominant Alzheimer's disease: cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of an observational study. *Lancet Neurol*. 2022;21:140-152.
243. Vos SJB, Delvenne A, Jack CR Jr, Thal DR, Visser PJ. The clinical importance of suspected non-Alzheimer disease pathophysiology. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2024;20:337-346.
244. Skillback T, Farahmand BY, Rosen C, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid tau and amyloid-beta1-42 in patients with dementia. *Brain*. 2015;138:2716-2731.
245. Itoh N, Arai H, Urakami K, et al. Large-scale, multicenter study of cerebrospinal fluid tau protein phosphorylated at serine 199 for the antemortem diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. *Ann Neurol*. 2001;50:150-156.
246. Erickson P, Simren J, Brum WS, et al. Prevalence and clinical implications of a β-amyloid-negative, tau-positive cerebrospinal fluid biomarker profile in Alzheimer disease. *JAMA Neurol*. 2023;80:(9)969-979. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2023.2338
247. Costoya-Sanchez A, Moscoso A, Silva-Rodriguez J, et al. Increased medial temporal tau positron emission tomography uptake in the absence of amyloid-beta positivity. *JAMA Neurol*. 2023;80(10):1051-1061.
248. Wuestefeld A, Pichet Binette A, Berron D, et al. Age-related and amyloid-beta-independent tau deposition and its downstream effects. *Brain*. 2023;146:3192-3205.
249. Moscoso A, Silva-Rodríguez J, Heeman F, et al. PET-based detection of amyloid-β-negative amnestic patients with neocortical tau pathology. Oral Presentation at the ADPD 2024 Conference.
250. Palmqvist S, Janelidze S, Quiroz YT, et al. Discriminative accuracy of plasma phospho-tau217 for Alzheimer disease vs other neurodegenerative disorders. *JAMA*. 2020;324:772-781.
251. Brum WS, Cullen NC, Janelidze S, et al. A two-step workflow based on plasma p-tau217 to screen for amyloid beta positivity with further confirmatory testing only in uncertain cases. *Nat Aging*. 2023;3:1079-1090.
252. Iaccarino L, Burnham SC, Dell'Agnello G, Dowsett SA, Epelbaum S. Diagnostic biomarkers of amyloid and tau pathology in Alzheimer's disease: an overview of tests for clinical practice in the United States and Europe. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis*. 2023;10:426-442.
253. Combinostics. cPET Product Overview. Published online July 2023. https://www.combinostics.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/230707-cPET-Product-Overview.pdf
254. Mim Neurosciences. MIMNeuro. Accessed February 18, 2025. https://www.mimneuro.se
255. Siemens Healthineers. syngo.via. Accessed February 18, 2025. https://www.siemens-healthineers.com/en-us/molecular-imaging/pet-ct/syngo-via
256. Rabinovici GD, Knopman DS, Arbizu J, et al. Updated Appropriate Use Criteria for Amyloid and Tau PET: A Report from the Alzheimer's Association and Society for Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging Workgroup. *J Nuclear Med*. Published online January 8, 2025. doi:10.2967/jnumed.124.268756
257. Shortman RI, Neriman D, Hoath J, et al. A comparison of the psychological burden of PET/MRI and PET/CT scans and association to initial state anxiety and previous imaging experiences. *Br J Radiol*. 2015;88:20150121.
258. Young P, Heeman F, Axelsson J, et al. Impact of simulated reduced injected dose on the assessment of amyloid PET scans. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2024;51:734-748.
259. Grill JD, Lingler JH. Centers for medicare and medicaid services coverage of amyloid PET. *JAMA Neurol*. 2024;81(9):903-904.
260. Duits FH, Martinez-Lage P, Paquet C, et al. Performance and complications of lumbar puncture in memory clinics: results of the multicenter lumbar puncture feasibility study. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2016;12:154-163.
261. Herukka SK, Simonsen AH, Andreasen N, et al. Recommendations for cerebrospinal fluid Alzheimer's disease biomarkers in the diagnostic evaluation of mild cognitive impairment. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2017;13:285-295.
262. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Substantial Equivalence Determination Decision Summary: Elecsys β-Amyloid (1-42) CSF II, Elecsys Total-Tau CSF (K231348). Published online June 2023. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf23/K231348.pdf
263. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Substantial Equivalence Determination Decision Summary: Elecsys β-Amyloid (1-42) CSF II, Elecsys Phospho-Tau (181P) CSF (K221842). Published online December 2022. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf22/K221842.pdf
264. Food and Drug Administration. Evaluation of Automatic Class III Designator for Lumipulse G β-Amyloid Ratio (1-42/1-40) - Decision Summary, Breakthrough Devices Program (DEN200072). Published online May 2022. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf20/DEN200072.pdf
265. Shaw LM, Arias J, Blennow K, et al. Appropriate use criteria for lumbar puncture and cerebrospinal fluid testing in the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14:1505-1521.
266. Bocchetta M, Galluzzi S, Kehoe PG, et al. The use of biomarkers for the etiologic diagnosis of MCI in Europe: an EADC survey. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2015;11:195-206.e1.
267. Boccardi M, Nicolosi V, Festari C, et al. Italian consensus recommendations for a biomarker-based aetiological diagnosis in mild cognitive impairment patients. *Eur J Neurol*. 2020;27:475-483.
268. Engelborghs S, Niemantsverdriet E, Struyfs H, et al. Consensus guidelines for lumbar puncture in patients with neurological diseases. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2017;8:111-126.

269. Menendez-Gonzalez M. Routine lumbar puncture for the early diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. Is it safe? *Front Aging Neurosci*. 2014;6:65.
270. Hampel H, Shaw LM, Aisen P, et al. State-of-the-art of lumbar puncture and its place in the journey of patients with Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2022;18:159-177.
271. Baldaranov D, Garcia V, Miller G, et al. Safety and tolerability of lumbar puncture for the evaluation of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2023;15:e12431.
272. Soo SA, Zailan FZ, Tan JY, et al. Safety and usefulness of lumbar puncture for the diagnosis and management of young-onset cognitive disorders. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2022;87:479-488.
273. Vidoni ED, Morris JK, Raider K, Burns JM. Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I. Reducing post-lumbar puncture headaches with small bore atraumatic needles. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2014;21:536-537.
274. Hindley NJ, Jobst KA, King E, Barnetson L, Smith A, Haigh AM. High acceptability and low morbidity of diagnostic lumbar puncture in elderly subjects of mixed cognitive status. *Acta Neurol Scand*. 1995;91:405-411.
275. Peskind ER, Riekse R, Quinn JF, et al. Safety and acceptability of the research lumbar puncture. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2005;19:220-225.
276. Bonomi S, Gupta MR, Schindler SE. Inadequate reimbursement for lumbar puncture is a potential barrier to accessing new Alzheimer's disease treatments. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:5849-5851.
277. Horie K, Salvado G, Barthelemy NR, et al. CSF MTBR-tau243 is a specific biomarker of tau tangle pathology in Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Med*. 2023;29:1954-1963.
278. Lantero-Rodriguez J, Montoliu-Gaya L, Benedet AL, et al. CSF p-tau205: a biomarker of tau pathology in Alzheimer's disease. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2024;147:12.
279. Dubois B, Villain N, Schneider L, et al. Alzheimer Disease as a Clinical-Biological Construct—An International Working Group Recommendation. *JAMA Neurol*. 2024;81(12):1304-1311. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2024.3770
280. Ossenkoppele R, Jansen WJ, Rabinovici GD, et al. Prevalence of amyloid PET positivity in dementia syndromes: a meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2015;313:1939-1949.
281. Altomare D, Barkhof F, Caprioglio C, et al. Clinical effect of early vs late amyloid positron emission tomography in memory clinic patients: the AMYPAD-DPMS randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Neurol*. 2023;80:548-557.
282. Cummings J, Zhou Y, Lee G, Zhong K, Fonseca J, Cheng F. [Not Available]. *Alzheimers Dement (N Y)*. 2024;10:e12465.
283. Rafii MS, Sperling RA, Donohue MC, et al. The AHEAD 3-45 Study: design of a prevention trial for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:1227-1233.
284. Sperling RA, Donohue MC, Raman R, et al. Trial of solanezumab in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2023;389:1096-1107.
285. Klein G, Delmar P, Kerchner GA, et al. Thirty-six-month amyloid positron emission tomography results show continued reduction in amyloid burden with subcutaneous gantenerumab. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis*. 2021;8:3-6.
286. Food and Drug Administration. Kisunla (donanemab-azbt) injection, for intravenous use. Published online 2024. https://www.fda.gov/media/180803/download
287. Zimmer JA. Insights from TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2 (Donanemab): Clinical Efficacy. In: ALZ; 2024. Accessed February 18, 2025. https://alz.confex.com/alz/2024/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/95854
288. Nakamura A, Kaneko N, Villemagne VL, et al. High performance plasma amyloid-beta biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease. *Nature*. 2018;554:249-254.
289. Schindler SE, Bollinger JG, Ovod V, et al. High-precision plasma beta-amyloid 42/40 predicts current and future brain amyloidosis. *Neurology*. 2019;93:e1647-e1659.
290. Brand AL, Lawler PE, Bollinger JG, et al. The performance of plasma amyloid beta measurements in identifying amyloid plaques in Alzheimer's disease: a literature review. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2022;14:195.
291. Janelidze S, Teunissen CE, Zetterberg Het al. Head-to-head comparison of 8 plasma amyloid-beta 42/40 assays in Alzheimer disease. *JAMA Neurol*. 2021;78:1375-1382.
292. Mielke MM, Hagen CE, Xu J, et al. Plasma phospho-tau181 increases with Alzheimer's disease clinical severity and is associated with tau- and amyloid-positron emission tomography. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14:989-997.
293. Karikari TK, Pascoal TA, Ashton NJ, et al. Blood phosphorylated tau 181 as a biomarker for Alzheimer's disease: a diagnostic performance and prediction modelling study using data from four prospective cohorts. *Lancet Neurol*. 2020;19:422-433.
294. Karikari TK, Benedet AL, Ashton NJ, et al. Diagnostic performance and prediction of clinical progression of plasma phospho-tau181 in the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2020;26(2):429-442.
295. Ashton NJ, Pascoal TA, Karikari TK, et al. Plasma p-tau231: a new biomarker for incipient Alzheimer's disease pathology. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2021;141:709-724.
296. Janelidze S, Mattsson N, Palmqvist S, et al. Plasma P-tau181 in Alzheimer's disease: relationship to other biomarkers, differential diagnosis, neuropathology and longitudinal progression to Alzheimer's dementia. *Nat Med*. 2020;26:379-386.
297. Salvado G, Ossenkoppele R, Ashton NJ, et al. Specific associations between plasma biomarkers and postmortem amyloid plaque and tau tangle loads. *EMBO Mol Med*. 2023;15:e17123.
298. Ashton NJ, Brum WS, Di Molfetta G, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of a plasma phosphorylated tau 217 immunoassay for Alzheimer disease pathology. *JAMA Neurol*. 2024;81:255-263.
299. Thijssen EH, La Joie R, Strom A, et al. Plasma phosphorylated tau 217 and phosphorylated tau 181 as biomarkers in Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal lobar degeneration: a retrospective diagnostic performance study. *Lancet Neurol*. 2021;20:739-752.
300. Palmqvist S, Tideman P, Mattsson-Carlgren N, et al. Blood biomarkers to detect Alzheimer disease in primary care and secondary care. *JAMA*. 2024;332(15):1245-1257.
301. Zicha S, Bateman RJ, Shaw LM, et al. Comparative analytical performance of multiple plasma Abeta42 and Abeta40 assays and their ability to predict positron emission tomography amyloid positivity. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2022;19(3):956-966.
302. Janelidze S, Bali D, Ashton NJ, et al. Head-to-head comparison of 10 plasma phospho-tau assays in prodromal Alzheimer's disease. *Brain*. 2023;146:1592-1601.
303. Ashton NJ, Puig-Pijoan A, Mila-Aloma M, et al. Plasma and CSF biomarkers in a memory clinic: head-to-head comparison of phosphorylated tau immunoassays. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:1913-1924.
304. Benedet AL, Brum WS, Hansson O, et al. The accuracy and robustness of plasma biomarker models for amyloid PET positivity. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2022;14:26.
305. Rabe C, Bittner T, Jethwa A, et al. Clinical performance and robustness evaluation of plasma amyloid-beta(42/40) prescreening. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:1393-1402.
306. Cullen NC, Janelidze S, Mattsson-Carlgren N, et al. Test-retest variability of plasma biomarkers in Alzheimer's disease and its effects on clinical prediction models. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2022;19(3):797-806.
307. Simren J, Brum WS, Ashton NJ, et al. CSF tau368/total-tau ratio reflects cognitive performance and neocortical tau better compared to p-tau181 and p-tau217 in cognitively impaired individuals. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2022;14:192.
308. Barthelemy NR, Li Y, Joseph-Mathurin N, et al. A soluble phosphorylated tau signature links tau, amyloid and the evolution of stages

of dominantly inherited Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Med*. 2020;26:398-407.
309. Scholl M, Verberk IMW, Del Campo M, et al. Challenges in the practical implementation of blood biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet Healthy Longev*. 2024;5(10):100630.
310. Mielke MM, Anderson M, Ashford JW, et al. Recommendations for clinical implementation of blood-based biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20(11):8216-8224.
311. Schindler SE, Li Y, Li M, et al. Using Alzheimer's disease blood tests to accelerate clinical trial enrollment. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:1175-1183.
312. Ashton NJ, Janelidze S, Mattsson-Carlgren N, et al. Differential roles of Abeta42/40, p-tau231 and p-tau217 for Alzheimer's trial selection and disease monitoring. *Nat Med*. 2022;28:2555-2562.
313. Pontecorvo MJ, Lu M, Burnham SC, et al. Association of donanemab treatment with exploratory plasma biomarkers in early symptomatic Alzheimer disease: a secondary analysis of the TRAILBLAZER-ALZ randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Neurol*. 2022;79:1250-1259.
314. C_2N Diagnostics Receives Breakthrough Device Designation from U.S. FDA for Blood Test to Screen for Alzheimer's Disease Risk. C2N Diagnostics. Accessed February 18, 2025. https://c2n.com/news-releases/2019/01/29/2019-1-24-c2n-diagnostics-receives-breakthrough-device-designation-from-us-fda-for-blood-test-to-screen-for-alzheimers-disease-risk
315. C_2N Diagnostics Introduces the PrecivityAD2TM Blood Test. C2N Diagnostics. Accessed January 7, 2023. https://c2n.com/news-releases/c2n-diagnostics-introduces-the-precivityad2-blood-testnext-generation-blood-test-aims-to-establish-new-standard-in-alzheimers-disease-diagnosis-with-combined-measures-of-amyloid-beta-and-tau-protein
316. Hu Y, Kirmess KM, Meyer MR, et al. Assessment of a plasma amyloid probability score to estimate amyloid positron emission tomography findings among adults with cognitive impairment. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5:e228392.
317. Monane M, Johnson KG, Snider BJ, et al. A blood biomarker test for brain amyloid impacts the clinical evaluation of cognitive impairment. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol*. 2023;10:1738-1748.
318. Meyer MR, Kirmess KM, Eastwood S, et al. Clinical validation of the PrecivityAD2 blood test: a mass spectrometry-based test with algorithm combining %p-tau217 and Abeta42/40 ratio to identify presence of brain amyloid. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20:3179-3192.
319. Roche granted FDA Breakthrough Device Designation for pTau217 blood test to support earlier Alzheimer's disease diagnosis. Roche Diagnostics. Accessed February 18, 2025. https://diagnostics.roche.com/us/en/news-listing/2024/roche-granted-fda-breakthrough-device-designation-ptau217-blood-test-support-earlier-alzheimers-disease-diagnosis.html
320. Schindler SE, Galasko D, Pereira AC, et al. Acceptable performance of blood biomarker tests of amyloid pathology—recommendations from the Global CEO Initiative on Alzheimer's Disease. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2024;20(7):426-439.
321. Mielke MM, Dage JL, Frank RD, et al. Performance of plasma phosphorylated tau 181 and 217 in the community. *Nat Med*. 2022;28:1398-1405.
322. Mielke MM, Frank RD, Dage JL, et al. Comparison of plasma phosphorylated tau species with amyloid and tau positron emission tomography, neurodegeneration, vascular pathology, and cognitive outcomes. *JAMA Neurol*. 2021;78:1108-1117.
323. Pichet Binette A, Janelidze S, Cullen N, et al. Confounding factors of Alzheimer's disease plasma biomarkers and their impact on clinical performance. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2023;19:1403-1414.
324. Brum WS, Docherty KF, Ashton NJ, et al. Effect of neprilysin inhibition on Alzheimer disease plasma biomarkers: a secondary analysis of a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Neurol*. 2024;81:197-200.
325. Brum WS, Ashton NJ, Simren J, et al. Biological variation estimates of Alzheimer's disease plasma biomarkers in healthy individuals. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20:1284-1297.
326. Paterson RW, Slattery CF, Poole T, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid in the differential diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: clinical utility of an extended panel of biomarkers in a specialist cognitive clinic. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2018;10:32.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

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

How to cite this article: Leuzy A, Bollack A, Pellegrino D, et al. Considerations in the clinical use of amyloid PET and CSF biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's Dement*. 2025;21:e14528. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.14528