

# Towards harmonizing subtyping methods for neuroimaging studies in Alzheimer's disease

Rosaleena Mohanty\*, Gustav Mårtensson\*, Konstantinos Poulakis, J-Sebastian Muehlboeck, Elena Rodriguez Vieitez, Konstantinos Chiotis, Michel J. Grothe, Agneta Nordberg, Daniel Ferreira<sup>#</sup> and Eric Westman<sup>#</sup>

\*Shared first authors; <sup>#</sup>Shared senior authors

## Supplementary Material

**Table S1. Subtyping methods: original vs. implemented algorithms**

Method	Original Algorithm	Implemented Algorithm
Murray et al. (1)	<p><b>Covariate adjustments:</b> none</p> <p><b>Measure:</b> postmortem NFT count</p> <p><b>ROIs:</b> hippocampus (CA1 and subiculum), middle frontal cortex, inferior parietal cortex, superior temporal cortex in both cerebral hemispheres</p> <p><b>Method:</b></p> <p><u>1. Initial classification:</u> The ratio of the hippocampal to cortical NFT counts was split at the 25th and 75th percentiles of the sample distribution. Individuals with the ratio&lt;25% were assigned to be hippocampal-sparing AD, while those with ratio&gt;75% were assigned to limbic-predominant AD.</p> <p><u>2. Re-classification:</u> Hippocampal and cortical NFT counts were considered separately and compared to the overall median value of each. Individuals initially classified as hippocampal-sparing AD remained as such only if hippocampal BFT count&gt;median hippocampal NFT count and cortical NFT count&lt;median cortical NFT count. Individuals initially classified as limbic-predominant AD remained as such only if hippocampal NFT count&lt;median hippocampal NFT count and cortical NFT count&gt;median cortical NFT count. Remainder of the individuals were classified as typical AD.</p> <p><b>Subtypes:</b> typical, limbic-predominant and hippocampal-sparing AD</p>	Not implemented in this study but described for interpretation of the imaging subtyping methods listed below
Charil et al. (2)	<p><b>Covariate adjustments:</b> none</p> <p><b>Measure:</b> SUVR (tau PET)</p>	Same as the original algorithm except ROIs were chosen from the

	<p><b>ROIs:</b> anterior-most position (head) of hippocampus, superior temporal gyrus, lateral parietal lobe (angular gyrus), lateral frontal lobe (mid-frontal gyrus) in both cerebral hemispheres (same regions as in Murray et al.)</p> <p><b>Method:</b></p> <p>1. <u>Initial classification:</u> The ratio of the hippocampal to cortical SUVR values was split at the 25th and 75th percentiles of the sample distribution. Individuals with the ratio&lt;25% were assigned to be hippocampal-sparing AD, while those with ratio&gt;75% were assigned to limbic-predominant AD.</p> <p>2. <u>Re-classification:</u> Hippocampal and cortical SUVR were considered separately and compared to the overall median value of each. Individuals initially classified as hippocampal-sparing AD remained as such only if hippocampal SUVR&gt;median hippocampal SUVR and cortical SUVR&lt;median cortical SUVR. Individuals initially classified as limbic-predominant AD remained as such only if hippocampal SUVR&lt;median hippocampal SUVR and cortical SUVR&gt;median cortical SUVR. Remainder of the individuals were classified as typical AD.</p> <p><b>Subtypes:</b> typical, limbic-predominant and hippocampal-sparing AD</p>	<p>standard atlas (3) and SUVR values were partial volume corrected. We applied the algorithm on all available amyloid-positive prodromal AD and AD dementia individuals, while Charil et al., applied the algorithm on amyloid-positive individuals at Braak stage V or VI.</p>
Risacher et al. (4)	<p><b>Covariate adjustments:</b> intracranial volume, scanner field strength, age, sex</p> <p><b>Measure:</b> cortical/subcortical volumes (sMRI)</p> <p><b>ROIs:</b> hippocampus, lateral frontal (caudal and rostral midfrontal, pars opercularis, pars triangularis), superior temporal, and lateral parietal (inferior parietal, superior parietal, supramarginal) in both cerebral hemispheres</p> <p><b>Method:</b></p> <p>1. <u>Initial classification:</u> The ratio of the hippocampal to cortical volumes was split at the 25th and 75th percentiles of the sample distribution. Individuals with the ratio&lt;25% were assigned to be limbic-predominant AD, while those with ratio&gt;75% were assigned to hippocampal-sparing AD.</p> <p>2. <u>Re-classification:</u> Hippocampal and cortical volumes were considered separately and compared to the overall median value of each. Individuals initially classified as hippocampal-sparing AD remained as such only if hippocampal volume&gt;median hippocampal volume and cortical volume&lt;median cortical volume. Individuals initially classified as limbic-predominant AD remained as such only if hippocampal volume&lt;median hippocampal volume and cortical volume&gt;median cortical volume. Remainder of the individuals were classified as typical AD.</p> <p><b>Subtypes:</b> typical, limbic-predominant and hippocampal-sparing AD</p>	<p>Same as the original algorithm except volume measures were adjusted for intracranial volume and age only, since all patients are from scanners with the same field strength in our study</p>
Byun et al. (5)	<p><b>Covariate Adjustment:</b> intracranial volume</p> <p><b>Measure:</b> cortical/subcortical volumes (sMRI)</p> <p><b>ROIs:</b> hippocampus, middle frontal, superior temporal, inferior parietal in both cerebral hemispheres (same regions as in</p>	<p>Same as in the original algorithm except volume measures were adjusted for intracranial volume and age using multiple linear</p>

	<p>Murray et al.)</p> <p><b>Method:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Normative data:</u> A normative dataset was constructed from the normalized volume measures of healthy individuals, stratified by age and sex.</li> <li>2. <u>Abnormality Identification:</u> Z-scores of hippocampal (<math>Z_H</math>), frontal (<math>Z_F</math>), temporal (<math>Z_T</math>) and parietal (<math>Z_P</math>) volumes of individuals were calculated based on the normative data. The cut-off value of <math>Z\text{-score} &lt; -1.0</math> determined the presence of prominent atrophy in each ROI.</li> <li>3. <u>Classification:</u> If <math>Z_H &lt; -1</math> and at least one of the three Z-scores (<math>Z_F</math>, <math>Z_T</math>, <math>Z_P</math>) <math>&lt; -1</math>, then individuals were classified as both abnormal (typical AD). If <math>Z_H &lt; -1</math> and all three Z-scores (<math>Z_F</math>, <math>Z_T</math>, <math>Z_P</math>) <math>\geq -1</math>, then individuals were classified as hippocampal atrophy only (limbic-predominant AD). If <math>Z_H \geq -1</math> and at least one of the three Z-scores (<math>Z_F</math>, <math>Z_T</math>, <math>Z_P</math>) <math>&lt; -1</math>, then individuals were classified as cortical atrophy only (hippocampal-sparing AD). If <math>Z_H \geq -1</math> and all three Z-scores (<math>Z_F</math>, <math>Z_T</math>, <math>Z_P</math>) <math>\geq -1</math>, then individuals were classified as both spared (minimal atrophy AD).</li> </ol> <p><b>Subtypes:</b> typical, limbic-predominant, hippocampal-sparing, and minimal atrophy AD</p>	<p>regression instead of using a normative dataset. As part of our systematic analysis of methodological variations, we also investigated the effect of correcting for intracranial volume only, thus aligning with the original correction by Byun et al. We based our correction on a normative group of amyloid-negative healthy controls, while Byun et al. did not perform any stratification based on amyloid status. Also, we applied subtyping on amyloid-positive AD patients, while Byun et al. did not perform any stratification based on amyloid status</p>
Ferreira et al. (6)	<p><b>Covariate Adjustment:</b> none</p> <p><b>Measure:</b> visual ratings (sMRI)</p> <p><b>ROIs:</b> hippocampus, parahippocampal gyrus, entorhinal cortex, surrounding cerebrospinal fluid spaces (for medial temporal atrophy; MTA); posterior cingulate sulcus, precuneus, parieto-occipital sulcus, parietal cortex (anatomical boundaries for posterior atrophy; PA); central sulcus, the frontal bone, fissure of Sylvius (anatomical boundaries for global cortical atrophy – frontal subscale; GCA-F)</p> <p><b>Method:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Abnormality Identification:</u> For MTA, the cut-off of <math>\geq 1.5</math>, <math>\geq 1.5</math>, <math>\geq 2</math>, <math>\geq 2.5</math> determined abnormality for the respective age groups 45–64, 65–74, 75–84, and 85–94 years. For PA and GCA-F, <math>\geq 1</math> determined abnormality irrespective of the age group.</li> <li>2. <u>Classification:</u> If MTA together with PA and/or GCA-F were abnormal, the individual was classified as typical AD. If MTA was abnormal with PA and GCA-F being normal, the individual was classified as limbic-predominant AD. If MTA was normal but PA and/or GCA-F are abnormal, the individual was classified as hippocampal-sparing AD. If all of MTA, PA and GCA-F were normal, the individual was classified as minimal atrophy AD.</li> </ol> <p><b>Subtypes:</b> typical, limbic-predominant, hippocampal-sparing, minimal atrophy AD</p>	<p>Same as in the original algorithm. For the sMRI cohort, the visual ratings were provided by a expert neuroradiologist, whereas for the sMRI-tauPET cohort, the visual ratings were automatically generated with AVRA (7). We applied subtyping on amyloid-positive AD patients, while Ferreira et al. did not perform any stratification based on amyloid status</p>
Poulakis et al. (8)	<p><b>Covariate Adjustment:</b> intracranial volume</p> <p><b>Measure:</b> cortical/subcortical volumes (sMRI)</p>	<p>Same as in the original algorithm. For better comparability across subtyping methods, we</p>

	<p><b>ROIs:</b> 148 cortical and 7 subcortical ROIs</p> <p><b>Method:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Clustering:</u> Random forest algorithm was applied to all volume measures to extract a similarity matrix. A lower dimensional representation was obtained using multidimensional scaling. Then, an agglomerative hierarchical clustering algorithm with average linkage was applied.</li> <li>2. <u>Classification:</u> Five clusters were identified based on the average Hopkins statistic.</li> </ol> <p><b>Subtypes:</b> Diffuse1(=typical AD), diffuse2 (=typical AD), limbic-predominant, hippocampal-sparing, and minimal atrophy AD</p>	<p>combined the two typical AD subtypes (diffuse 1 and 2) into a single subtype of typical AD. We applied subtyping on amyloid-positive AD patients, while Poulakis et al. did not perform any stratification based on amyloid status</p>
--	---	---

**Key:** PET=positron emission tomography; sMRI=structural magnetic resonance imaging; ROIs=regions of interest; NFT= neurofibrillary tangle; CA1=cornu Ammonis subfield of hippocampus; SUVR=standardized uptake value ratio; AD=Alzheimer's disease.

Figure S1. Individual-level agreement for (a) sMRI cohort and (b) sMRI-tauPET cohort with ADNI RIDs


(a)

0=Typical AD, 1=LP, 2=HS, 3=Minimal atrophy/tau

0010	0	1	3	3
0029	2	0	0	2
0076	0	0	0	0
0083	0	0	0	0
0084	0	1	2	0
0091	0	2	2	3
0093	2	2	0	0
0094	0	0	0	0
0129	0	1	0	0
0139	0	2	1	3
0147	2	2	3	0
0149	0	3	2	3
0194	0	1	2	0
0213	2	2	2	2
0219	0	1	0	0
0221	0	0	0	0
0286	2	0	1	0
0310	0	0	0	0
0316	1	1	1	0
0321	0	3	2	3
0341	0	0	1	0
0356	0	0	0	0
0366	2	2	2	0
0372	0	0	0	0
0374	0	0	0	0
0400	2	0	0	2
0431	0	1	1	3
0438	2	0	0	0
0457	0	0	1	0
0470	0	0	2	0
0474	0	1	1	0
0492	0	1	0	0
0517	0	0	0	0
0535	0	0	2	0
0543	2	2	0	0
0577	1	1	0	0
0606	0	0	3	0
0619	0	0	0	0
0627	0	2	3	3
0691	0	0	0	0
0720	0	1	1	0
0724	2	0	0	0
0733	0	2	3	2
0739	0	0	2	0
0753	0	0	0	0
0754	0	1	1	3
0784	1	1	1	3
0803	0	0	0	0
0814	1	0	1	0
0816	0	3	3	3
0836	0	1	0	3
0850	1	0	1	3
0852	1	1	1	0
0884	0	1	2	0
0891	0	0	0	0
1037	0	0	0	2
1041	2	2	0	0
1044	0	0	0	3
1055	2	0	0	0
1062	0	3	0	3
1079	0	0	0	0
1081	1	0	0	0
1082	0	0	0	0
1090	1	1	1	3
1109	0	0	2	0
1137	0	0	0	0
1144	0	0	1	0
1161	0	2	2	0
1170	1	1	0	3
1171	2	2	0	0
1185	0	0	0	2
1209	0	0	1	3
1221	1	0	0	0
1253	2	2	3	0
1262	0	0	0	0
1263	0	1	3	3
1281	1	0	2	1
1285	2	0	3	2
1341	0	0	0	0
1296	2	0	0	0
0003	0	0	0	0
0426	0	0	0	0
0300	0	3	3	3
1402	2	2	0	2
1373	0	0	0	0
1371	0	2	2	3
1290	0	0	2	2
0266	0	0	0	0
0790	0	3	2	0

Risacher (sMRI)      Byun (sMRI)      Ferreira (sMRI)      Poulakis (sMRI)

(b)



**Key:** PET=positron emission tomography; sMRI=structural magnetic resonance imaging; ADNI= Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative; RID=roster identifier for individuals; AD=Alzheimer's disease; LP=limbic-predominant; HS=hippocampal-sparing.

## REFERENCES

1. Murray ME, Graff-Radford NR, Ross OA, Petersen RC, Duara R, Dickson DW. Neuropathologically defined subtypes of Alzheimer's disease with distinct clinical characteristics: a retrospective study. *Lancet Neurol.* 2011;10(9):785–96.
2. Charil A, Shcherbinin S, Southeikal S, Devous MD, Mintun M, Murray ME, et al. Tau Subtypes of Alzheimer's Disease Determined in vivo Using Flortaucipir PET Imaging. *J Alzheimer's Dis.* 2019;(Preprint):1–12.
3. Desikan RS, Ségonne F, Fischl B, Quinn BT, Dickerson BC, Blacker D, et al. An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *Neuroimage.* 2006;31(3):968–80.
4. Risacher SL, Anderson WH, Charil A, Castelluccio PF, Shcherbinin S, Saykin AJ, et al. Alzheimer disease brain atrophy subtypes are associated with cognition and rate of decline. *Neurology.* 2017;89(21):2176–86.
5. Byun MS, Kim SE, Park J, Yi D, Choe YM, Sohn BK, et al. Heterogeneity of regional brain atrophy patterns associated with distinct progression rates in Alzheimer's disease. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(11):e0142756.
6. Ferreira D, Verhagen C, Hernández-Cabrera JA, Cavallin L, Guo C-J, Ekman U, et al. Distinct subtypes of Alzheimer's disease based on patterns of brain atrophy: longitudinal trajectories and clinical applications. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7:46263.
7. Mårtensson G, Ferreira D, Cavallin L, Muehlboeck J-S, Wahlund L-O, Wang C, et al. AVRA: Automatic visual ratings of atrophy from MRI images using recurrent convolutional neural networks. *NeuroImage Clin.* 2019;23:101872.
8. Poulakis K, Pereira JB, Mecocci P, Vellas B, Tsolaki M, Kłoszewska I, et al. Heterogeneous patterns of brain atrophy in Alzheimer's disease. *Neurobiol Aging.* 2018;65:98–108.