Frontal and cerebellar atrophy supports FTLD-ALS clinical continuum and neuropsychology

Beatrice Pizzarotti, MD[1,#], Fulvia Palesi, PhD[1,2,#], Paolo Vitali, MD, PhD[2,3], Gloria Castellazzi, PhD[4], Nicoletta Anzalone, MD[5], Elena Alvisi, MD[6], Daniele Martinelli, MD[1,2], Sara Bernini, PsyD, PhD[7], Matteo Cotta Ramusino, MD[1,8], Mauro Ceroni, MD[1,9], Giuseppe Micieli, MD[10], Elena Sinforiani, MD[7], Egidio D'Angelo, MD, PhD[1], Alfredo Costa, MD[1, 8,#], Claudia AM Gandini Wheeler-Kingshott, PhD[4,1,2,#]

[1] Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy,
[2] Brain MRI 3T Center, IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy,
[3] Department of Radiology, IRCCS Policlinico San Donato, San Donato Milanese, Milan, Italy,
[4] NMR Research Unit, Department of Neuroinflammation, Queen Square MS Centre, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, Faculty of Brain Sciences, University College London, London, England, United Kingdom,
[5] Neuroradiology Unit, San Raffaele Scientific Institute and Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, Milan, Italy,
[6] Department of Neurology and Laboratory Neuroscience, IRCCS Italian Auxological Institute, Milan, Italy,
[7] Laboratory of Neuropsychology, IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy,
[8] Unit of Behavioral Neurology, IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy,
[9] Department of Neurology, IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy
[10] Department of Emergency Neurology, IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy,

[#] The authors equally contributed to this work

Search Terms: ALS, FTD, dementia, VBM, cerebellum
Publication History: This manuscript was previously published in bioRxiv: doi:

Submission Type: **Article**
Title Character count: **87**
Number of Tables: **4 (plus 1 Supplementary table)**
Number of Figures: **2**

Words count of Abstract: **250**
Words count of Paper: **4180**

Corresponding Author:
Beatrice Pizzarotti
Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, via Forlanini 6, 27100 Pavia, Italy
Phone: +39 340 36 24 650
mail: beatrice.pizzarotti01@universitadipavia.it

Palesi Fulvia: fulvia.palesi@unipv.it;

Vitali Paolo: paolo.vitali@grupposandonato.it;

Castellazzi Gloria: gloria.castellazzi@unipv.it;

Anzalone Nicoletta: anzalone.nicoletta@hsr.it;

Elena Alvisi: elena.alvisi.doc@gmail.com;

Martinelli Daniele: daniele.martinelli01@universitadipavia.it;

Bernini Sara: sara.bernini@mondino.it;
Cotta Ramusino Matteo: matteo.cottaramusino01@universitadipavia.it;
Ceroni Mauro: mceroni@unipv.it;
Micieli Giuseppe: giuseppe.micieli@mondino.it;
Sinforiani Elena: elena.sinforiani@mondino.it;
D'Angelo Egidio: egidiougo.dangelo@unipv.it;
Costa Alfredo: alfredo.costa@unipv.it;
Gandini Wheeler-Kingshott Claudia Angela Michela: c.wheeler-kingshott@ucl.ac.uk.

Funding: This work was performed at the IRCCS Mondino Foundation and was supported by the Italian Ministry of Health (RC2014-2017). FP and ED received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation under the Specific Grant Agreement No. 785907 (Human Brain Project SGA2).

The UK Multiple Sclerosis Society and UCL-UCLH Biomedical Research Centre for ongoing support of the Queen Square MS Centre (CGWK). CGWK receives funding from ISRT, Wings for Life and the Craig H. Neilsen Foundation (the INSPIRED study), from the MS Society (#77), Wings for Life (#169111), Horizon2020 (CDS-QUAMRI, #634541).

Abstract

Objective: Frontotemporal Lobe Degeneration (FTLD) and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) are neurodegenerative diseases more often considered as a continuum from clinical, epidemiologic and genetic perspectives. We used localized brain atrophy to evaluate common and specific features of FTLD, FTLD-ALS and ALS patients to clarify this clinical continuum.

Methods: We used voxel-based morphometry (VBM) on structural MRI images to localize volume alterations of brain regions in group comparisons: patients (20 FTLD, 7 FTLD-ALS, 18 ALS) versus controls (39 CTR) and patient groups between themselves. We used whole-brain cortical thickness (CT) to assess correlations with brain volume to propose mechanistic explanations of the heterogeneous clinical presentations. We assessed whether brain atrophy can explain cognitive impairment, measured with neuropsychological tests (Frontal Assessment Battery, verbal fluency and semantic fluency).

Results: Common (mainly frontal) and specific areas of atrophy between FTLD, FTLD-ALS and ALS patients were detected, on the one hand confirming the suggestion of a clinical continuum, while on the other hand defining morphological specificities for each clinical group (e.g. a different cerebral and cerebellar involvement between FTLD and ALS). CT values suggested extensive network disruption in the pathological process, with indications of a correlation between white matter volume and CT in ALS. The correlation between neuropsychological scores pointed at an important role of the cerebellum, together with frontotemporal regions, in explaining cognitive impairment at the level of executive and linguistic functions.

Conclusions: We identified common elements that explain the FTLD-ALS clinical continuum, while also identifying specificities of each group, partially explained by different cerebral and cerebellar involvement.

Introduction

Frontotemporal Lobe Degeneration (FTLD) represents 5% of all causes of dementia in subjects over 65 years and has two main clinical presentations: the behavioral

variant (bvFTLD) and the linguistic variant (Primary Progressive Aphasia, PPA). The behavioral variant can present with disinhibition, agitation, aggressiveness, or apathy, loss of interest and social isolation, while the linguistic one can present in one of the three possible forms: non-fluent, semantic or logopenic.[1] Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) is a neurodegenerative disease affecting the first and second motoneuron,[2] characterized by fasciculations, cramps, muscular amyotrophy and signs of pyramidal involvement.[3] Despite ALS has always been considered as a disease with an exclusive neuromuscular involvement, several studies also reported cognitive impairment, especially of the logical-executive functions.[4] FTLD and ALS may be thought as pathophysiological continuum, with 5% of ALS patients developing FTLD, and 15% of FTLD patients having a motoneuronal involvement. Furthermore, family forms combining both diseases have already been described in literature, where each component was caused by different mutations in different genes.[5] Nowadays, many common features of the two pathologies are known, however it is hard to predict which patients are prone to develop both aspects of the clinical continuum.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is commonly used to exclude secondary causes of dementia (such as brain masses, strokes or infections) and to detect morphological findings useful for a correct diagnosis (i.e. selective cortical atrophies). In particular, voxel based-morphometry (VBM) is a useful method to process structural MRI images, which allows to detect and localize volume differences of specific brain structures when comparing groups of subjects or the same group longitudinally. Several VBM investigations have already demonstrated morphological alterations in specific areas, such as frontal and temporal lobes, insula and anterior cingulum, in what has been proposed as the FTLD-ALS continuum.[6,7,8,9,10]

This study aimed to identify the cognitive and neurostructural deterioration of the FTLD and ALS clinical continuum by using neuropsychological evaluations and VBM analysis of brain MRI. In order to do so, we searched for common and specific characteristic of ALS, FTLD-ALS and FTLD in terms of atrophy location compared to controls subjects (CTR) and between pairs of groups. Furthermore, we assessed whether cortical thickness (CT) could explain differences between groups and propose possible mechanistic interpretation of the different clinical presentations. The second goal was to assess whether a direct relationship exists between cognitive and neurostructural deterioration by correlating neuropsychological characteristics of the entire patient population with volume of specific areas over the entire brain, including regions not usually considered for this analysis such as the cerebellum.

Methods

Subjects

Fourty-five patients belonging to FTLD-ALS continuum were recruited at IRCCS Mondino Foundation. Patients were classified in three etiological subgroups according the most recent diagnostic criteria: FTLD (including bvFTLD[11] and PPA[12]), ALS[13] and FTLD-ALS (see Table 1 for demographic characteristics). A group of thirty-nine age- and gender-matched CTR was selected as a reference group and enrolled on a voluntary basis among subjects attending to a local third age university (University of Pavia, Information Technology course) or included in a program on healthy aging (Fondazione Golgi, Abbiategrasso). Exclusion criteria comprised at least one of the following: major psychiatric disorders over the last 12 months,

pharmacologically treated delirium or hallucinations, secondary causes of cognitive decline (e.g. vascular, metabolic, endocrine, toxic, iatrogenic).

This study was carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki with written informed consent from all subjects. The protocol was approved by the local ethic committee of the IRCCS Mondino Foundation.

Neuropsychological assessment

Fourty-two of fourty-five patients (20 with FTLD, 15 with ALS and 7 with FTLD-ALS) underwent neuropsychological standardized evaluation for investigating the global cognitive status (Mini Mental State Examination, MMSE) and the following cognitive domains: attention (attentive matrices, trail making test A and B, Stroop test), memory (digit span, verbal span, Corsi block-tapping test, logical memory, Rey–Osterrieth complex figure recall, Rey 15 item test), language (verbal and semantic fluency), executive function (Raven's matrices, Wisconsin card sorting test, frontal assessment battery), and visuo-spatial skills (Rey–Osterrieth complex figure). Neuropsychological scores were corrected by age and education. The cut-off to identify cognitive impaired patients were defined according to validated criteria in literature. Two FTLD patients were not capable of performing the neuropsychological evaluation; 2 FTLD, 1 FTLD-ALS and 1 ALS patients only completed MMSE assessment. In the present study, only frontal assessment battery (FAB), verbal fluency (FAS) and semantic fluency (SF) were used in the statistical analysis since executive and linguistic functions are the core neuropsychological items affected in the FTD-ALS spectrum.

MRI acquisition

All subjects underwent the same MRI protocol on a Siemens Skyra 3T scanner (Siemens, Erlangen, Germany) with a 32 channel head-coil. A 3D T1-weighted

(3DT1w) structural MPRAGE sequence was setup according to the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative protocol (ADNI2)[14] with the following parameters: TR = 2300 ms, TE = 2.95 ms, TI = 900 ms, flip angle = 9°, 176 sagittal slices, acquisition matrix = 256 x 256, in-plane resolution = 1.05 x 1.05 mm^2, slice thickness = 1.2 mm, acquisition time = 5.12 minutes. Standard clinical sequences were performed to exclude other pathologies.

VBM analysis

3DT1w images were converted from DICOM to NIFTI format and segmented in their native space into grey matter (GM), white matter (WM) and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) using the CAT12 Matlab toolbox for SPM12.[15] The segmented images were normalized to the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space (ICBM-152) with 1.5 mm isotropic voxels, total intracranial volume (TIV) and the mean CT value over the whole cortex were assessed with CAT12. The resulting images, i.e. normalized GM and WM images, were smoothed using a gaussian kernel of 6x6x6 mm^3 in SPM12[16] and were used as inputs for the statistical analysis.

Statistical analysis

Demographic and neuropsychologic data were compared using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSS21 (IBM, Armonk, New York), to assess significant differences between groups. Gaussian distribution was checked with a Shapiro-Wilk test, then normally distributed variables (age, MMSE and SF) were compared using a one-way ANOVA test with Bonferroni correction, while non-normally distributed ones (FAB and FAS) were compared using a Kruskall-Wallis test (Mann-Whitney for pair comparisons). Gender was compared with a chi-squared test. Two-sided $p<0.05$ was used as significance threshold.

Each pathological group (FTLD, ALS, FTLD-ALS) was compared voxelwise to the CTR group using a one-way ANOVA VBM analysis, performed with SPM12, to identify the atrophic regions of GM and WM specific for each pathologic group. The same analysis was carried out between pairs of patient groups. In order to assess the potential functional implications of the atrophic areas, we classified all the altered voxels based on their spatial overlap with standard resting state networks (RSNs)[17]. This final analysis shows which RSNs are likely to be involved in each pathological presentation (FTLD, FTLD-ALS and ALS).

SPM12 was also used to perform multiple regression analyses on all subjects to correlate GM and WM volume with CT values. Moreover, for each neuropsychological score, a multiple regression analysis was performed on all patients considered together to determine possible areas responsible for the distribution of results.

For the one-way ANOVA and CT regression, the significance was set at $p<0.05$ FWE corrected at cluster level**.** Exploratory results were also investigated with an uncorrected $p<0.001$ together with a cluster extension correction of minimum 160 voxels. Gender, age and TIV were used as covariates.

The XJVIEW toolbox (http://www.alivelearn.net/xjview/) and FSL anatomical atlases, such as JHU[17,18] and SUIT,[19] were used to accurately localize the regions affected by alterations.

Results

Overall this study was able to identify patterns of involvement of brain areas affected by atrophy when comparing ALS, FTLD-ALS and FTLD patients with CTR subjects.

Whole brain mean CT was found to correlate with GM and WM volumes, non-necessarily implicated in group differences.

Correlations of atrophy and neuropsychological scores in the overall patient group indicated that there were cortical areas key to specific functions, such as the cerebellum, despite atrophy per se was affecting the cerebellum only in the FTLD group.

Patient characteristics

Based on clinical criteria, patients were clustered as follow: 20 patients with FTLD (16 bvFTLD and 4 PPA, 2 logopenic and 2 semantic variant), 18 patients with ALS and 7 patients with both forms FTLD-ALS. Demographic data and neuropsychological scores are summarized in Table 1.

Groups were age- and gender-matched while MMSE was significantly reduced only in FTLD and FTLD-ALS patients with respect to CTR but did not differ between patient groups (p= 0.214). FAB scores were homogeneous between patient groups (p=0.160), whereas FAS and SF differed between patient groups (p=0.002 and p=0.004).

Comparison between patients and controls

Voxelwise comparisons between patients and CTR with regard to brain atrophy are reported in Table 2. The most compromised group in terms of GM atrophy is the FTLD group, followed by FTLD-ALS and by ALS. In detail, the atrophic GM regions in FTLD compared with CTR were mainly located (bilaterally) in the frontal and temporal lobes (Figure 1). WM also resulted more atrophic in FTLD compared to CTR in several tracts comprising the inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus (IFOF),

forceps minor (Fm), cingulum gyrus (CingG), anterior thalamic radiation (ATR) and superior longitudinal fasciculus (SLF).

The atrophic regions in FTLD-ALS compared with CTR were lateralized to the left hemisphere and involved the frontal lobe (in particular the frontal and central opercular cortex (Foc and Coc)) and the left insula of the temporal lobe, also altered in FTLD. Considering WM, FTLD-ALS compared with CTR, was more atrophic only in the SLF and the uncinate fasciculus (UF).

ALS did not show any statistically significant atrophic areas compared to CTR. When lowering the statistical threshold, ALS resulted atrophic compared with CTR only in the left pre- and post-central gyrus (PcG and PostcG). No significant areas of WM atrophy were found.

The location of all atrophic voxels with reference to RSN involvement is shown in Table 3 for the comparison of each patient group to CTR. The ALS group involved predominantly areas of the sensory motor network (SMN); FTLD-ALS showed atrophy affecting not only motor functions (e.g. frontal cortex (FCN)), but also other sensory networks (e.g. the occipital visual network (OVN)), several higher-functions including working memory (WMN), executive function (ECN) and ventral attention (LVAN) networks, as well as hippocampal areas belonging to the default mode network (DMN); FTLD patients presented atrophy involving almost all functional systems, with a further extensive involvement of the DMN and the cerebellar network.

Comparison between pathological subgroups

Comparisons between atrophy of different groups of patients are also reported in Table 2.

Direct comparison between patient groups showed statistically significant differences when comparing FTLD and FTLD-ALS to ALS patients (Figure 2). FTLD were more atrophic than ALS in a number of temporal areas including the fusiform gyrus (FusG), the parahippocampal gyrus (ParahG), the temporal pole (Tp), the inferior and medium temporal gyri (ITG and MTG) as well as the lateral occipital cortex (inferior) (LOCi). In WM regions, FTLD showed atrophy compared to ALS in the Fm, ATR, SLF (regions also atrophic when comparing FTLD to CTR), in the temporal longitudinal inferior fasciculus (TLIF) and extensively in the posterior cerebellum (Crus I/II, lobules VII and VIII).

FTLD-ALS subjects in comparison to ALS subjects shared several areas of GM atrophy that emerged as statistically significant also in the comparison of FTLD to ALS. These areas involved mainly GM of the temporal lobe.

Comparisons of FTLD versus FTLD-ALS did not survive FWE correction. Trends of atrophy were explored lowering the statistical threshold. It emerged that in FTLD the insula is the only area potentially more atrophic than FTLD-ALS. No WM regions seemed to indicate group specific trends of atrophy between FTLD and FTLD-ALS and between FTLD-ALS and ALS.

Correlation between atrophy and CT

There were no statistically significant correlations between local atrophy and whole brain CT that survive correction for multiple comparison. A detailed description of trends is in the supplementary material.

Overall, in the FTLD group, CT correlated ($p<0.001$, uncorrected) with GM volume in the right middle and inferior frontal gyrus (MFG and IFG), superior orbital frontal gyrus (SOrFG), inferior parietal lobule (InfLob), supramarginal gyrus (SupramG) and left anterior CingG, whereas CT correlated ($p<0.001$, uncorrected) with WM volumes

of the forceps major (FM), SLF, IFOF and of WM volumes of regions adjacent to the IFG and lingula (Ling).

In the ALS group, CT correlated ($p<0.001$, uncorrected) with GM volume in the cerebellum (bilateral IX and right VIII areas) whereas CT correlated ($p<0.001$, uncorrected) with WM volume in the Fm, UF, IFOF, TLIF and afferent to the insula.

No trends or correlations between CT and volume was found in the FTLD-ALS group.

Correlation between atrophy and neuropsychological scores

Correlations between neuropsychological scores and volume in all patients are reported in Table 4.

FAB scores correlated with GM volume in some brain regions, including several cerebellar areas (left crus I and II, VII and VIII); in the same way the score correlated with several WM regions, including the cerebellum ones.

Reduced FAS scores had a significant involvement of GM regions of all lobes, cerebellum and the thalamus. Moreover, FAS correlated with WM volume in multiples subcortical regions and in numerous cerebellar areas.

Also SF scores correlated with GM volume of frontal, parietal, temporal, occipital and cerebellar areas, but WM correlation was less extended in comparison to the aforementioned neuropsychological tests.

Discussion

The main finding of this study supports the clinical continuum of FTLD, FTLD-ALS and ALS patients given the presence of shared common features. The clinical

continuum was well detected by fluency scores (both FAS and SF), which were the lowest in FTLD, lower in FTD-ALS and only slight decreased in ALS with respect to normal scores. The same behavior was detected in volume deterioration: FTLD presented a diffuse cerebral (bilateral frontotemporal) and cerebellar atrophy, FTLD-ALS presented a less pronounced cerebral (left frontotemporal) and cerebellar atrophy, while ALS presented a minimal atrophy (bilateral pericentral).

Interestingly, however, there are clear specificities showing involvement of cognitive areas and of WM disruption that contribute to explain clinical and neuropsychological presentations. Common features included more atrophic frontal lobes compared to CTR. FTLD and FTLD-ALS shared increased atrophy of the temporal lobe compared to ALS, although in the FTLD-ALS this did not surviving multiple comparisons correction. It is noteworthy that while areas of GM atrophy were found in all three groups of patients compared to CTR, WM atrophy was more disease specific, with extensive involvement in FTLD and some involvement in FTLD-ALS. Cerebellar differences were particularly marked between FTLD and ALS patient groups; there were also morphological properties detected by VBM analysis in extensive posterior cerebellar areas (both in GM and WM) correlating with neuropsychological scores.

Atrophy of frontal and temporal cortices in FTLD patients confirms previous results.[20] Nonetheless the ventromedial and posterior orbital frontal cortex did not emerge to be more atrophic in these patients as reported in previous studies.[21] Considering alterations in WM, there were several regions more atrophic in FTLD compared to CTR, as shown in Table 2, indicating an overall network disruption that may be independent or secondary to GM atrophy. The present cross-sectional data cannot answer mechanistic questions on WM and GM alterations in FTLD patients,

that need to be dealt with appropriate dedicated longitudinal studies where the interplay of GM and WM involvement can be followed over time.

FTLD-ALS patients, instead, showed lateralized alterations (to the left hemisphere) in the Foc and Coc, which are located in the frontal lobe, and in the left insula, which are all GM areas that are also involved in FTLD. Given that the insula has a pivotal role in cognitive functions (self-perception, motivation, executive functions and subjective responses) and the anterior insula is connected with dorsolateral and ventromedial prefrontal cortex[22] it is interesting that this brain region is more and bilaterally atrophic in the FTLD group with worse executive functions. Noteworthy that in previous studies the insula was proven to be involved in genetic pre-symptomatic FTLD patients with different genetic mutations.[7] Unfortunately, genetic data were not available for our study and the VBM analysis was not able to differentiate whether the anterior or posterior part of the insula was most prominently involved. Furthermore, the FTLD-ALS group showed involvement of some WM regions belonging to the SLF, also altered in FTLD, as well as of the UF. The SLF and UF are both associative long tracts that connect different lobes of the brain, with the SLF being known to contribute to higher motor functions while the UF has a role in memory and emotional behavior.[23] This finding supports the mixed clinical presentation of FTLD-ALS patients.

In ALS patients, previous studies reported atrophy in non-motor areas involved in executive and behavioral functions, such as frontal, temporal and limbic regions.[24,25] Although our ALS patients did not show statistically significant atrophy when compared to CTR in those regions, the involvement of motor and premotor regions emerging from a less stringent statistical analysis is indeed consistent with motor symptoms onset in ALS.

These results were also captured by the RSN overlap analysis. The ALS group showed an involvement of the sensory motor network only, while FTLD-ALS had atrophy spread across sensory and associative networks, including the DMN, although limited to the hippocampus. In FTLD there was a widespread involvement not only of sensory and associative networks, but of all cognitive domains including executive function networks. These three groups of patients can be considered as a clinical continuum, where subjects belong to one group or the other depending on the domain affected by tissue atrophy.

All the above was discussed in terms of comparison between patient groups and CTR. The direct comparison between patients highlighted the clear difference in atrophy of the temporal lobe between FTLD and ALS, which was also found in the comparison of FTLD-ALS and ALS, although at a lower statistical threshold. Interestingly, the comparison of FTLD and ALS highlighted a statistically significant atrophy of the cerebellum in FTLD, which confirms findings of previous studies in C9orf72 mutated patients.[24,25, 26] Genetic data were not available for our analysis, but it would be interesting to understand whether cerebellar involvement is gene-dependent. Moreover, since our FTLD group was mainly represented by the behavioral variant (16 subjects), we could also hypothesize that cerebellar alterations, which were shown in this group, are particularly relevant to this disease phenotype. The fact that there was a significant involvement of the cerebellar Crus I/II (bilaterally) in FTLD compared to ALS, could partially explain the cognitive impairment of these patients given the role of this region in memory and language processing[27] as well in continuous cognitive processing tasks.[17] Furthermore, our study shows a statistically significant involvement of the posterior cerebellum in FTLD compared to ALS, which could point to a greater disruption of the cerebro-cerebellar circuit in FTLD.

This is further supported by the atrophy found in the ATR, which is known to be part of the efferent pathway from the superior cerebellar peduncle.[28]

In order to understand the source of atrophy in the three patient groups, we investigated whether mean CT values were correlated with local or distributed atrophy as measured by VBM analysis. Although whole brain CT did not survive multiple comparison when correlated with local volume, trends are interesting and can help mechanistic interpretation of the VBM results. Indeed, both VBM and CT are based on cortex morphology, but with CT being more specific to cellular density.[29]

Details of the CT correlations with local volumes are given in the supplementary materials; nevertheless, it is intriguing to consider CT correlations ($p<0.001$, uncorrected) with GM and WM volume in each group. Indeed, the different etiology of these patients brings out some differences in morphological changes that subtend CT and VBM volumes correlations. In particular, in ALS, CT correlates with GM volume in the posterior cerebellum, and in particular area VIII and IX, known to be key to motor control, as well as motor learning and sensory integration. This is different from previous studies that showed CT correlations with the precentral cortex, cingulum and insula.[31,32] In our cohort, though, CT correlated with extensive WM areas affecting long tracts connecting main cortical lobes, including the Fm connecting interhemispheric frontal cortices, the ITLF connecting temporal and occipital lobes, the UF connecting the limbic system to the temporal and frontal lobes and the IFOF connecting occipital and frontal cortices. These correlations that emerge only in ALS patients, indicate that white matter integrity has a key role in preserving cortical cell density, as measured through CT. Indeed, no correlations were found in FTLD-ALS, while CT and volume correlated in a number of frontal lobe GM regions

and in only temporal WM in FTLD, supporting the different clinical presentation of these patients' groups.

The correlation between neuropsychological scores and brain volume was performed to elucidate whether the cognitive involvement could be described in terms of atrophy of specific brain regions. The neuropsychological tests confirmed that FTLD and FTLD-ALS scored lower than ALS in MMSE, FAS and SF (Table 1). The correlation between neuropsychological scores and brain volume performed using the VBM approach for the overall patient group revealed that the structural integrity of the cerebellum is strongly associated with the FAB score. This result is consistent with recent literature showing more and more often that the cerebellum has a key role in cognition and in supporting advanced functions.[31,32,17] Furthermore, recent studies have reported the presence of a high proportion of cerebellar connections with the frontal and prefrontal cortex[29] consistent with the fact that the FAB is thought to require predominantly frontal and prefrontal cortex and more generally high-level functions. Indeed, Crus I is known to be involved in cognition, whereas lobule VII has recently been shown to have a role in cognitive and social behavior, with particular focus on persisting behavior and novelty seeking.[33] Since the cerebellar areas correlating with FAB are also those resulting more atrophic in FTLD compared to ALS (i.e. Crus I/II and lobule VII/VIII), it is possible that the correlation between cerebellar volume and neuropsychological scores is driven by alterations of FTLD group. Future studies will be able to confirm the generalization of these results for the FAB test. Our findings also revealed that performances of the verbal fluency test, i.e. FAS, correlated with atrophy of both frontal areas, consistently with their inhibitory role, and with mostly bilateral cerebellar areas, including Crus I/II as well as both the anterior (lobule IV, V, VI) and posterior (lobule VII, VIII and IX) cerebellum. Interestingly, there is also a correlation with the left thalamus, which is a location of

synaptic relay for the cerebro-cerebellar loop as well as being an important node for whole brain structural connectivity. The thalamic involvement is not surprising, given that the most striking outcome of the correlation analysis with the FAS scores is the widespread involvement of WM areas of the temporal and parietal lobes, supporting associative functions that are cardinal to this task. The extensive GM and WM cerebellar involvement can be explained by the amnestic and linguistic roles of Crus I/II and by the motor involvement of the anterior cerebellum.[33, 27] Finally, SF scores also showed correlations with volume of parietal and temporal regions, classically involved in language processing. Once again, the cerebellar involvement marks its importance in functions such as memory and language and confirms its role in patients belonging to the FTLD and ALS continuum.

These interesting results, however, must be interpreted with caution. The relatively small number of patients per group, in particular for FTLD-ALS, may have reduced the statistical power of some analysis, reducing sensitivity to detect significant differences between patient groups. Nonetheless, it is important to consider that FTLD and ALS are rare diseases so larger cohorts may be feasible in future multi-center studies. Furthermore, the more disabled patients were not able to perform the neuropsychological tests, therefore we were able to perform the correlation analyses only considering the overall group of patients. Finally, the CTR group did not undergo the neuropsychological examination, therefore limiting the correlation analysis to the pathological cases. Having CTR scores would be highly desirable for future studies.

In conclusion, our study assessed morphological alterations of FTLD, FTLD-ALS and ALS patient groups in the attempt to clarify the substrate of known clinical

differences and their clinical continuum. The involvement of GM areas, to different extent, in frontal regions in all groups, with atrophy of insular areas in FTLD and FTLD-ALS patients, and temporal cortices and WM regions in FTLD only, supports the presence of shared features, but, at the same time, very distinctive characteristics of these patient groups. Interestingly, cerebellar differences between FTLD and ALS as well as the cerebellar role in correlations between atrophy and cognitive scores, indicates that the cerebellum contributes to determining the FTLD or ALS variant of this continuum. Furthermore, the correlation between CT and local volume of long WM bundles in ALS, potentially indicates the role of inter-lobe WM integrity for supporting cognitive functions in ALS. Alterations of CT and temporal WM in FTLD, instead, is consistent with emotional and cognitive impairment in this group of patients. Future longitudinal studies are needed to better investigate the relation between CT, localized atrophy, clinical and neuropsychological outcomes in terms of mechanisms of the FTLD and ALS spectrum.

Appendix 1. Authors

Name	**Location**	**Role**	**Contribution**
Beatrice Pizzarotti, MD	University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy	Author	Study design and conceptualization; data analysis; manuscript preparation/revision and intellectual content
Fulvia Palesi, PhD	University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy	Author	Study design and conceptualization; MRI protocol design; statistical analysis; manuscript preparation/revision and intellectual content

Paolo Vitali, MD, PhD	IRCCS Policlinico San Donato, San Donato Milanese, Italy	Author	MRI protocol design; MRI acquisition and neuroradiological evaluation
Gloria Castellazzi, PhD	University College London, London, United Kingdom	Author	MRI protocol design; statistical analysis of resting state networks
Nicoletta Anzalone, MD	San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy	Author	MRI acquisition and neuroradiological evaluation
Elena Alvisi, MD	IRCCS Italian Auxological Institute, Milan, Italy	Author	Clinical assessment and ALS and ALS-FTD recruitment
Daniele Martinelli, MD	IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy	Author	Statistical analysis of resting state networks
Sara Bernini, PsyD, PhD	IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy	Author	Neuropsychological assessment and elaboration of cognitive profile
Matteo Cotta Ramusino, MD	University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy	Author	Clinical assessment, contribution to the manuscript
Ceroni Mauro, MD	IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy	Author	ALS and ALS-FTD recruitment and follow-up
Giuseppe Micieli, MD	IRCCS Mondino Foundation	Author	Contribution to study design and discussion
Elena Sinforiani, MD	IRCCS Mondino Foundation	Author	Neuropsychological assessment and elaboration of cognitive profile
Egidio D'Angelo, MD, PhD	University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy	Author	Contribution to study design and discussion, manuscript revision
Alfredo Costa, MD	IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy	Author	Patients recruitment, contribution to study design and discussion, contribution to the manuscript

Claudia AM Gandini Wheeler-Kingshott, PhD	University College London, London, United Kingdom	Author	Contribution to study design and discussion, MRI protocol design, data analysis, manuscript preparation and intellectual content

Acknowledgments: We thank the patients, their families, all healthy volunteers for making this research possible. We thank Giancarlo Germani for MRI acquisitions and Roberta Fortunato for her support to the study organization.

References

1. Harciarek M, Cosentino S; Language, Executive Function and Social Cognition in the Diagnosis of Frontotemporal Dementia Syndromes. Int Rev Psychatry 2013; 25:178–196.

2. de Carvalho M, Dengler R, Eisen A, et al. Electrodiagnostic criteria for diagnosis of ALS. Clin Neurophysiol. 2008;119: 497–503.

3. Gordon PH. Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis: An update for 2013 Clinical Features, Pathophysiology, Management and Therapeutic Trials. Aging & Disease 2013; 4:295–310.

4. Leslie FVC, Hsieh S, Caga J, et al. Semantic deficits in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration. Amytrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal degeneration 2015; 16:46–53.

5. Lattante S, Ciura S, Rouleau GA, Kabashi E. Defining the genetic connection linking amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) with frontotemporal dementia (FTD). Trends Genet 2015; 31:263–273.

6. Meeter LH, Kaat LD, Rohrer JD, Van Swieten JC. Imaging and fluid biomarkers in frontotemporal dementia. Nat Rev Neurol. 2017; 13:406–419.

7. Cash DM, Bocchetta M, Thomas DL, et al. Patterns of gray matter atrophy in genetic frontotemporal dementia: results from the GENFI study. Neurobiology of Aging 2018; 62:191–196.

8. Crespi C, Dodich A, Cappa SF, et al. Multimodal MRI quantification of the common neurostructural bases within the FTD-ALS continuum. Neurobiology of Aging 2017; Sept 26:1–35.

9. Christidi F, Karavasilis E, Riederer F, et al. Gray matter and white matter changes in non-demented amyotrophic lateral sclerosis patients with or without cognitive impairment: A combined voxel-based morphometry and tract-based spatial statistics whole-brain analysis. Brain Imaging and Behavior 2017 Apr 19 :1–17.

10. Shen D, Cui L, Fang J, Cui B, Li D, Tai H. Voxel-Wise Meta-Analysis of Gray Matter Changes in Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. Front Aging Neurosci. 2016; 8:1507.

11. Katya Rascovsky MG. Clinical diagnostic criteria and classification controversies in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. Int Rev Psychiatry 2013; 25:145–158.

12. Gorno-Tempini ML, Rascovsky K, Knopman DS, et al. Classification of primary progressive aphasia and its variants. Neurology 2011;76: 1006-1014.

13. Carvalho MD, Swash M. Awaji diagnostic algorithm increases sensitivity of El Escorial criteria for ALS diagnosis. Amyotroph Lateral Scler. 2009; 10:53–57.

14. Jack CR, Barnes J, Bernstein MA, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging in Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative 2. Alzheimers Dement. 2015; 11:740–756.

15. Gaser C, Kurth F. Manual Computational Anatomy Toolbox - CAT12. 2016.

16. John A. Generative Models for MRI/DWI. Frontiers in Neuroinformatics. 2013 Sept 7.

17. Castellazzi G, Bruno SD, Toosy AT, et al. Prominent Changes in Cerebro-Cerebellar Functional Connectivity During Continuous Cognitive Processing. Front Cell Neurosci. 2018; 12:2959–15.

18. Oishi K, Zilles K, Amunts K, et al. Human brain white matter atlas: identification and assignment of common anatomical structures in superficial white matter. NeuroImage. 2008; 43:447–457.

19. Diedrichsen J, Balsters JH, Flavell J, Cussans E, Ramnani N. A probabilistic MR atlas of the human cerebellum. NeuroImage. 2009; 46:39–46.

20. Kanda T, Ishii K, Uemura T, et al. Comparison of grey matter and metabolic reductions in frontotemporal dementia using FDG-PET and voxel-based morphometric MR studies. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2008; 35:2227–2234.

21. Pereira JMS, Williams GB, Acosta-Cabronero J, et al. Atrophy patterns in histologic vs clinical groupings of frontotemporal lobar degeneration. Neurology. 2009; 72:1653–1660.

22. Namkung H, Kim S-H, Sawa A. The Insula: An Underestimated Brain Area in Clinical Neuroscience, Psychiatry, and Neurology. Trends in Neurosciences 2017; 40:200–207.

23. Heide Von Der RJ, Skipper LM, Klobusicky E, Olson IR. Dissecting the uncinate fasciculus: disorders, controversies and a hypothesis. Brain. 2013; 136:1692–1707.

24. Cosottini M, Pesaresi I, Piazza S, et al. Structural and functional evaluation of cortical motor areas in Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. Experimental Neurology 2012; 234:169–180.

25. Menke RAL, Körner S, Filippini N, et al. Widespread grey matter pathology dominates the longitudinal cerebral MRI and clinical landscape of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Brain. 2014; 137:2546–2555.

26. Tan RH, Devenney E, Dobson-Stone C, et al. Cerebellar integrity in the amyotrophic lateral sclerosis-frontotemporal dementia continuum. PLoS ONE 2014; 9:e105632.

27. Gellersen HM, Guo CC, O'Callaghan C, Tan RH, Sami S, Hornberger M. Cerebellar atrophy in neurodegeneration-a meta-analysis. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry 2017;88:780–788.

28. Palesi F, Tournier JD, Calamante F, et al. Contralateral cerebello-thalamo-cortical pathways with prominent involvement of associative areas in humans in vivo. Brain Struct Funct 2015; 220:3369–3384.

29. Palesi F, Rinaldis A, Castellazzi G, et al. Contralateral cortico-ponto- cerebellar pathways reconstruction in humans in vivo: implications for reciprocal cerebro-cerebellar structural connectivity in motor and non-motor areas. Scientific Reports 2017 Sep 29.:1–13.

30. Thorns J, Jansma H, Peschel T, et al. Extent of cortical involvement in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis--an analysis based on cortical thickness. BMC Neurol 2013; 13:148.

31. Agosta F, Ferraro PM, Riva N, et al. Structural brain correlates of cognitive and behavioral impairment in MND. Hum Brain Mapp. 2016; 37:1614–1626.

32. Schuster C, Kasper E, Dyrba M, et al. Cortical thinning and its relation to cognition in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Neurobiology of Aging 2014; 35:240–246.

33. Badura A, Verpeut JL et al. Normal cognitive and social development require posterior cerebellar activity. ELife 2018 Oct 19.:1–36.

Tables

Table 1: Demographic and clinical evaluation

	CTR (39)	FTLD (20)	FTLD-ALS (7)	ALS (18)	p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
AGE	65.85 (10.54)	66.05 (7.74)	69.71 (11.21)	63.67 (8.19)	0.555
GENDER (M/F)	M 53,85%/ F 46,15%	M 60% F 40%	M 57,12% F 42,88%	M 50% F 50%	0.937 †
MMSE	27.59 (1.50)	21.51 (5.27)	20.94 (7.88)	24.56 (4.48)	0.002
FAB	-	11.81 (5.59)	12.93 (2.61)	14.12 (3.49)	0.160 *
FAS	-	13.99 (7.95)	19.38 (12.31)	26.55 (9.09)	0.002 *
SF	-	22.6 (7.61)	25.6 (6.47)	29.62 (12.85)	0.004

Demographic and clinical scores for healthy controls (CTR), Fronto-Temporal Lobe Dementia (FTLD), Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) and FTLD-ALS. Values are expresses as mean (SD). P-value refers to significance between all different four groups. Comparisons were performed using one-way ANOVA test with Bonferroni correction, or †Chi-squared test or *Kruskall-Wallis test. MMSE = Mini Mental State Examination; FAB = Frontal Assessment Battery; FAS = Verbal Fluency; SF = Semantic Fluency.

Table 2: Atrophic regions between different groups of patients and controls (CTR)

Brain areas	**FTLD < CTR** **p=0.05 (FWE)**	**FTLD-ALS < CTR** **p=0.05 (FWE)**	**ALS < CTR** **p=0.001 (k=160)**	**FTLD < FTD-ALS** **p=0.001 (k=160)**	**FTLD < ALS** **p=0.05 (FWE)**	**FTLD-ALS < ALS** **p=0.05 (FWE)**
Frontal lobe	IFG (r) MFG (bil) SFG (l) PcG (bil) Foc (bil) Coc (bil) Fp (l)	Foc (l) Coc (l)	PcG (l)			Foc (bil)
Insula	Insula (bil)	Insula (l)		Insula (r)		Insula (l)
Temporal lobe	FusG (bil) ParahG (bil) Tp (r)				FusG (bil) ParahG (bil) Tp (l) ITG (r) MTG (r)	FusG (bil) ParahG (bil) Tp (bil) ITG (l) MTG (l) STG (l)
Parietal lobe			PostcG (l)			
Occipital Lobe					LOCi (r)	
White matter	IFOF (r) Fm (bil) CingG (bil) ATR (l) SLF (l)	SLF (l)			Fm (r) ATR (l) SLF (bil)	

	UF (l)			TLIF (l)	
CBL				Crus I (bil) Crus II (bil) VIIIa (r) VIIb VIIIb	

Regions of significant atrophy in patients. The lateralization is identified with: l= left; r= right; bil= bilateral. **Frontal lobe**: IFG= inferior frontal gyrus; MFG= medium frontal gyrus; SFG= superior frontal gyrus; PcG= precentral gyrus; Foc= frontal operculum cortex; Coc=central opercular cortex; Fp= frontal pole. **Temporal lobe**: FusG= fusiform gyrus; ParahG= parahippocampal gyrus; Tp= temporal pole; ITG= inferior temporal gyrus; MTG= medium temporal gyrus; STG= superior temporal gyrus. **Parietal lobe**: PostcG= posterior cingulate. **Occipital lobe**: LOCi= lateral occipital cortex inferior. **White matter**: IFOF= inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus; Fm= forceps minor; CingG= cingulate gyrus; ATR= anterior thalamic radiation; SLF= superior longitudinal fasciculus; UF= uncinate fasciculum; TLIF= temporal longitudinal inferior fasciculus; ACR= anterior corona radiata. **CBL**: cerebellum.

Table 3: Involvement of resting state networks

*< CTR	MVN	CBL	OVN	SMN	DMN	AN	SN	LVN	LVAN	ECN	WMN	FCN	RVAN
ALS				x		x							
FTLD-ALS			x		x	x			X	x	x	x	
FTLD	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		X	x	x	x	x

Resting state networks (RSNs) involved by atrophy of patients (*) compared to controls (CTR). “x” indicates areas of atrophy overlapping with specific RSNs. MVN = Medial Visual Network; CBLN = Cerebellar Network; OVN = Occipital Visual Network; SMN = Sensory Motor Network; DMN = Default Mode Network; AN = Auditory Network; SN = Salience Network; LVN = Lateral Visual Network; LVAN = Left Ventral Attention Network; ECN = Executive Control Network; WMN = Working memory Network; FCN = Frontal Cortex Network; RVAN = Right Ventral Network.

Table 4: Neuropsychological regression

Brain regions	**FAB** **p=0.001 (k>180)**	**FAS** **p=0.001 (k>170)**	**SF** **p=0.001 (k>120)**
Frontal lobe	PcG (r)	MFG (bil) IFG (r) SFG (l) ParacG (l) AntCing (bil) SubcalG (r) Fp (r)	IFG (l) SFG (r) AntCing (l) ParacG (l)
Parietal lobe	PostcG (bil) SupLob (l) AngG (bil)	PostcG (bil) AngG (bil)	SupramG (l) SupLob (l) AngG (bil)
Temporal lobe		MTG (r) ITG (r)	MTG (r) STG (r) Insula (r)
Occipital lobe	LatO (l)	LatO (bil) Op (l)	LatO (bil)
Cerebellum	Crus I (l) Crus II (l) VII (l) VIII (l)	Crus I (bil) Crus II (bil) IV (bil) V (r) VI (bil) VII (bil) VIII (bil) IX (l)	Crus I (l) Crus II (bil) IV (r) V (r) VIIb (bil) VIIIa (bil)
Deep GM		Thalamus (l)	

White Matter	SubcG (r)	SubcG (bil)	SubcG (l)
	MFG (r)	MFG (l)	MFG (L)
			ITG (l)
		PrecG (l)	Precun (r)
	SFG (r)	ITG (r)	Cun (r)
	Fp (r)	MTG (r)	
		Juxtapositional lobule (l)	
	Hipp (r)		
		Putamen (bil)	
		Insula (l)	
	IFL (r)	IFL (bil)	
	PFLS (r)	PSLF (bil)	
	Tp (r)		
	Cun (l)		
	Precun (r)	Precun (l)	
	PostCing (l)	PostCing (l)	
		AntCing (l)	
		SupramG (l)	SupramG (l)
		ATR (l)	AngG (bil)
		U (r)	
	LatO (l)	LatO (bil)	
	FM (r)	FM (l)	
	Crus I (l)	Crus I (bil)	I-IV (r)
	Crus II (l)	Crus II (bil)	
		IV (r)	
		V (r)	V (r)
		VI (r)	
	VIIb (l)	VIIb (bil)	

VIIIa (l)	VIIIa (bil)
	IX (l)
	X (l)

Areas of positive correlation between neuropsychological scores and brain volume. The lateralization is identified with: l= left; r= right; bil= bilateral. **Frontal lobe**: PcG= precentral gyrus; MFG= middle frontal gyrus; IFG= inferior frontal gyrus; SFG = superior frontal gyrus; ParacG= paracingulate gyrus; AntCing= anterior cingulus; SubcalG= subcallosal gyrus; Fp = frontal pole; SubcG= subcallosus gyrus; **Parietal lobe**: PostcG= postcentral gyrus; SupLob= superior lobule; SupramG= supramarginal gyrus; AngG= angular gyrus; **Temporal lobe**: MTG= middle temporal gyrus; ITG= inferior temporal gyrus; STG= superior temporal gyrus; **Occipital lobe**: LatO= lateral occipital; Op= occipital pole; **White Matter**: Hipp = hippocampus; IFL = inferior fasciculus longitudinalis; PSLF= parietal superior longitudinal fasciculus; Tp = temporal pole; Cun= cuneus; Precun= precuneus; PostCing= posterior cingulus; FM= forceps major; ATR= anterior thalamic radiation; U= uncus.

Figure Legends



Figure 1: GM and WM atrophy in patients compared to controls. Regions of grey matter (GM) and white matter (WM) atrophy in patients compared to controls (CTR). Significance was set at $p<0.05$ FWE corrected at cluster level, except for the comparison ALS and CTR ($p<0.001$, $k>160$). All results are overlaid onto the MNI 152 template and are shown as interleaved axial slices. L indicates the left hemisphere (radiological view). A) GM atrophic regions in FTLD (blue), FTLD-ALS (yellow) and ALS (red) compared to CTR. B) WM atrophic regions in FTLD (blue) and FTLD-ALS (yellow) compared to CTR.



Figure 2: GM and WM atrophy between patient groups. Regions of grey matter (GM) and white matter (WM) atrophy between patients. Significance was set at $p<0.05$ FWE corrected at cluster level, except for the comparison FTLD and FTLD-ALS ($p<0.001$, $k>160$). All results are overlaid onto the MNI 152 template and are shown as interleaved axial slices. L indicates the left hemisphere (radiological view). A) GM atrophic regions in FTLD vs ALS (blue), FTLD-ALS vs ALS (yellow) and FTLD vs FTLD-ALS (red). B) WM atrophic regions in FTLD (blue) compared to ALS.