A machine learning-based holistic approach for diagnoses within the Alzheimer's disease spectrum

Noemi Massetti [1,2], Alberto Granzotto [1,2,3], Manuela Bomba [1,2], Stefano Delli Pizzi [1,2], Alessandra Mosca [1,2], Reinhold Scherer [4], Marco Onofrj [1,2], and Stefano L. Sensi [1,2,5] for the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI)

[1] Center for Advanced Studies and Technology - CAST, University G. d'Annunzio of Chieti-Pescara, Italy
[2] Department of Neuroscience, Imaging, and Clinical Sciences, University G. d'Annunzio of Chieti-Pescara, Italy
[3] Sue and Bill Gross Stem Cell Research Center, University of California - Irvine, Irvine, USA
[4] Brain-Computer Interfaces and Neural Engineering Laboratory, School of Computer Science and Electronic Engineering, University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom
[5] Institute for Mind Impairments and Neurological Disorders – iMIND, University of California - Irvine, Irvine, USA

* Corresponding author:
Prof. Stefano L. Sensi
Center for Advanced Studies and Technology - CAST
University G. d'Annunzio of Chieti-Pescara,
Via Colle dell'Ara, Chieti 66100, Italy.
Tel.: +39 0871 541544;
Fax: +39 0871 541542;
e-mail: ssensi@uci.edu

Abstract

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is a neurodegenerative condition driven by a multifactorial etiology. We employed a machine learning (ML) based algorithm and the wealth of information offered by the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database to investigate the relative contribution of clinically relevant factors for identifying subjects affected by Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI), a transitional status between healthy aging and dementia. Our ML-based Random Forest (RF) algorithm did not help predict clinical outcomes and the AD conversion of MCI subjects. On the other hand, non-converting (ncMCI) subjects were correctly classified and predicted. Two neuropsychological tests, the FAQ and ADAS13, were the most relevant features used for the classification and prediction of younger, under 70, ncMCI subjects. Structural MRI data combined with systemic parameters and the cardiovascular status were instead the most critical factors for the classification of over 70 ncMCI subjects. Our results support the notion that AD is not an organ-specific condition and results from pathological processes inside and outside the Central Nervous System.

Introduction

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is one of the most prevalent forms of dementia (Prince et al., 2013). Clinical and epidemiological evidence indicates that pathogenic changes occur decades before the onset of clinical symptoms (Vermunt et al., 2019). Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) is a transitional state between healthy brain aging and dementia and a critical prodromal phase of AD (Morris et al., 2001) that offers a window of opportunity for therapeutic intervention. To date, no disease-modifying strategies are available, and almost all the AD clinical trials have failed (Long and Holtzman, 2019). On the other hand, a growing body of evidence indicates that prevention strategies delay AD onset and progression (Rakesh et al., 2017). Therefore, the development of cost-effective approaches set to identify MCI subjects at-risk of conversion to dementia is of paramount importance.

The clinical identification of the MCI stage occurs through the combined implementation of neuropsychological tests (Jessen et al., 2014; Petersen et al., 1999), the use of brain Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) scans, and the evaluation, in the cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), of altered levels of AD-related proteins (i.e., β-amyloid and tau). Furthermore, experimental and pathological evidence indicates that subtle molecular, cellular, and subcellular changes precede, by decades, the appearance of cognitive symptoms (Dickerson et al., 2009; Scahill et al., 2002; Thompson et al., 2001). Thus, the investigation of these combined biomarkers is critical to set the course of early diagnosis and, in the future, effective therapy.

Machine learning (ML) is a computer science field that provides computational tools that help with automated data classification and event prediction. Applied to AD, ML can capture the complex molecular interactions of pathogenic events that occur in the early stages of the disease and facilitate its progression (Beam and Kohane, 2018; Kononenko, 2001). In that respect, various ML architectures fed with MRI data informative on undergoing subtle structural brain changes have helped generate models of the disease continuum that spans from MCI to AD (Gaser et al., 2013; Hua et al., 2010; Moradi et al., 2015). However, significant levels of accuracy in predicting the MCI transition to dementia have only been achieved by combining detailed MRI-based measurements of cortical thicknesses and brain volumes, the assessment of alterations of β-amyloid and tau in the CSF, comprehensive neuropsychological and behavioral testing, and the evaluation of AD-related genetic mutations as well as sociodemographic data (Bhagwat et al., 2018; Casanova et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2019; Young et al., 2018).

In general, the use of such an array of biomarkers has been limited to parameters that reflect changes occurring within the Central Nervous System (CNS). However, a paradigm shift in the theoretical construct related to dementia and non-transmissible chronic disease indicates that the implementation of a systems medicine and network-based approach along with the evaluation of peripheral and systemic changes may offer better opportunities for the comprehension of the AD spectrum (Lee and Loscalzo, 2019). In line with this network- and systems medicine-based perspective, some authors have proposed that chronic diseases, including dementia, should be considered as the result of converging perturbations of complex intra- and inter-cellular networks and alterations that occur at many levels and not limited to one organ or driven by a single molecular factor or pathogenic mechanism (Barabási et al., 2011; Hampel et al., 2018; Lee and Loscalzo, 2019; Orešič et al., 2010).

Moving from this conceptual mainframe, we have therefore employed an ML-based approach to identify subsets of MCI individuals who are more prone to convert to dementia by

taking advantage of a wealth of biological, functional, and MRI-based structural data that reflect the pathogenic events occurring inside as well as outside of the CNS.

To that aim, the study evaluated a cohort of 517 MCI patients and the related data obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database. In this study cohort, we implemented an ML-based Random Forest (RF) algorithm to classify, in a supervised manner, converting to AD (cMCI) or stable, non-converting (ncMCI), MCI subjects. Data related to the study population were analyzed by RF as separate features or combined and assessed in terms of classification power. In detail, the study investigated the relative contribution in the classification process offered by the use of first-tier diagnostic tools, like alterations of AD-related CSF proteins and neuropsychological tests, or the implementation of second-tier biomarkers, like detailed structural MRI-related brain changes or variations of peripheral parameters. After these first learning steps, the ML-based RF that generated the best classification of cMCI and ncMCI subjects was tested on a new cohort of patients (a test-dataset) to estimate the machine predictive capability. Finally, we performed an RF dividing the MCI study cohort into subjects older or younger than 70. The decision stemmed from the assumption that disease processes occur with a different degree of relevance and pathogenic weight in "younger" versus "older" individuals. The choice was also based on the hypothesis that the pathogenic processes are different and only partially overlapping in these two groups. Thus, in a nutshell, we tested the idea that younger MCI individuals are mainly subjected to primary neurodegenerative processes while older MCI subjects may suffer from a more combined variety of precipitating and age-dependent factors like alterations of blood pressure, energy deficits, and dysmetabolism that also occur outside of the CNS.

Results

The demographic data of the individuals involved in the study are summarized in Table 1.

The best combinations of features that allow the most accurate RF-driven classification of cMCI and ncMCI patients, as well as their performance evaluation, are shown in Table 2. Results are depicted and sorted by accuracy values. Predictivity values were considered significant if greater than or equal to 85%. Results of the whole ML analysis are shown in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2. In cMCI patients, no combination of parameters allowed the ML to achieve a significant predictivity value (Table 2). Thus, disappointingly, we had to conclude that ML could not detect cMCI subjects when the machine is only fed with baseline data of these individuals.

The ML-based RF helps in the classification of ncMCI subjects

The ML performance in classifying ncMCI subjects was very effective. When employing data related to the neuropsychological tests (NEURO), we reached an encouraging accuracy value of 0.95 and a predictivity rate of 84.9% (Table 2). The result improved and reached a predictivity value of 86.4% when education levels were added (Table 2). Interestingly, the neuropsychological test that had a decisive weight for the classification was the Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (RAVLT) immediate, a test employed to assess episodic memory. However, to our surprise, data related to biological samples generated the best predictivity value (Table 2). Triglyceride and cholesterol (TRI_COL) features allowed the RF to correctly predict 87% of the ncMCI individuals with an accuracy rate of 0.92. The same accuracy value was reached when feeding the ML with features related to energy substrates (ENER_SUB) and systemic indices like changes in blood levels of albumin and

creatinine (SYST_IND), even though only in the first two cases the predictivity approached the threshold for statistical significance and produced a predictivity value of 84.7%. Of note, the most determinant features for the classification and prediction were changes related to blood levels of triglycerides, low-density lipoproteins (LDL), and glucose.

The ML-based RF analysis reveals at least two different undergoing conditions and the presence of an age-divide

To investigate the effect of age, we divided the study cohort into cMCI subjects over and under 70 years of age. Table 3 shows the best results for the two cMCI groups sorted by considering the ML-based RF performance accuracy. No combination of data allowed the ML to classify and predict the fate of cMCI patients.

The situation was different when investigating younger or older ncMCI individuals. The best RF's predictivity values increased, and, interestingly, the data combination that helped the better ML performance completely differed (Table 4). In older ncMCI individuals, structural MRI data combined with features related to lipoproteins, glucogenesis-associated metabolites, and amino acids (METABOL) allowed the best classification and prediction model generating the highest values of accuracy and predictivity (Supplementary Figure 1). The left hippocampus volume was the MRI-related feature that generated a prediction value of 85.5% and an accuracy of 0.98. Feeding the RF with MRI data associated with vital signs (VIT_SIG) produced the second-best result, although the predictivity value dropped to 82.1%. Finally, combining MRI data with systemic indices (SYST_IND) allowed the RF to classify ncMCI subjects with an accuracy value of 0.95 and a predictivity value of 86.3% (Table 4).

For younger ncMCI subjects, the scenario was different. Data related to neuropsychological scores alone allowed the RF to correctly classify with a 100% accuracy and 90.2% predictivity. These values were achieved by the interaction of all the employed 16 neuropsychological tests. Of note, the use of the Functional Activity Questionnaire (FAQ; a questionnaire used for the assessment of daily living activities) and the Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale–Cognitive Subscale test (ADAS13; a test that assesses the severity of impairment to memory, learning, language, practice, and orientation), as well as the RAVLT-immediate test, were the primary driving force for the RF process (Supplementary Figure 2). Combining neuropsychological evaluations with education levels decreased the predictivity to 88%, although the accuracy score was unaffected. In contrast, the combination of neuropsychological test scores with MRI structural data was less useful to help the ML in the classification and produced an accuracy value of 0.95 and a prediction score of 86%.

Results of our ML-based RF approach indicate that the tool cannot help predict the clinical outcomes of cMCI subjects. On the other hand, ncMCI individuals were correctly classified and predicted. In particular, our results indicate that two behavioral/neuropsychological tools like the FAQ and ADAS13 are the most relevant for the classification and prediction of younger ncMCI subjects. At the same time, structural MRI data combined with data informative on the status of energy and lipid metabolisms as well as measurements of patient's cardiovascular status and systemic indices were the most critical factors for the classification and prediction of older ncMCI individuals.

Discussion

In this study, we aimed at identifying which combination of ADNI-related data was the most effective for the classification of cMCI and ncMCI patients. We started with CNS-related features that are classically employed in the dementia diagnostic workup to ascertain neurodegeneration and cognitive decline (i.e., altered levels of AD-related CSF proteins and neuropsychological evaluations). We then added structural MRI features and peripheral biomarkers (i.e., blood/plasma levels of lipoproteins, gluconeogenic metabolites, amino acids, bile acids, and purines) to refine the analyses. This large number of variables, assessed only at baseline, was not enough for the ML to correctly classify and predict the fate of cMCI subjects. The RF failed to achieve significant accuracy and predictivity when estimating the conversion in young and old MCI individuals. One possible explanation for the poor performance is that the ML-based RF needs more than baseline features to work, thereby making the availability of data indicative of longitudinal changes mandatory.

A very different scenario emerged when approaching the ncMCI dataset. In this case, baseline data were sufficient to classify and identify stable MCI patients with significant accuracy levels. The analysis of the features employed to allocate these subjects indicates that neuropsychological tests, triglycerides, cholesterol, and energy substrates were the major driving forces for the RF process. This result supports the hypothesis that AD, like other chronic diseases, is not an organ-specific condition but the result of a wealth of mostly unexplored pathological processes that occur inside and outside of the CNS. Further inferences were possible when dividing ncMCI individuals upon the 70-year-old threshold.

Older ncMCI subjects were best classified by using a combination of detailed structural MRI and lipid- and energy metabolism-related features (METABOL), cardiovascular measurements (VIT_SIGN), along with systemic indices (SYST_IND), thereby indicating the convergence of pathogenic processes that are likely occurring inside and outside of the brain (Fig. 1). These findings are in line with previous studies showing the occurrence of lipid and energy-related dysmetabolism in AD patients (Bernath et al., 2020; Butterfield and Halliwell, 2019; Cunnane et al., 2020; Gamberger et al., 2017). The RF output analysis indicated that features related to left hippocampal volumes had the most weight in the classification, in line with well-established observations indicating that this region is the most affected by the AD-related neurodegenerative processes (Apostolova et al., 2006; Fox et al., 1996; Henneman et al., 2009).

On the other hand, when assessing young ncMCI individuals, the best prediction and classification performances were achieved using cognitive status features (Fig. 1). The items that showed more classification power were the FAQ and the ADAS13. This finding is not surprising as the FAQ is an ecological tool used to assess the subject's ability to deal with daily activities and personal care. These features are deeply affected by aging but expected to be less defective in younger patients and, therefore, if impaired, interpreted as significant warning signs by the ML.

The ADAS13 evaluates the overall cognitive status (Kueper et al., 2018). Of note, in routine clinical work, the MMSE is preferred to the ADAS13, but, surprisingly, our ML-based RF found the MMSE scores almost the least useful parameter for these patients' classification. This result can be explained by considering the origin and score structure of the two tests.

The MMSE was created as an easy-to-use clinical tool, while the ADAS13 is more research-oriented (Kueper et al., 2018). The score range is also different, more comprehensive [from 0 (no symptoms) to 70 (maximum symptoms)] in the ADAS13 compared to the limited MMSE 30 points (with 30 indicative of no symptoms and 0 of maximum symptoms). Thus, the ADAS13 is more

specific and offers a more granular scale of values that can assess more subtle cognitive abnormalities (Schmidt-Richberg et al., 2016).

Finally, early cognitive and memory deficits are signs of undergoing synaptic failure (DeKosky and Scheff, 1990; Selkoe, 2002; Sheng et al., 2012). However, these changes are behind the resolution power of clinical MRI protocols, which might explain why our RF made little use of MRI features to classify younger patients. On the other hand, in older individuals, synaptic alterations vanish and dilute in the context of a broader degeneration detected by MRI, thereby allowing a better ML classification performance of ncMCI subjects.

Conclusions

AD is a complex and multifactorial condition, and the characterization of patients in a prodromal stage of the disease (MCI) represents a challenge for biomedical research and unmet clinical and therapeutic needs.

A revision of the dementia construct may help to reach these targets. For instance, a growing body of evidence supports the view that AD, Parkinson's disease (PD), and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS), to name the most frequent neurodegenerative conditions, share key pathophysiological processes (Espay et al., 2019). Clinical and epidemiological evidence have indicated that the AD-, PD- and ALS-related neurodegenerative processes result from the converging activity of many polygenic, epigenetic, environmental, vascular, excitotoxic, and metabolic factors (Brem and Sensi, 2018; Sensi et al., 2018). In the case of AD, a growing body of evidence supports the notion that many patients exhibit mixed neuropathology and different arrays of neurotoxic protein aggregates like Aβ, Tau, prion proteins (PrP), α-synuclein, and TAR DNA binding protein-43 (TDP-43) (Boyle et al., 2018).

In the past thirty years, a monumental effort in financial and human resources has been made to reduce these aggregated proteins. The rationale behind this strategy is that protein deposits are "toxic" and their physical disaggregation could stop neurodegeneration progression (Mathieu et al., 2020). Except for few highly debated clinical trials, the strategy has failed, thereby casting some fundamental doubts on the construct's validity (Cummings et al., 2017; Herrup, 2015; Knopman et al., 2020; Morris et al., 2018).

ML techniques and big data analysis can help identify novel and unexpected disease features and escape the dogmatic loop in which we are currently entrapped. For instance, a surprising finding of our study concerns the importance of peripheral biomarkers. The analysis of ML variables employed for classifying older ncMCI subjects revealed that - along with neuropsychological tests and changes in blood levels of triglycerides, cholesterol, and energy substrates - one of the most discriminating features used by our RF were the variations of blood levels of bile acids (BA), including the tauroursodeoxycholic acid (TUDCA). This intriguing result is in line with a growing body of evidence supporting the gut-brain connection, the role of the microbiota in neurodegeneration, and the role played by the liver in these processes (Sampson et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2020). The notion is also supported by a recent study in AD patients indicating the association between altered BA profiles with higher degrees of brain atrophy, brain hypometabolism (as assessed by FDG-PET), and alterations of CSF AD-related biomarkers (Nho et al., 2019). These findings also agree with a study in which AD patients exhibited significantly low plasma levels of several medium-chain acylcarnitines (ACC) (Ciavardelli et al., 2016). These changes indicate hepatic dysfunction as most of the Fatty Acid

Oxidation (FAO), the mechanism that controls ACC production (Schooneman et al., 2013), is controlled by the liver.

Of note, defective hepatic FAO eventually impairs ketogenesis and produces lower levels of plasma ketones (Fukao et al., 2004), the brain's energy substrates alternative to glucose. Thus, the impairment of hepatic ketogenesis occurring in AD may further exacerbate the energetic brain deficits and be a critical aggravating factor for disease progression. Interestingly, in preclinical AD models and cognitively impaired subjects, MCI or AD patients, ketogenic diets and/or pharmacologic manipulations that favor ketogenesis have been shown to improve cognitive performances (Fortier et al., 2020; Henderson et al., 2009; Reger et al., 2004; Van der Auwera et al., 2005; Yao et al., 2011). These AD-related peripheral changes are also in agreement with recent findings indicating that TUDCA, together with sodium phenylbutyrate, can be a promising disease-modifying strategy for ALS (Paganoni et al., 2020).

This set of combined systemic alterations is the gateway to precision medicine and offers fertile ground for innovative research. Most importantly, the search for a cure will likely depend on exploring unchartered territories and/or applying an "outside of the box" line of thinking. Artificial Intelligence and its unbiased computational capability will provide the tools to understand the unique complexity of "individual" diseases affecting each of our patients and take full advantage of a precision medicine-based approach. Precision medicine, systems medicine, and network-based approaches will generate tailored diagnoses, predict disease risks, and produce customized treatments that maximize safety and efficacy (Greene and Loscalzo, 2017; Loscalzo and Barabasi, 2011).

In that vein, we hope that our study can contribute to further exploring ML models to understand the mystery of neurodegenerative processes and dementia.

Methods

All the data used in this work are available from ADNI database. ADNI is a public-private repository of clinical, imaging, genetic, and biochemical biomarker data obtained from North American subjects or patients (www.adni-info.org). ADNI aims at identifying the determinant processes leading to AD and diagnose pathological changes occurring at the earliest stage. The data downloaded and analyzed in this study were collected at the first appointment (baseline) of the follow-up series required by the ADNI protocols. The management and selection of the data were carried out with custom made R-written codes.

Subjects

Subjects considered in this study were patients diagnosed with MCI extracted from the cohorts of ADNI-1, ADNI-GO, ADNI-2, and ADNI-3. The inclusion criteria for these patients were the ones provided by the ADNI protocols, and the diagnosis of MCI based on the assessment of global cognition as well as scores of neuropsychological evaluations related to episodic memory, the presence of subjective cognitive disorders, and the clinical evaluation through a semi-structured interview.

Two classes of MCI subjects were chosen: 1) individuals with a baseline diagnosis of MCI who converted to AD within 24 months (cMCI) and individuals with a diagnosis of MCI at baseline who remained stable for the following 36 months (ncMCI). The timeframe was chosen taking into

consideration evidence indicating that subjects with a diagnosis of MCI have a high probability of converting to AD within 30 months (Fischer et al., 2007).

Neuropsychological assessments

For each person, we considered sixteen neuropsychological tests employed to assess the status of different cognitive domains. This neuropsychological dataset included the Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive (ADAS-Cog) subscales to evaluate the severity of memory, learning, language (production and comprehension), praxis, and orientation deficits (Mohs and Cohen, 1988) (Mohs et al., 1997); the Mini-Mental State Examination (Folstein et al., 1975) to investigate global cognition; the 30-item Boston Naming Test (E, Goodglass H, 1983) and the Animal Fluency (Morris et al., 1989) to assess semantic memory and language abilities; the Functional Activities Questionnaire (FAQ) for the assessment of daily living activities (Pfeffer et al., 1982); the Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test and Logical Memory II, subscale of the Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised (WMS-R) to investigate recall and recognition (Rey, 1964; Wechsler, 1997); the Trail Making Test (Spreen, O., y Strauss, 1998), part A and B (time to completion) to assess attention/executive functions; the Clock Drawing Test to evaluate attention, working and visual memory, and auditory comprehension (Nishiwaki et al., 2004); the Clinical Dementia Rating Scale to quantify the patient degree of dementia (Tractenberg et al., 2001). The Supplementary Table 3 shows the abbreviations used for each neuropsychological assessment and the domains and cognitive functions that each test is set to evaluate.

Biospecimen quantification

Supplementary Table 4 shows the biomarkers and the biospecimens considered in this work. The biospecimen selection, within the datasets available on the ADNI database (Biospecimen Inventory, http://adni.loni.usc.edu), was made by taking into account the number of samples and the consistency of the biospecimen measurements among the different phases of the ADNI project (ADNI-1, ADNI-GO, ADNI-2, ADNI-3). To meet the second criterion and reduce the incidence of human error, we considered only data produced through automated techniques.

Additional indices and parameters

ADNI data related to years of education (Stern, 2006), APOE-ε4 genotypes (Blacker et al., 1997), and "vital signs" like systolic (VSBPSYS) and diastolic pressure (VSBPDIA), ventilation frequency (VSRESP), cardiac frequency (VSPULSE), and body temperature (VSTEMP) were also extracted.

Structural Magnetic Resonance data

The MRI data downloaded from the ADNI database (Image Collections, http://adni.loni.usc.edu) were acquired with a Magnetization Prepared-RApid Gradient Echo (MP-RAGE) protocol by employing a Philips 3-tesla MRI scanner (for details about MRI procedures and protocols see http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/ADNI2_MRI_Training_Manual_FINAL.pdf) thereby limiting bias and technical issues associated with the use of different scanner types/brand. T1-weighted images were obtained using 3D Turbo Field-Echo sequences (slice thickness of 1.2 mm, repetition time/echo time of 6.8/3.1 ms). The structural MRI analysis was performed with Freesurfer (version 6.0). Automatic reconstruction and labeling of cortical and subcortical regions was achieved with the "recon-all-all"

command line, according to Desikan-Killiany Atlas (Desikan et al., 2006). The volumes of the brain regions, computed with *asegstats2table*, were normalized by dividing to the total intracranial volume of each patient, while the thicknesses of the brain areas considered are those calculated automatically by *aparcstats2table*. Supplementary Table 3 shows brain areas analyzed in this study.

ML analysis

Our ML approach implemented an RF algorithm. The RF is a supervised non-linear classifier, and its operation is based on the construction of binary decision trees obtained with the Bagging sampling method (an acronym for bootstrap aggregating) (Breiman, 1996). The RF classifier was chosen because the performance is robust and stable over an extensive range of parameters. Furthermore, it is independent of the distribution of data (i.e., neuropsychological scores, quantifications of lipoproteins, etc.) and has significant multi-class and advanced data-mining capabilities (Steyrl et al., 2016).

RF analyzed the data obtained from the ADNI baseline. In the training phase, the algorithm studied the non-linear interactions between the data (or features) of the subjects divided upstream into the two classes: cMCI and ncMCI. The goal at this stage was to identify the best subdivision/classification strategy. In the testing phase, the approach was assayed on a cohort of new subjects.

In the training phase, the RF analyzed 85% of each dataset (randomly extracted) and performed 30 times the analysis; the number of trees was chosen manually and set to minimize the out-of-bag error (number of trees: 200, 250, 300, 350, 400, 450, 500, 550, 600).

The parameters considered to evaluate the ML performance in classifying cMCI and ncMCI subjects were *accuracy*, *sensitivity,* and *specificity*. To assess the ability to predict whether a subject belongs to one of the two classes and, therefore, investigate, separately, the classification strategy for cMCI and ncMCI subjects, we introduced the variable *predictivity*, which measures the percentage of subjects (test-dataset) correctly classified in each of the two classes.

In the study, we employed the Treebagger class function of the Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox of MATLAB (The Mathworks Inc., Natick, MA, USA).

Acknowledgments

The study was funded by the Alzheimer's Association Part the Cloud: Translational Research Funding for Alzheimer's Disease (PTC) PTC-19-602325 and the Alzheimer's Association - GAAIN Exploration to Evaluate Novel Alzheimer's Queries (GEENA-Q-19-596282) (SLS). AG is supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement iMIND—No. 841665.

Conflict of interests

None of the authors have conflict of interests. This study is not industry-sponsored.

References

Apostolova LG, Dutton RA, Dinov ID, Hayashi KM, Toga AW, Cummings JL, Thompson PM. 2006. Conversion of Mild Cognitive Impairment to Alzheimer Disease Predicted by Hippocampal Atrophy Maps. *Arch Neurol* **63**:693–699. doi:10.1001/archneur.63.5.693

Barabási AL, Gulbahce N, Loscalzo J. 2011. Network medicine: A network-based approach to human disease. *Nat Rev Genet*. doi:10.1038/nrg2918

Beam AL, Kohane IS. 2018. Big data and machine learning in health care. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc*. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.18391

Bernath MM, Bhattacharyya S, Nho K, Barupal DK, Fiehn O, Baillie R, Risacher SL, Arnold M, Jacobson T, Trojanowski JQ, Shaw LM, Weiner MW, Doraiswamy PM, Kaddurah-Daouk R, Saykin AJ. 2020. Serum triglycerides in Alzheimer disease: Relation to neuroimaging and CSF biomarkers. *Neurology* **94**:e2088–e2098. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000009436

Bhagwat N, Viviano JD, Voineskos AN, Chakravarty MM. 2018. Modeling and prediction of clinical symptom trajectories in Alzheimer's disease using longitudinal data. *PLoS Comput Biol*. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006376

Blacker D, Haines JL, Rodes L, Terwedow H, Go RCP, Harrell LE, Perry RT, Bassett SS, Chase G, Meyers D, Albert MS, Tanzi R. 1997. ApoE-4 and age at onset of Alzheimer's disease: The NIMH genetics initiative. *Neurology*. doi:10.1212/WNL.48.1.139

Boyle PA, Yu L, Wilson RS, Leurgans SE, Schneider JA, Bennett DA. 2018. Person-specific contribution of neuropathologies to cognitive loss in old age. *Ann Neurol* **83**:74–83. doi:10.1002/ana.25123

Breiman L. 1996. Bagging predictors. *Mach Learn*. doi:10.1007/bf00058655

Brem A-KA-K, Sensi SLSL. 2018. Towards Combinatorial Approaches for Preserving Cognitive Fitness in Aging. *Trends Neurosci* **41**:885–897. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2018.09.009

Butterfield DA, Halliwell B. 2019. Oxidative stress, dysfunctional glucose metabolism and Alzheimer disease. *Nat Rev Neurosci* **20**:148–160. doi:10.1038/s41583-019-0132-6

Casanova R, Hsu FC, Sink KM, Rapp SR, Williamson JD, Resnick SM, Espeland MA. 2013. Alzheimer's disease risk assessment using large-scale machine learning methods. *PLoS One*. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0077949

Ciavardelli D, Piras F, Consalvo A, Rossi C, Zucchelli M, Di Ilio C, Frazzini V, Caltagirone C, Spalletta G, Sensi SLSL. 2016. Medium-chain plasma acylcarnitines, ketone levels, cognition, and gray matter volumes in healthy elderly, mildly cognitively impaired, or Alzheimer's disease subjects. *Neurobiol Aging* **43**:1–12. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2016.03.005

Cummings J, Lee G, Mortsdorf T, Ritter A, Zhong K. 2017. Alzheimer's disease drug development pipeline: 2017. *Alzheimer's Dement Transl Res Clin Interv* **3**:367–384. doi:10.1016/J.TRCI.2017.05.002

Cunnane SC, Trushina E, Morland C, Prigione A, Casadesus G, Andrews ZB, Beal MF, Bergersen LH, Brinton RD, de la Monte S, Eckert A, Harvey J, Jeggo R, Jhamandas JH, Kann O, la Cour CM, Martin WF, Mithieux G, Moreira PI, Murphy MP, Nave KA, Nuriel T, Oliet SHR, Saudou F, Mattson MP, Swerdlow RH, Millan MJ. 2020. Brain energy rescue: an emerging therapeutic concept for neurodegenerative disorders of ageing. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* **19**:609–633. doi:10.1038/s41573-020-0072-x

DeKosky ST, Scheff SW. 1990. Synapse loss in frontal cortex biopsies in Alzheimer's disease:

Correlation with cognitive severity. *Ann Neurol*. doi:10.1002/ana.410270502

Desikan RS, Ségonne F, Fischl B, Quinn BT, Dickerson BC, Blacker D, Buckner RL, Dale AM, Maguire RP, Hyman BT, Albert MS, Killiany RJ. 2006. An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *Neuroimage*. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.01.021

Dickerson BC, Bakkour A, Salat DH, Feczko E, Pacheco J, Greve DN, Grodstein F, Wright CI, Blacker D, Rosas HD, Sperling RA, Atri A, Growdon JH, Hyman BT, Morris JC, Fischl B, Buckner RL. 2009. The cortical signature of Alzheimer's disease: Regionally specific cortical thinning relates to symptom severity in very mild to mild AD dementia and is detectable in asymptomatic amyloid-positive individuals. *Cereb Cortex*. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhn113

E, Goodglass H WS. 1983. The Boston Naming Test. *Philadelphia Lea Febiger*.

Espay AJ, Vizcarra JA, Marsili L, Lang AE, Simon DK, Merola A, Josephs KA, Fasano A, Morgante F, Savica R, Greenamyre JT, Cambi F, Yamasaki TR, Tanner CM, Gan-Or Z, Litvan I, Mata IF, Zabetian CP, Brundin P, Fernandez HH, Standaert DG, Kauffman MA, Schwarzschild MA, Sardi SP, Sherer T, Perry G, Leverenz JB. 2019. Revisiting protein aggregation as pathogenic in sporadic Parkinson and Alzheimer diseases. *Neurology* **92**:329–337. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000006926

Fischer P, Jungwirth S, Zehetmayer S, Weissgram S, Hoenigschnabl S, Gelpi E, Krampla W, Tragl KH. 2007. Conversion from subtypes of mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer dementia. *Neurology*. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000252358.03285.9d

Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. 1975. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res*. doi:10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6

Fortier M, Castellano C, St-Pierre V, Myette-Côté É, Langlois F, Roy M, Morin M, Bocti C, Fulop T, Godin J, Delannoy C, Cuenoud B, Cunnane SC. 2020. A ketogenic drink improves cognition in mild cognitive impairment: Results of a 6-month RCT. *Alzheimer's Dement* alz.12206. doi:10.1002/alz.12206

Fox NC, Warrington EK, Freeborough PA, Hartikainen P, Kennedy AM, Stevens JM, Rossor MN. 1996. Presymptomatic hippocampal atrophy in Alzheimer's disease: A longitudinal MRI study. *Brain* **119**:2001–2007. doi:10.1093/brain/119.6.2001

Fukao T, Lopaschuk GD, Mitchell GA. 2004. Pathways and control of ketone body metabolism: on the fringe of lipid biochemistry. *Prostaglandins Leukot Essent Fatty Acids* **70**:243–51. doi:10.1016/j.plefa.2003.11.001

Gamberger D, Lavrač N, Srivatsa S, Tanzi RE, Doraiswamy PM. 2017. Identification of clusters of rapid and slow decliners among subjects at risk for Alzheimer's disease. *Sci Rep* **7**:1–12. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-06624-y

Gaser C, Franke K, Klöppel S, Koutsouleris N, Sauer H. 2013. BrainAGE in Mild Cognitive Impaired Patients: Predicting the Conversion to Alzheimer's Disease. *PLoS One*. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0067346

Greene JA, Loscalzo J. 2017. Putting the Patient Back Together — Social Medicine, Network Medicine, and the Limits of Reductionism. *N Engl J Med* **377**:2493–2499. doi:10.1056/NEJMms1706744

Hampel H, Toschi N, Babiloni C, Baldacci F, Black KL, Bokde ALW, Bun RS, Cacciola F, Cavedo E, Chiesa PA, Colliot O, Coman CM, Dubois B, Duggento A, Durrleman S, Ferretti MT, George N, Genthon R, Habert MO, Herholz K, Koronyo Y, Koronyo-Hamaoui M, Lamari F, Langevin T, Lehéricy S,

Lorenceau J, Neri C, Nisticò R, Nyasse-Messene F, Ritchie C, Rossi S, Santarnecchi E, Sporns O, Verdooner SR, Vergallo A, Villain N, Younesi E, Garaci F, Lista S. 2018. Revolution of Alzheimer Precision Neurology. Passageway of Systems Biology and Neurophysiology. *J Alzheimer's Dis* **64**:S47–S105. doi:10.3233/JAD-179932

Henderson ST, Vogel JL, Barr LJ, Garvin F, Jones JJ, Costantini LC. 2009. Study of the ketogenic agent AC-1202 in mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter trial. *Nutr Metab* **6**:31. doi:10.1186/1743-7075-6-31

Henneman WJP, Sluimer JD, Barnes J, Van Der Flier WM, Sluimer IC, Fox NC, Scheltens P, Vrenken H, Barkhof F. 2009. Hippocampal atrophy rates in Alzheimer disease: Added value over whole brain volume measures. *Neurology*. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000344568.09360.31

Herrup K. 2015. The case for rejecting the amyloid cascade hypothesis. *Nat Neurosci* **18**:794–799. doi:10.1038/nn.4017

Hua X, Lee S, Hibar DP, Yanovsky I, Leow AD, Toga AW, Jack CR, Bernstein MA, Reiman EM, Harvey DJ, Kornak J, Schuff N, Alexander GE, Weiner MW, Thompson PM. 2010. Mapping Alzheimer's disease progression in 1309 MRI scans: Power estimates for different inter-scan intervals. *Neuroimage*. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.01.104

Jessen F, Wolfsgruber S, Wiese B, Bickel H, Mösch E, Kaduszkiewicz H, Pentzek M, Riedel-Heller SG, Luck T, Fuchs A, Weyerer S, Werle J, Van Den Bussche H, Scherer M, Maier W, Wagner M. 2014. AD dementia risk in late MCI, in early MCI, and in subjective memory impairment. *Alzheimer's Dement*. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2012.09.017

Knopman DS, Jones DT, Greicius MD. 2020. Failure to demonstrate efficacy of aducanumab: An analysis of the EMERGE and ENGAGE trials as reported by Biogen, December 2019. *Alzheimers Dement*. doi:10.1002/alz.12213

Kononenko I. 2001. Machine learning for medical diagnosis: History, state of the art and perspective. *Artif Intell Med*. doi:10.1016/S0933-3657(01)00077-X

Kueper JK, Speechley M, Montero-Odasso M. 2018. The Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive Subscale (ADAS-Cog): Modifications and Responsiveness in Pre-Dementia Populations. A Narrative Review. *J Alzheimer's Dis*. doi:10.3233/JAD-170991

Lee G, Nho K, Kang B, Sohn KA, Kim D, Weiner MW, Aisen P, Petersen R, Jack CR, Jagust W, Trojanowki JQ, Toga AW, Beckett L, Green RC, Saykin AJ, Morris J, Shaw LM, Khachaturian Z, Sorensen G, Carrillo M, Kuller L, Raichle M, Paul S, Davies P, Fillit H, Hefti F, Holtzman D, Mesulam MM, Potter W, Snyder P, Montine T, Thomas RG, Donohue M, Walter S, Sather T, Jiminez G, Balasubramanian AB, Mason J, Sim I, Harvey D, Bernstein M, Fox N, Thompson P, Schuff N, DeCArli C, Borowski B, Gunter J, Senjem M, Vemuri P, Jones D, Kantarci K, Ward C, Koeppe RA, Foster N, Reiman EM, Chen K, Mathis C, Landau S, Cairns NJ, Householder E, Taylor-Reinwald L, Lee V, Korecka M, Figurski M, Crawford K, Neu S, Foroud TM, Potkin S, Shen L, Faber K, Kim S, Tha L, Frank R, Hsiao J, Kaye J, Quinn J, Silbert L, Lind B, Carter R, Dolen S, Ances B, Carroll M, Creech ML, Franklin E, Mintun MA, Schneider S, Oliver A, Schneider LS, Pawluczyk S, Beccera M, Teodoro L, Spann BM, Brewer J, Vanderswag H, Fleisher A, Marson D, Griffith R, Clark D, Geldmacher D, Brockington J, Roberson E, Love MN, Heidebrink JL, Lord JL, Mason SS, Albers CS, Knopman D, Johnson Kris, Grossman H, Mitsis E, Shah RC, deToledo-Morrell L, Doody RS, Villanueva-Meyer J, Chowdhury M, Rountree S, Dang M, Duara R, Varon D, Greig MT, Roberts P, Stern Y, Honig LS, Bell KL, Albert M, Onyike C, D'Agostino D, Kielb S, Galvin JE, Cerbone B, Michel CA, Pogorelec DM, Rusinek H, de Leon MJ, Glodzik L, De Santi S, Womack K, Mathews D, Quiceno M, Doraiswamy PM, Petrella JR, Borges-Neto S, Wong TZ, Coleman E, Levey AI, Lah JJ, Cella JS, Burns JM, Swerdlow RH, Brooks WM, Arnold SE, Karlawish JH, Wolk D,

Clark CM, Apostolova L, Tingus K, Woo E, Silverman DHS, Lu PH, Bartzokis G, Smith CD, Jicha G, Hardy P, Sinha P, Oates E, Conrad G, Graff-Radford NR, Parfitt F, Kendall T, Johnson H, Lopez OL, Oakley MA, Simpson DM, Farlow MR, Hake AM, Matthews BR, Brosch JR, Herring S, Hunt C, Porsteinsson AP, Goldstein BS, Martin K, Makino KM, Ismail MS, Brand C, Mulnard RA, Thai G, Mc-Adams-Ortiz C, van Dyck CH, Carson RE, MacAvoy MG, Varma P, Chertkow H, Bergman H, Hosein C, Black S, Stefanovic B, Caldwell C, Hsiung GYR, Feldman H, Mudge B, Assaly M, Finger Elizabeth, Pasternack S, Rachisky I, Trost D, Kertesz A, Bernick C, Munic D, Lipowski K, Weintraub M, Bonakdarpour B, Kerwin D, Wu CK, Johnson N, Sadowsky C, Villena T, Turner RS, Johnson Kathleen, Reynolds B, Sperling RA, Johnson KA, Marshall G, Yesavage J, Taylor JL, Lane B, Rosen A, Tinklenberg J, Sabbagh MN, Belden CM, Jacobson SA, Sirrel SA, Kowall N, Killiany R, Budson AE, Norbash A, Johnson PL, Obisesan TO, Wolday S, Allard J, Lerner A, Ogrocki P, Tatsuoka C, Fatica P, Fletcher E, Maillard P, Olichney J, Carmichael O, Kittur S, Borrie M, Lee TY, Bartha R, Johnson S, Asthana S, Carlsson CM, Preda A, Nguyen D, Tariot P, Burke A, Trncic N, Fleisher A, Reeder S, Bates V, Capote H, Rainka M, Scharre DW, Kataki M, Adeli A, Zimmerman EA, Celmins D, Brown AD, Pearlson GD, Blank K, Anderson K, Flashman LA, Seltzer M, Hynes ML, Santulli RB, Sink KM, Gordineer L, Williamson JD, Garg P, Watkins F, Ott BR, Querfurth H, Tremont G, Salloway S, Malloy P, Correia S, Rosen HJ, Miller BL, Perry D, Mintzer J, Spicer K, Bachman D, Finger Elizabether, Pasternak S, Rachinsky I, Rogers J, Drost D, Pomara N, Hernando R, Sarrael A, Schultz SK, Ponto LLB, Shim H, Smith KE, Relkin N, Chaing G, Lin M, Ravdin L, Smith A, Raj BA, Fargher K. 2019. Predicting Alzheimer's disease progression using multi-modal deep learning approach. *Sci Rep*. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-37769-z

Lee LYH, Loscalzo J. 2019. Network Medicine in Pathobiology. *Am J Pathol* **189**:1311–1326. doi:10.1016/j.ajpath.2019.03.009

Long JM, Holtzman DM. 2019. Alzheimer Disease: An Update on Pathobiology and Treatment Strategies. *Cell*. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2019.09.001

Loscalzo J, Barabasi AL. 2011. Systems biology and the future of medicine. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Syst Biol Med* **3**:619–627. doi:10.1002/wsbm.144

Mathieu C, Pappu R V., Paul Taylor J. 2020. Beyond aggregation: Pathological phase transitions in neurodegenerative disease. *Science (80-)* **370**:56–60. doi:10.1126/science.abb8032

Mohs RC, Cohen L. 1988. Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale (ADAS). *Psychopharmacol Bull*.

Mohs RC, Knopman D, Petersen RC, Ferris SH, Ernesto C, Grundman M, Sano M, Bieliauskas L, Geldmacher D, Clark C, Thal LJ. 1997. Development of cognitive instruments for use in clinical trials of antidementia drugs: Additions to the Alzheimer's disease assessment scale that broaden its scope. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. doi:10.1097/00002093-199700112-00003

Moradi E, Pepe A, Gaser C, Huttunen H, Tohka J. 2015. Machine learning framework for early MRI-based Alzheimer's conversion prediction in MCI subjects. *Neuroimage*. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.10.002

Morris GP, Clark IA, Vissel B. 2018. Questions concerning the role of amyloid-β in the definition, aetiology and diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. *Acta Neuropathol* **136**:663–689. doi:10.1007/s00401-018-1918-8

Morris JC, Heyman A, Mohs RC, Hughes JP, van Belle G, Fillenbaum G, Mellits ED, Clark C. 1989. The consortium to establish a registry for alzheimer's disease (CERAD). Part I. Clinical and neuropsychological assessment of alzheimer's disease. *Neurology*. doi:10.1212/wnl.39.9.1159

Morris JC, Storandt M, Miller JP, McKeel DW, Price JL, Rubin EH, Berg L. 2001. Mild cognitive impairment represents early-stage Alzheimer disease. *Arch Neurol*. doi:10.1001/archneur.58.3.397

Nho K, Kueider-Paisley A, MahmoudianDehkordi S, Arnold M, Risacher SL, Louie G, Blach C, Baillie R, Han X, Kastenmüller G, Jia W, Xie G, Ahmad S, Hankemeier T, van Duijn CM, Trojanowski JQ, Shaw LM, Weiner MW, Doraiswamy PM, Saykin AJ, Kaddurah-Daouk R. 2019. Altered bile acid profile in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease: Relationship to neuroimaging and CSF biomarkers. *Alzheimer's Dement* **15**:232–244. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2018.08.012

Nishiwaki Y, Breeze E, Smeeth L, Bulpitt CJ, Peters R, Fletcher AE. 2004. Validity of the Clock-Drawing Test as a screening tool for cognitive impairment in the elderly. *Am J Epidemiol*. doi:10.1093/aje/kwh288

Orešič M, Lötjönen J, Soininen H. 2010. Systems medicine and the integration of bioinformatic tools for the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease. *Genome Med* **2**:83. doi:10.1186/gm204

Paganoni S, Macklin EA, Hendrix S, Berry JD, Elliott MA, Maiser S, Karam C, Caress JB, Owegi MA, Quick A, Wymer J, Goutman SA, Heitzman D, Heiman-Patterson T, Jackson CE, Quinn C, Rothstein JD, Kasarskis EJ, Katz J, Jenkins L, Ladha S, Miller TM, Scelsa SN, Vu TH, Fournier CN, Glass JD, Johnson KM, Swenson A, Goyal NA, Pattee GL, Andres PL, Babu S, Chase M, Dagostino D, Dickson SP, Ellison N, Hall M, Hendrix K, Kittle G, McGovern M, Ostrow J, Pothier L, Randall R, Shefner JM, Sherman A V., Tustison E, Vigneswaran P, Walker J, Yu H, Chan J, Wittes J, Cohen J, Klee J, Leslie K, Tanzi RE, Gilbert W, Yeramian PD, Schoenfeld D, Cudkowicz ME. 2020. Trial of Sodium Phenylbutyrate–Taurursodiol for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* **383**:919–930. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1916945

Petersen RC, Smith GE, Waring SC, Ivnik RJ, Tangalos EG, Kokmen E. 1999. Mild cognitive impairment: Clinical characterization and outcome. *Arch Neurol*. doi:10.1001/archneur.56.3.303

Pfeffer RI, Kurosaki TT, Harrah CH, Chance JM, Filos S. 1982. Measurement of functional activities in older adults in the community. *Journals Gerontol*. doi:10.1093/geronj/37.3.323

Prince M, Bryce R, Albanese E, Wimo A, Ribeiro W, Ferri CP. 2013. The global prevalence of dementia: A systematic review and metaanalysis. *Alzheimer's Dement* **9**:63-75.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2012.11.007

Rakesh G, Szabo ST, Alexopoulos GS, Zannas AS. 2017. Strategies for dementia prevention: latest evidence and implications. *Ther Adv Chronic Dis*. doi:10.1177/2040622317712442

Reger MA, Henderson ST, Hale C, Cholerton B, Baker LD, Watson GS, Hyde K, Chapman D, Craft S. 2004. Effects of beta-hydroxybutyrate on cognition in memory-impaired adults. *Neurobiol Aging* **25**:311–314. doi:10.1016/S0197-4580(03)00087-3

Rey A. 1964. L'examen clinique en psychologie. [The clinical examination in psychology.], L'examen clinique en psychologie.

Sampson TR, Debelius JW, Thron T, Janssen S, Shastri GG, Ilhan ZE, Challis C, Schretter CE, Rocha S, Gradinaru V, Chesselet MF, Keshavarzian A, Shannon KM, Krajmalnik-Brown R, Wittung-Stafshede P, Knight R, Mazmanian SK. 2016. Gut Microbiota Regulate Motor Deficits and Neuroinflammation in a Model of Parkinson's Disease. *Cell* **167**:1469-1480.e12. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.11.018

Scahill RI, Schott JM, Stevens JM, Rossor MN, Fox NC. 2002. Mapping the evolution of regional atrophy in Alzheimer's disease: Unbiased analysis of fluid-registered serial MRI. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. doi:10.1073/pnas.052587399

Schmidt-Richberg A, Ledig C, Guerrero R, Molina-Abril H, Frangi A, Rueckert D. 2016. Learning biomarker models for progression estimation of Alzheimer's disease. *PLoS One* **11**:e0153040.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153040

Schooneman MG, Vaz FM, Houten SM, Soeters MR. 2013. Acylcarnitines: reflecting or inflicting insulin resistance? *Diabetes* **62**:1–8. doi:10.2337/db12-0466

Selkoe DJ. 2002. Alzheimer's disease is a synaptic failure. *Science* **298**:789–91. doi:10.1126/science.1074069

Sensi SLSL, Granzotto A, Siotto M, Squitti R. 2018. Copper and Zinc Dysregulation in Alzheimer's Disease. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* **39**:1049–1063. doi:10.1016/j.tips.2018.10.001

Sheng M, Sabatini BL, Südhof TC. 2012. Synapses and Alzheimer's disease. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* **4**.

Spreen, O., y Strauss E. 1998. A Compendium of Neuropsychological Tests. *Adm Norms Comment*.

Stern Y. 2006. Cognitive reserve and Alzheimer disease. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. doi:10.1097/01.wad.0000213815.20177.19

Steyrl D, Scherer R, Faller J, Müller-Putz GR. 2016. Random forests in non-invasive sensorimotor rhythm brain-computer interfaces: A practical and convenient non-linear classifier. *Biomed Tech*. doi:10.1515/bmt-2014-0117

Thompson PM, Mega MS, Woods RP, Zoumalan CI, Lindshield CJ, Blanton RE, Moussai J, Holmes CJ, Cummings JL, Toga AW. 2001. Cortical change in Alzheimer's disease detected with a disease-specific population-based brain atlas. *Cereb Cortex*. doi:10.1093/cercor/11.1.1

Tractenberg RE, Schafer K, Morris JC. 2001. Interobserver disagreements on clinical dementia rating assessment: Interpretation and implications for training. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. doi:10.1097/00002093-200107000-00007

Van der Auwera I, Wera S, Van Leuven F, Henderson ST. 2005. A ketogenic diet reduces amyloid beta 40 and 42 in a mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. *Nutr Metab* **2**:28. doi:10.1186/1743-7075-2-28

Vermunt L, Tijms BM, Visser PJ, Scheltens P, Bateman R, Benzinger TLS, Gordon BA. 2019. SINGLE-SUBJECT GREY MATTER NETWORKS DETERIORATE 12 YEARS BEFORE DEMENTIA. *Alzheimer's Dement*. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2019.06.4502

Wechsler D. 1997. WAIS--III: Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (3rd ed.) Administration and scoring manual, The Psychological Corporation, San Antonio, TX.

Yao J, Chen S, Mao Z, Cadenas E, Brinton RD. 2011. 2-Deoxy-D-glucose treatment induces ketogenesis, sustains mitochondrial function, and reduces pathology in female mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. *PLoS One* **6**:e21788. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0021788

Young AL, Marinescu R V., Oxtoby NP, Bocchetta M, Yong K, Firth NC, Cash DM, Thomas DL, Dick KM, Cardoso J, van Swieten J, Borroni B, Galimberti D, Masellis M, Tartaglia MC, Rowe JB, Graff C, Tagliavini F, Frisoni GB, Laforce R, Finger E, de Mendonça A, Sorbi S, Warren JD, Crutch S, Fox NC, Ourselin S, Schott JM, Rohrer JD, Alexander DC, Andersson C, Archetti S, Arighi A, Benussi L, Binetti G, Black S, Cosseddu M, Fallström M, Ferreira C, Fenoglio C, Freedman M, Fumagalli GG, Gazzina S, Ghidoni R, Grisoli M, Jelic V, Jiskoot L, Keren R, Lombardi G, Maruta C, Meeter L, Mead S, van Minkelen R, Nacmias B, Öijerstedt L, Padovani A, Panman J, Pievani M, Polito C, Premi E, Prioni S, Rademakers R, Redaelli V, Rogaeva E, Rossi G, Rossor M, Scarpini E, Tang-Wai D, Thonberg H, Tiraboschi P, Verdelho A, Weiner MW, Aisen P, Petersen R, Jack CR, Jagust W, Trojanowki JQ, Toga AW, Beckett L, Green RC, Saykin AJ, Morris J, Shaw LM, Khachaturian Z, Sorensen G, Kuller L, Raichle M, Paul S, Davies P, Fillit H, Hefti F, Holtzman D, Mesulam M.

Marcel, Potter W, Snyder P, Schwartz A, Montine T, Thomas RG, Donohue M, Walter S, Gessert D, Sather T, Jiminez G, Harvey D, Bernstein M, Thompson P, Schuff N, Borowski B, Gunter J, Senjem M, Vemuri P, Jones D, Kantarci K, Ward C, Koeppe RA, Foster N, Reiman EM, Chen K, Mathis C, Landau S, Cairns NJ, Householder E, Taylor-Reinwald L, Lee V, Korecka M, Figurski M, Crawford K, Neu S, Foroud TM, Potkin S, Shen L, Faber K, Kim S, Nho K, Thal L, Buckholtz N, Albert Marylyn, Frank R, Hsiao J, Kaye J, Quinn J, Lind B, Carter R, Dolen S, Schneider LS, Pawluczyk S, Beccera M, Teodoro L, Spann BM, Brewer J, Vanderswag H, Fleisher A, Heidebrink JL, Lord JL, Mason SS, Albers CS, Knopman D, Johnson Kris, Doody RS, Villanueva-Meyer J, Chowdhury M, Rountree S, Dang M, Stern Y, Honig LS, Bell KL, Ances B, Carroll M, Leon S, Mintun MA, Schneider S, Oliver A, Marson D, Griffith R, Clark D, Geldmacher D, Brockington J, Roberson E, Grossman H, Mitsis E, de Toledo-Morrell L, Shah RC, Duara R, Varon D, Greig MT, Roberts P, Albert Marilyn, Onyike C, D'Agostino D, Kielb S, Galvin JE, Cerbone B, Michel CA, Rusinek H, de Leon MJ, Glodzik L, De Santi S, Doraiswamy PM, Petrella JR, Wong TZ, Arnold SE, Karlawish JH, Wolk D, Smith CD, Jicha G, Hardy P, Sinha P, Oates E, Conrad G, Lopez OL, Oakley MA, Simpson DM, Porsteinsson AP, Goldstein BS, Martin K, Makino KM, Ismail MS, Brand C, Mulnard RA, Thai G, Mc-Adams-Ortiz C, Womack K, Mathews D, Quiceno M, Diaz-Arrastia R, King R, Weiner M, Martin-Cook K, DeVous M, Levey AI, Lah JJ, Cellar JS, Burns JM, Anderson HS, Swerdlow RH, Apostolova L, Tingus K, Woo E, Silverman DH, Lu PH, Bartzokis G, Graff-Radford NR, Parfitt F, Kendall T, Johnson H, Farlow MR, Hake AM, Matthews BR, Herring S, Hunt C, van Dyck CH, Carson RE, MacAvoy MG, Chertkow H, Bergman H, Hosein C, Stefanovic B, Caldwell C, Hsiung GYR, Feldman H, Mudge B, Assaly M, Kertesz A, Rogers J, Bernick C, Munic D, Kerwin D, Mesulam Marek Marsel, Lipowski K, Wu CK, Johnson N, Sadowsky C, Martinez W, Villena T, Turner RS, Johnson Kathleen, Reynolds B, Sperling RA, Johnson KA, Marshall G, Frey M, Lane B, Rosen A, Tinklenberg J, Sabbagh MN, Belden CM, Jacobson SA, Sirrel SA, Kowall N, Killiany R, Budson AE, Norbash A, Johnson PL, Allard J, Lerner A, Ogrocki P, Hudson L, Fletcher E, Carmichael O, Olichney J, DeCarli C, Kittur S, Borrie M, Lee TY, Bartha R, Johnson S, Asthana S, Carlsson CM, Potkin SG, Preda A, Nguyen D, Tariot P, Reeder S, Bates V, Capote H, Rainka M, Scharre DW, Kataki M, Adeli A, Zimmerman EA, Celmins D, Brown AD, Pearlson GD, Blank K, Anderson K, Santulli RB, Kitzmiller TJ, Schwartz ES, Sink KM, Williamson JD, Garg P, Watkins F, Ott BR, Querfurth H, Tremont G, Salloway S, Malloy P, Correia S, Rosen HJ, Miller BL, Mintzer J, Spicer K, Bachman D, Pasternak S, Rachinsky I, Drost D, Pomara N, Hernando R, Sarrael A, Schultz SK, Ponto LLB, Shim H, Smith KE, Relkin N, Chaing G, Raudin L, Smith A, Fargher K, Raj BA, Neylan T, Grafman J, Davis M, Morrison R, Hayes J, Finley S, Friedl K, Fleischman D, Arfanakis K, James O, Massoglia D, Fruehling JJ, Harding S, Peskind ER, Petrie EC, Li G, Yesavage JA, Taylor JL, Furst AJ. 2018. Uncovering the heterogeneity and temporal complexity of neurodegenerative diseases with Subtype and Stage Inference. *Nat Commun*. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-05892-0

Zhu S, Jiang Y, Xu K, Cui M, Ye W, Zhao G, Jin L, Chen X. 2020. The progress of gut microbiome research related to brain disorders. *J Neuroinflammation*. doi:10.1186/s12974-020-1705-z

Figures

Figure 1. Differential contribution of ADNI-derived features for the classification and prediction of ncMCI. The pictogram illustrates the differential contribution of ADNI-derived features (see Supplementary Information for a complete list of the assayed items) employed by the ML-based RF algorithm to classify and predict ncMCI subjects. Note that the 70-year-old age cutoff reveals a marked dichotomy on how the RF algorithm employs and weights different features to discriminate "younger" and "older" individuals.
For subjects < 70 years of age, the classification/prediction is primarily driven by neuropsychological testing (FAQ, ADAS13, RAVLT-immediate). On the contrary, subjects > 70 years of age are identified by a more structured palette of imaging, metabolic, and systemic data.



Tables

Table 1. Demographics. The table illustrates the demographics of the MCI cohort (t_0) as well as the demographics of the same subjects in the 24-month, for MCI converting to AD (cMCI, t_1), and in the 36-month follow-up for MCI subjects non converting do AD (ncMCI, t_2).

	MCI (n=520) Time: t_0	**cMCI** (n= 178) Time: t_1	**ncMCI** (n= 342) Time: t_2
Gender (female/male)	196 / 325	70 / 108	126 / 216
Age (years)	73.6 ± 7.6	75.2 ± 7.3	76.4 ± 7.8
education (y)	15.8 ± 2.9	15.8 ± 2.7	15.8 ± 2.9
MMSE	27.3 ± 1.9	23.7 ± 2.9	27.1 ± 2.9
ADAS13	17.7 ± 6.9	26.9 ± 6.8	16.6 ± 8.8
ApoE ε4 (Non carrier/Het/Homo)	252 / 207 / 61	57 / 91 / 30	195 / 116 / 31

Abbreviations: MCI, mild cognitive impairment; cMCI, converter mild cognitive impairment; ncMCI, non-converter mild cognitive impairment; MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; ADAS13, Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive subscales, 13 items; ApoE ε4 (Non carrier / Heterozygous carrier / Homozygous carrier), apolipoprotein E ε4 allele.

1 **Table 2. ML prediction performance for MCI subjects converting (cMCI) and non-converting (ncMCI) to AD.** The tables depict the ML ability to classify
2 cMCI and ncMCI subjects in the test dataset. The ranking is based on Accuracy values.

	cMCI				
	Number of trees	Predictivity	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
NEURO	500	66.8%	0.95	0.87	1.00
NEURO+EDU	300	66.2%	0.95	0.87	1.00
TRI_COL	300	12.70%	0.92	0.83	0.97
ENER_SUB	250	22.70%	0.92	0.79	1.00
SYST_IND	200	35.40%	0.92	0.83	0.97
AMINO	150	31.20%	0.90	0.79	0.97
NEURO+METABOL	200	59.6%	0.86	0.86	0.87
CSF+ENER_SUB	300	44.70%	0.86	1.00	0.75
CSF+VIT_SIG	250	55.5%	0.82	0.64	0.83
NEURO+VIT_SIG	300	59.6%	0.81	0.54	0.93
NEURO+ApoEε4	300	64.9%	0.81	0.60	0.94
MRI+BIL_ACID	300	51.7%	0.80	0.75	0.84
MRI+CSF	250	58.9%	0.78	0.64	0.85
MRI+NEURO+CSF	250	69.4%	0.78	0.64	0.85
CSF+AMINO	300	52%	0.78	0.68	0.81
NEURO+BIL_ACID	300	60.4%	0.77	0.60	0.86
NEURO+MRI	300	61.1%	0.75	0.56	0.87

	ncMCI				
	Number of trees	Predictivity	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
NEURO	500	84.9%	0.95	1.00	0.87
NEURO+EDU	300	86.4%	0.95	1.00	0.87
TRI_COL	300	87%	0.92	0.97	0.83
ENER_SUB	250	84.70%	0.92	1.00	0.79
SYST_IND	200	74.10%	0.92	0.97	0.83
AMINO	150	72.90%	0.90	0.97	0.79
NEURO+METABOL	200	85.7%	0.86	0.87	0.86
CSF+ENER_SUB	300	82.10%	0.86	0.75	1.00
CSF+VIT_SIG	250	77.3%	0.82	0.83	0.64
NEURO+VIT_SIG	300	84.2%	0.81	0.93	0.54
NEURO+ApoEε4	300	89.2%	0.81	0.94	0.60
MRI+BIL_ACID	300	89.9%	0.80	0.84	0.75
MRI+CSF	250	86.7%	0.78	0.85	0.64
MRI+NEURO+CSF	250	88.6%	0.78	0.85	0.64
CSF+AMINO	300	79.20%	0.78	0.81	0.68
NEURO+BIL_ACID	300	87.0%	0.77	0.86	0.60
NEURO+MRI	300	89.0%	0.75	0.87	0.56

3

4 Abbreviations (see also Supplementary Tables 1, 2, and 3): NEURO, neuropsychological tests; EDU, years of education; TRI_COL, Triglycerides and
5 cholesterol; ENER_SUB, energetic substrates; SYST_IND, systemic indices; AMINO, amino acids; METABOL, lipoproteins, glucogenesis-related metabolites

1 and amino acids; CSF, cerebrospinal fluid proteins; VIT_SIG, vital signs; ApoE ε4, apolipoprotein E ε4 allele; BIL_ACID, bile acids; MRI, magnetic resonance
2 imaging.

1 **Table 3. ML prediction performance for MCI subjects converting to AD (cMCI), following age stratification.** The tables depict the ML ability to classify
2 subjects following age stratification as indicated. Measurements of predictivity, accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity refer to the ML performance obtained
3 from the test-dataset. Please, note that, in both cases, the predictivity values do not reach the 85% threshold value. The ranking is based on the accuracy
4 score.

	cMCI (> 70)				
	Number of trees	Predictivity	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
MRI+METABOL	300	54.3%	0.98	0.95	1.00
MRI+VIT_SIGN	300	52.4%	0.98	0.95	1.00
MRI+SYST_IND	350	53%	0.95	0.90	1.00
TRI_COL	250	24.80%	0.93	0.85	1.00
ENER_SUB	250	25.50%	0.93	0.85	1.00
AMINO	200	36.20%	0.93	0.85	1.00
NEURO	500	59.0%	0.89	0.84	0.91
NEURO+EDU	200	61.8%	0.89	0.84	0.91
SYST_IND	250	37.10%	0.88	0.85	0.91
NEURO+CSF	300	76.0%	0.88	0.70	0.96
NEURO+CSF+ApoEε4	200	73.3%	0.88	0.80	0.92
NEURO+ApoEε4	350	65.4%	0.87	0.79	0.91
CSF+VIT_SIGN	250	54.8%	0.83	0.75	0.87
NEURO+VIT_SIGN	400	52.3%	0.81	0.65	0.91
NEURO+ENER_SUB	200	59%	0.78	0.55	0.94
NEURO+BIL_ACID	300	57.1%	0.77	0.50	0.89
CSF+METABOL	300	49.3%	0.76	0.56	0.83

	cMCI (< 70)				
	Number of trees	Predictivity	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
NEURO	400	67.4%	1.00	1.00	1.00
NEURO+EDU	200	71.4%	1.00	1.00	1.00
NEURO+MRI	350	63.8%	0.95	1.00	0.93
MRI+NEURO+CSF	300	65.4%	0.93	0.50	1.00
MRI	400	52.7%	0.90	0.67	1.00
CSF+VIT_SIGN	350	31.0%	0.88	1.00	0.86
CSF+SYST_IND	200	57.10%	0.88	0.00	1.00
CSF+AMINO	200	53.60%	0.88	0.00	1.00
MRI+CSF	250	57.7%	0.86	0.00	1.00
NEURO+VIT_SIGN	300	72.5%	0.78	0.43	0.94
NEURO+CSF	300	64.0%	0.76	0.63	0.89
NEURO+CSF+ApoEε4	200	68.0%	0.76	0.63	0.89
TRI_COL	250	15.60%	0.73	0.00	1.00
ENER_SUB	250	21.80%	0.73	0.00	1.00
SYST_IND	250	21.80%	0.73	0.00	1.00
AMINO	200	25%	0.73	0.00	1.00
MRI+ENER_SUB	400	53.10%	0.73	0.50	0.82

Abbreviations: NEURO, neuropsychological tests; EDU, years of education; TRI_COL, Triglycerides and cholesterol; ENER_SUB, energetic substrates; SYST_IND, systemic indices; AMINO, amino acids; METABOL, lipoproteins, glucogenesis-related metabolites, and amino acids; CSF, cerebrospinal fluid proteins; VIT_SIG, vital signs; ApoE ε4, apolipoprotein E ε4 allele; BIL_ACID, bile acids; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging.

Table 4. ML prediction performance for MCI subjects non-converting to AD (ncMCI), following age stratification. The tables depict the ML ability to classify subjects following age stratification as indicated. Measurements of predictivity, accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity refer to the ML performance obtained from the test-dataset. Please, note that, unlike cMCI (Table 3), the predictivity value exceeds the 85% threshold, with ML performance for ncMCI subjects < 70 years showing the highest predictivity scores. The ranking is based on the accuracy score.

	ncMCI (> 70)				
	Number of trees	Predictivity	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
MRI+METABOL	300	85.5%	0.98	1.00	0.95
MRI+VIT_SIGN	300	82.1%	0.98	1.00	0.95
MRI+SYST_IND	350	86.30%	0.95	1.00	0.90
TRI_COL	250	81.40%	0.93	1.00	0.85
ENER_SUB	250	81.90%	0.93	1.00	0.85
AMINO	200	73.90%	0.93	1.00	0.85
NEURO	500	84.6%	0.89	0.91	0.84
NEURO+EDU	200	85.1%	0.89	0.91	0.84
SYST_IND	250	77.10%	0.88	0.91	0.85
NEURO+CSF	300	81.8%	0.88	0.96	0.70
NEURO+CSF+ApoEε4	200	80.1%	0.88	0.92	0.80
NEURO+ApoEε4	350	86.6%	0.87	0.91	0.79
CSF+VIT_SIGN	250	74.4%	0.83	0.87	0.75
NEURO+VIT_SIGN	400	85.0%	0.81	0.91	0.65
NEURO+BIL_ACID	300	87.0%	0.77	0.89	0.50
CSF+METABOL	300	76.9%	0.76	0.83	0.56
MRI+NEURO+CSF	300	87.8%	0.74	0.88	0.50

	ncMCI (< 70)				
	Number of trees	Predictivity	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
NEURO	400	90.2%	1.00	1.00	1.00
NEURO+EDU	200	88.0%	1.00	1.00	1.00
NEURO+MRI	350	86.0%	0.95	0.93	1.00
MRI+NEURO+CSF	300	89.5%	0.93	1.00	0.50
MRI	400	87.3%	0.90	1.00	0.67
CSF+VIT_SIGN	350	85.5%	0.88	0.86	1.00
CSF+SYST_IND	200	87.90%	0.88	1.00	0.00
CSF+AMINO	200	89.40%	0.88	1.00	0.00
MRI+CSF	250	89.5%	0.86	1.00	0.00
NEURO+VIT_SIGN	300	90.0%	0.78	0.94	0.43
NEURO+CSF	300	94.6%	0.76	0.89	0.63
NEURO+CSF+ApoEε4	200	91.9%	0.76	0.89	0.63
TRI_COL	250	91%	0.73	1.00	0.00
ENER_SUB	250	93.30%	0.73	1.00	0
SYST_IND	250	86.60%	0.73	1.00	0
AMINO	200	86.60%	0.73	1.00	0
MRI+TRI_COL	300	12.80%	0.73	0.82	0.50

Abbreviations: NEURO, neuropsychological tests; EDU, years of education; TRI_COL, Triglycerides and cholesterol; ENER_SUB, energetic substrates; SYST_IND, systemic indices; AMINO, amino acids; METABOL, lipoproteins, glucogenesis-related metabolites and amino acids; CSF, cerebrospinal fluid proteins; VIT_SIG, vital signs; ApoE ε4, apolipoprotein E ε4 allele; BIL_ACID, bile acids; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging.

Supplementary information

The manuscript includes the following supplementary material:

Supplementary File 1
Supplementary File 2
Supplementary File 3
Supplementary File 4
Supplementary File 5
Supplementary File 6
Supplementary File 7