

Title

Voice of the patient: Emergence of new motor and non-motor symptoms in early Parkinson's Disease?

Authors

^{1,2} Michelle H.S. Tosin, PhD, ³Tanya Simuni, MD, ²Glenn T. Stebbins, PhD, ^{4,5}Jesse M. Cedarbaum, MD

Word count

Abstract: 250 (max. 250)

Main Text: 2532 (max. 3700)

Running title

Motor and non-motor symptoms in early PD

Keywords

Parkinson's Disease, Clinimetrics, Activities of Daily Living, Patient Outcome Assessment, Severity of Illness Index

Financial Disclosure/Conflict of Interest concerning the research related to the manuscript and Funding sources for study: none

¹ Department of Nursing, Fluminense Federal University, Niterói, RJ, BRA

² Department of Neurological Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL, USA

³ Department of Neurology, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

⁴ Coeruleus Clinical Sciences LLC, Woodbridge CT, USA

⁵ Department of Neurology, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, US

1 **Abstract**

2 Objective: To explore the utility of using patient reported emergence of new symptoms (ES) as
3 an outcome measure during the early phase of the disease.

4 Methods: We analyzed data from MDS-UPDRS Part IB and Part II from the Safety, Tolerability,
5 and Efficacy Assessment of Isradipine for PD (STEADY-PD3) study, with at least one annual
6 follow-up over two years. We divided the sample into categories of follow-up visit (between 0
7 and 12-months, and 13 and 24-months) and the number of ES for each part of the scale
8 between participants who started symptomatic treatment and those who did not (STx=yes/no).
9 We assessed ES differences between participants STx in each follow-up visit using Mann-
10 Whitney U test, and the Kaplan-Meier analyses.

11 Results: Of 331 participants observed for months 0 to 12, 288 (87%) developed ES, and 182
12 (55%) started STx. For Part IB, the median number of ES did not significantly differ between the
13 STx groups ($Z=-0.86$, $p = 0.39$), while for Part 2, the number of ES was significantly higher for the
14 STx=yes group ($Z=-2.38$, $p=0.02$). Of 148 participants who continued to be observed for months
15 13 to 24, 114 (77%) developed ES, and 62 (42%) started STx. For Part IB, the median number of
16 ES did not significantly differ between the STx groups ($Z=-0.33$, $p = 0.74$), while for Part 2, the
17 number of ES was significantly higher for the STx=yes group ($Z=-2.25$, $p=0.02$).

18 Conclusions: Assessing ES among patient-reported experiences of daily living may provide a
19 useful marker for tracking PD progression.

20 Introduction

21 The Braak hypothesis holds that as Parkinson’s disease (PD) progresses, different areas of the
22 brain become progressively invaded by the neurodegenerative process which manifests in
23 behavioral changes ¹. Although the clinical impact of PD is physically and visually obvious to
24 most patients in the early stages of the disease, we do not have sensitive tools to assess disease
25 progression specifically in early PD ²⁻⁴. Currently, to assess progression we rely mainly on
26 observations of symptoms and functionality, measured with clinician completed scales and
27 patient self-report measures ^{5,6}. The progression of functional impairment over the course of
28 the disease, especially in its earliest stages, seems almost imperceptible as measured by the
29 current scales. However, in daily practice, clinicians and researchers are commonly struck by
30 patient statements such as: “Last time I saw you I could do “X”, but now I can’t (or I need help,
31 or it takes me longer)”. Disease progression, as viewed through this patient-centric lens of ever-
32 accumulating milestones of difficulty to the point of failure, is not a linear process, but a
33 stepwise, saltatory decline, with emerging symptoms (ES) or impairments piling on the old, one
34 after another ^{7,8}.

35 Measuring the impact of therapies designed to slow disease progression is thus rendered
36 extremely challenging, with attempts from clinical trials to assess the clinical meaningfulness
37 and statistical significance of interventions that might reduce by 30-50% an average disease
38 progression rate of 5% per year. In this sense, determining how the measurement ES can
39 outline the course of the disease, especially in patients with PD at an early stage, will contribute
40 to the development of new health technologies based on patient centered outcomes ^{9,10}.

41 A similar initiative in patients with early Alzheimer's disease tracked the appearance of new
42 neuropsychiatric symptoms, suggesting clinical relevance when associated with increased
43 morbidity¹¹. In our study, we aimed to explore the utility of assessing ES impacting the daily
44 experiences of patients with early PD, as measured by the Movement Disorder Society-
45 sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS) Part IB and II
46 in relation to the initiation of antiparkinson therapy (STx), as a potentially novel patient
47 relevant outcome measure during the early phase of the disease.

48

49 **Methods**

50 We analyzed data from the Safety, Tolerability, and Efficacy Assessment of Isradipine for PD
51 (STEADY-PD) study, a multicenter, randomized, parallel-group, double-blind, placebo-controlled
52 trial (ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT02168842). The aims and methods of the STEADY-PD study have
53 been published elsewhere¹², as well as results¹³.

54 Data and Sample

55 From the enrolled cohort of 336 participants of the STEADY-PD dataset, we limited the sample
56 to PD participants with complete data from MDS-UPDRS Part IB (Non-motor Aspects of
57 Experiences of Daily Living) and Part II (Motor Aspects of Experiences of Daily Living), and with
58 at least one annual follow-up for two years, totaling 331 participants.

59 Because the outcome of the STEADY-PD study showed no effect of the investigative agent, in
60 our analysis we combined participants receiving both placebo and active treatment.

61 Outcomes

62 Our primary outcome was ES for participants during the course of the study. To perform this
63 analysis, we divided the sample into categories according to the period of the follow-up visit,
64 initiation of antiparkinson treatment or not (STx=yes or STx=no) during the observation period,
65 and the presence of ES. We used STx as a proxy of patient- and clinician-perceived disease
66 progression. We analyzed these outcomes for each part of the scale.

67 We separated the follow-up visits in two distinct periods: the first observation period was when
68 the participants were evaluated between baseline and 12 months, and the second observation
69 period was when the participants were evaluated between 13 months and 24 months.

70 To assign STx categories, we used the date when antiparkinson therapy was initiated (the visit
71 day) and analyzed it according to the time interval between follow-up visits. For example, if the
72 subject started antiparkinson therapy on day 105 of the study, he was allocated to the first
73 observation period between baseline and 12 months to the “STx=yes” group for the entire
74 interval. If a participant started antiparkinson therapy on day 400 of the study, he was
75 allocated to the second treatment period between 13 and 24 months.

76 We defined ES as the occurrence of a new symptom between the beginning of each period and
77 the follow-up visit. For example, participants who were scored as zero on any given item on the
78 MDS-UPDRS at the baseline and had any score other than zero at 12 months, were classified as
79 having an ES. Those who were scored zero at the baseline, zero at 13 months and any score
80 different from zero at 24 months were classified as having ES in the period between 13 months
81 and 24 months.

82 Statistical Analyses

83 We used tables and histograms with distribution of frequencies, medians, and percentages to
84 summarize the descriptive statistics. Comparison ES between participant starting
85 antiparksonian therapy (STx=yes) and those not on antiparksonian therapy (STx=no) were
86 conducted as binomial tests. Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare differences between
87 the two groups of participants with or without ES, regardless of STx status. Survival
88 distributions for ES vs non-ES groups were analyzed using Kaplan-Meier curves. Statistical
89 significance was set at $\alpha < 0.05$ and analyses were corrected for multiple comparisons,
90 where appropriate, using a Bonferroni correction. Finally, we estimated required sample size to
91 detect at least a 30% change in ES over a 12-month period. All statistical analyses were
92 performed using SPSS[®] Statistics version 26 (IBM reference)

93

94 **Results**

95 At baseline, the 331 STEADY-PD participants included in this study had a mean age of 62.4 years
96 (± 9.0), with a preponderance of males (72%). The mean disease duration from diagnosis was
97 10 months (± 8.8), and the Hoehn and Yahr stage median score was 2 (ranging from 0 to 3). The
98 mean total for the Motor Examination (Part III) of the MDS-UPDRS was 25.4 (SD 10.4). For the
99 MDS-UPDRS Parts that were analyzed for this study (Parts IB and II) the means were 4.1 (SD
100 3.02) and 5.24 (SD 3.95).

101 Of 331 participants observed in the first treatment period, 288 (87%) developed ES and 182
102 (55.0%) were STx=yes ($p=0.078$). Of 149 participants in the second treatment period one patient
103 had missing values. Of the 148 remaining participants in the second treatment period 114 (77%)
104 developed ES, and 62 (42%) were STx=yes ($p=0.058$) (Table 1).

105 Based on the period treatment subsamples, we assessed the number of ES reported per
106 participant separately for MDS-UPDRS Parts IB, II and for Parts 1B and II combined.
107 Of the seven symptoms assessed by Part IB of the MDS-UPDRS there was a median ES of 1
108 (range = 0 – 4) in the STx-yes subsample in first period with an average of ES per participant of
109 0.98. In the second period, the median remained at 1 for the STx-yes subsample, but the range
110 of ES increased to 0 – 5 with an average of ES per participant of 0.60. There was no significant
111 difference between the number of participants with ES on Part IB in the STx-yes and STx-no
112 groups in both periods ($p=0.069$ on the first treatment period and $p=0.162$ on the second
113 treatment period). Also, ES of the Part IB were not significantly different between the STx-yes
114 and STx-no groups for either treatment period ($Z=-0.86$, $p=0.39$ on the first treatment period
115 and $Z=-0.33$, $p=0.74$ on the second treatment period) (Table 1), (see Supplemental 1 A and D).
116 Of the thirteen symptoms assessed by Part II of the MDS-UPDRS, we found a median ES of 2
117 (range 0 - 7) in the STx-yes subsample for both follow-up periods, with an average of ES per
118 participant of 2.12 in the first treatment period and 1.94 in the second treatment period. There
119 was a significant difference between the number of participants with ES in the STx-yes and STx-
120 no groups in the first treatment period year ($p=0.037$) but not in the second treatment period
121 ($p=0.547$). Most participants had 0 or 1 ES in both the STx-yes and STx-no groups. However,
122 there was a significant difference in the prevalence of ES when the therapeutic groups were
123 compared in the two periods ($Z=-2.38$, $p=0.02$ for the first treatment period and $Z=-2.25$, $p=0.02$
124 for the second treatment period) (Table 1), (see Supplemental 1 B and E).
125 When we considered all 20 items of Parts IB and II of the MDS-UPDRS combined, we found a
126 median of 3 ES (range 0-11) in the STx-yes subsample in first period with an average of ES per

127 participant of 3.1, and a median of 3 (range 0-12) in the second treatment period with an
128 average of ES per participant of 2.53. There was significant difference between the number of
129 ES in the STx-yes and STx-no groups only in the first treatment period ($Z=-2.19$, $p=0.039$). There
130 was a significant preponderance of participants in the STx-no subsample with two ES in the first
131 period (26.8%, $Z=-1.53$ $p=0.028$). In the second treatment period, participants with one ES
132 prevailed and no significance was found between the therapeutic groups (Table 1), (see
133 Supplemental 1 C and F).

134 Next, we analyzed the pattern of individual symptoms experienced by the groups of
135 participants at baseline and in the two treatment periods (Figure 1), (see Supplemental 2). Part
136 IB (Figure 1, A) and Part II (Figures 1, B and C) item-analyses demonstrated that participants in
137 the STx-yes group had significantly more ES related to Freezing ($p=0.014$), Eating Tasks
138 ($p=0.019$), Walking and Balance ($p=0.045$) and Doing Hobbies ($p=0.028$) compared to the STx-no
139 group in the first treatment period. In the second treatment period participants in the STx-yes
140 group had significantly more ES related to Speech ($p=0.002$), Hygiene ($p=0.007$), Saliva and
141 Drooling ($p=0.043$) and Eating Tasks ($p=0.045$) compared to the STx-no group. It should be
142 noted, however that since MDS-UPDRS was performed only at the beginning and end of each
143 interval, we cannot relate occurrence of ES to need for medication in this analysis.

144 Given these results, we were interested to see how ES might perform as a clinical trial outcome
145 measure. We estimate that a sample size of 98 would provide 0.80 power ($1-\beta$) to detect a 30%
146 reduction in ES from baseline to 12-month follow-up, given an alpha of 0.05 and with equal
147 assignment to treatment group and continuity correction when using Part IB alone. A sample
148 size of 96 would be required for the same parameters when considering Part II alone. However,

149 when both Parts IB and II are combined, a sample size of 82 would provide 0.80 power ($1-\beta$) to
150 detect a 30% reduction in ES given the same parameters for alpha and subject assignment.

151

152 **Discussion**

153 Kiebertz et al. recently suggested that tracking milestones of disease progression could provide
154 a useful outcome measure for clinical trials of potential disease modifying therapies¹⁴.

155 However, milestones previously proposed, such as need for symptomatic medication,
156 significant falls, or recognizable cognitive impairment, either represent changes in participant
157 status relevant to more advanced disease or represent subjective and/or socially determined
158 states. In early disease a milestone-based assessment of disease progression would of
159 necessity need to be much more fine-grained.

160 In this exploratory analysis we asked whether, like the Braak progression of engagement of new
161 brain areas concurrent with worsening of severity of pathology, the clinical progression of PD
162 can be characterized by progressive appearance of ES, independent of the worsening severity
163 of symptoms already present^{1,15}. Using data from Parts IB and 2 of the MDS-UPDRS in the
164 STEADY-PD clinical trial¹², we found that the number of both motor and non-motor symptoms
165 reported by participants increased over time in a clinical trial population, and that 87% of the
166 study population reported at least one ES over the first 12 months of the study. Emergence of
167 new motor symptoms was slightly more frequent than the emergence of non-motor symptoms,
168 and the incidence, particular of motor ES was reduced in the group of participants who began
169 STx during the first 12 months of the study. Thus, tracking self-reported ES may provide a novel
170 means of assessing the progression of PD.

171 The results of our study demonstrated that Parts IB and II of the MDS-UPDRS, taken together as
172 a single Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO) measure, can function as a record of milestone
173 attainment in the form of appearance of new disease manifestations¹⁶. Arguably, especially
174 early in disease, appearance of a new symptom, as occurred in 87% of our participants within
175 the first year of observation, could be interpreted to represent a significant milestone for most
176 persons suffering from PD. The sensitivity of tracking ES as an outcome measure is reflected by
177 the sample size estimates that less than 100 participants/arm would be required to observe a
178 statistically significant effect in a 1-year clinical trial.

179 Our work does have limitations. First, our observation is based on a study in which the MDS-
180 UPDRS was administered only at yearly intervals. At this point in time, data are not available in
181 the public domain from other clinical studies that have administered the MDS-UPDRS more
182 frequently than once every 6 or 12 months. Thus, we were unable, for example to assess the
183 stability of ES once recorded. For ES to constitute a truly useful outcome measure, one would
184 like to be able to verify stability of ES with observations at consecutive timepoints at least a
185 month apart. Thus, it would be highly desirable to replicate our observations in a database with
186 more-frequent MDS-UPDRS administration. Secondly, the clinical meaningfulness for
187 participants of ES based on the MDS-UPDRS item inventory, while an attractive concept, has yet
188 to be verified. Such verification could come either via the traditional scale validation and
189 clinimetric methodology- use of Delphi panels, cognitive debriefing, and revalidation, or via
190 correlation with patient self-reported experiences using approaches, such as the Patient Report
191 of Problems (PROP) proposed by Vinikoor-Ilmer et al. based on data in the Fox Insight
192 database¹⁷.

193 Finally, we found it interesting to note that the appearance of ES was slightly less frequent in
194 study participants, all of whom were naïve to dopaminergic medications at enrollment, who
195 began to receive STx during the study. Based on the available data it cannot be determined
196 whether either a) STx delayed the onset of ES; b) Participants who started EX paradoxically had
197 less ES during the time interval or c) STx masked the severity of ES that were present
198 sufficiently to render them unremarkable using the MDS-UPDRS definitions. This topic could be
199 a subject for further study. However, as has been reported, initiation of STx is the result of a
200 complex medical and often social and economic calculus for individual participants, and factors
201 like social circumstances, continuation of employment etc., may be more powerful
202 determinants of STx initiation than emergence of any one or combination of symptoms¹⁸.

203

204 **Conclusions**

205 New symptoms continue to appear in most PD participants in the first 2 years of PD. Motor ES
206 (Part II) were more frequent than non-motor ES (Part IB) among participants initiating
207 antiparkinsonian treatment in both 0-12 and 13-24 months of the study. Assessing ES among
208 patient-reported experiences of daily living may provide a useful marker for tracking PD
209 progression. The concept of tracking ES as a clinical trial outcome measure is worthy of
210 exploration in future studies and alternative datasets.

211

Author Roles

1. Research project: A. Conception, B. Organization, C. Execution.
2. Statistical Analysis: A. Design, B. Execution, C. Review and Critique.
3. Manuscript Preparation: A. Writing of the first draft, B. Review and Critique.

M.H.S. Tosin: 1A, 1B, 1C, 2A, 2B, 2C, 3A.

T. Simuni: 3B.

G.T. Stebbins: 1A, 1B, 2A, 2C, 3B.

J.M. Cedarbaum: 1A, 1B, 2C, 3B.

Disclosures

1. Funding Sources and Conflict of Interest: No specific funding was received for this work and the authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest relevant to this work.

2. Financial Disclosures for the previous 12 months:

MHST received grants and research from: Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), International Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society. MHST Reports consulting with honoraria from Rush University Medical Center.

TS in the last 12 months has served as a consultant for Acadia, Caraway Therapeutics, Critical Path for Parkinson's Consortium (CPP), Denali, General Electric (GE), Neuroderm, Sanofi, Sinopia, Sunovion, Roche, Takeda, MJFF and Voyager. Dr. Simuni served on the ad board for Acadia, Denali, General Electric (GE), Sunovion, Roche. Dr. Simuni has served as a member of the scientific advisory board of Caraway Therapeutics, Neuroderm and Sanofi. Dr. Simuni has

received research funding from Biogen, Roche, Neuroderm, Sanofi, Sun Pharma, Amneal, Prevail, UCB, NINDS, MJFF, Parkinson's Foundation

GTS reports consulting and advisory board membership with honoraria from: Acadia, Pharmaceuticals, Adamas Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Biogen, Inc., Ceregene, Inc., CHDI Management, Inc., Cleveland Clinic Foundation, Ingenix Pharmaceutical Services (i3 Research), MedGenesis Therapeutix, Inc., Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc., Pfizer, Inc., Tools-4-Patients, Ultragenyx, Inc., and the Sunshine Care Foundation. GTS received grants and research from: National Institutes of Health, Department of Defense, Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research, Dystonia Coalition, CHDI, Cleveland Clinic Foundation, International Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society, and CBD Solutions. GTS reports honoraria from: International Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society, American Academy of Neurology, Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research, Food and Drug Administration, National Institutes of Health, and the Alzheimer's Association. GTS received salary from Rush University Medical Center.

JMC receives salary support from Coeruleus Clinical Sciences LLC and Yale Medical School. He has received honoraria from the Charcot Marie Tooth Research Foundation, the Michael J Fox Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health.

Ethical Compliance Statement

We confirm that we have read the Journal's position on issues involved in ethical publication and affirm that this work is consistent with those guidelines. This is a study of secondary data analysis and therefore did not need ethical approval.

References

1. Braak H, Del Tredici K, Rüb U, De Vos RAJ, Jansen Steur ENH, Braak E. Staging of brain pathology related to sporadic Parkinson's disease. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2003;24(2):197–211.
2. Holden SK, Finseth T, Sillau SH, Berman BD. Progression of MDS-UPDRS Scores Over Five Years in De Novo Parkinson Disease from the Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative Cohort. *Mov Disord Clin Pract*. 2018;5(1):47–53.
3. Regnault A, Boroojerdi B, Meunier J, Bani M, Morel T, Cano S. Does the MDS-UPDRS provide the precision to assess progression in early Parkinson's disease? Learnings from the Parkinson's progression marker initiative cohort. *J Neurol*. 2019;266(8):1927–36.
4. Vu TC, Nutt JG, Holford NHG. Progression of motor and nonmotor features of Parkinson's disease and their response to treatment. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2012;74(2):267–83.
5. McCann H, Cartwright H, Halliday GM. Neuropathology of α -synuclein propagation and braak hypothesis. *Mov Disord*. 2016;31(2):152–60.
6. Lawrence BJ, Gasson N, Kane R, Bucks RS, Loftus AM. Activities of daily living, depression, and quality of life in Parkinson's disease. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(7):e102294.
7. Strupp J, Kunde A, Galushko M, Voltz R, Golla H. Severely Affected by Parkinson Disease: The Patient's View and Implications for Palliative Care. *Am J Hosp Palliat Med*. 2018;35(4):579–85.
8. Fox S, Cashell A, Kernohan WG, Lynch M, McGlade C, O'Brien T, et al. Palliative care for Parkinson's disease: Patient and carer's perspectives explored through qualitative interview. *Palliat Med*. 2017 Jul 28;31(7):634–41.
9. Pires AO, Teixeira FG, Mendes-Pinheiro B, Serra SC, Sousa N, Salgado AJ. Old and new

- challenges in Parkinson's disease therapeutics. *Prog Neurobiol.* 2017;156:69–89.
10. van Uem JMT, Marinus J, Canning C, van Lummel R, Dodel R, Liepelt-Scarfone I, et al. Health-Related Quality of Life in patients with Parkinson's disease-A systematic review based on the ICF model. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2016;61(5):26–34.
 11. Tariot P, Lyketsos C, Crans G, Cedarbaum J, Hernandez C, Abushakra S. The Effects of ELND005 (Scyllo-Inositol) on Emergence of Neuropsychiatric Symptoms (NPS) in Mild/Moderate Alzheimers Disease: Results from a 78-Week Phase 2 Study (P04.215). *Neurology.* 2012;78(1 Supplement):P04.215 LP-P04.215.
 12. Biglan KM, Oakes D, Lang AE, Hauser RA, Hodgeman K, Greco B, et al. A novel design of a Phase III trial of isradipine in early Parkinson disease (STEADY-PD III). *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.* 2017;4(6):360–8.
 13. Simuni T. Isradipine versus placebo in early Parkinson disease a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;172(9):591–8.
 14. Kieburtz K, Katz R, McGarry A, Olanow CW. A New Approach to the Development of Disease-Modifying Therapies for PD; Fighting Another Pandemic. *Mov Disord.* 2021;36(1):59–63.
 15. Jellinger KA. Is Braak staging valid for all types of Parkinson's disease? *J Neural Transm.* 2018;0(0):1–9.
 16. Kane PB, Benjamin DM, Barker RA, Lang AE, Sherer T, Kimmelman J. Comparison of Patient and Expert Perceptions of the Attainment of Research Milestones in Parkinson's Disease. *Mov Disord.* 2021 Jan;36(1):171–7.
 17. Vinikoor-Imler L, Arbatti L, Hosamath A, Sapir I, Shirvan J, Maserejian N, et al. Cross-

Sectional Profile of Most Bothersome Problems as Reported Directly by Individuals with Parkinson's Disease. In: 2697. Neurology; 2021. p. 15 Supplement.

18. LeWitt P, Oakes D, Cui L. The need for levodopa as an end point of Parkinson's disease progression in a clinical trial of selegiline and α -tocopherol. *Mov Disord.* 1997;12(2):183-9.

Table 1. Emergent symptoms in participants with or without antiparkinsonian therapy measured by MDS-UPDRS Parts IB and II according to the follow-up visit

0 to 12 Months (n of patients=331, 100%)													
MDS-UPDRS	STx-Yes (n of patients=182, 55.0%)				STx-No (n of patients=149, 45.0%)				Total of patients with ES (%)	Total of ES (%)	Binomial Test for Patients STx Yes vs. No	Mann-Whitney Z-score (Patients)	p-value (Patients)
	N of Patients (%)	N of ES	ES Median (Min-Max)	Average of ES per patient	N of Patients (%)	N of ES	ES Median (Min-Max)	Average of ES per patient					
ES-Part IB	108 (56.8)	179 (56.3)	1 (0-4)	0.98	82 (43.2)	139 (43.7)	1 (0-6)	0.93	190 (57.4)	318 (100.0)	0.069	-0.86	0.389
ES-Part II	142 (56.8)	386 (61.8)	2 (0-7)	2.12	108 (43.2)	239 (38.2)	2 (0-9)	1.6	250 (75.5)	625 (100.0)	0.037	-2.38	0.017
ES-Parts IB and II	162 (56.3)	565 (59.9)	3 (0-11)	3.1	126 (43.8)	378 (40.0)	2 (0-12)	2.54	288 (87.0)	943 (100.0)	0.039	-2.19	0.028
13 to 24 Months (n of patients=148, 100%)													
MDS-UPDRS	STx-Yes (n=62, 41.9%)				STx-No (n=86, 58.1%)				Total of Patients with ES	Total of ES (%)	Binomial Test	Mann-Whitney Z-score (Patients)	p-value (Patients)
	N of Patients (%)	N of ES	ES Median (Min-Max)	Average of ES per patient	N of Patients (%)	N of ES	ES Median (Min-Max)	Average of ES per patient					
ES-Part IB	25 (40.3)	37 (41.1)	1 (0-5)	0.60	37 (59.7)	53 (58.9)	1 (0-3)	0.62	62 (41.9)	90 (100.0)	0.162	-0.33	0.738
ES-Part II	46 (46.5)	120 (53.3)	2 (0-7)	1.94	53 (53.5)	105 (46.6)	2 (0-6)	1.22	99 (29.9)	225 (100.0)	0.547	-2.25	0.024
ES-Parts IB and II	49 (43.0)	157 (49.8)	3 (0-12)	2.53	65 (57.0)	158 (50.2)	2 (0-8)	1.84	114 (77.0)	315 (100.0)	0.16	-1.529	0.126

STx: Symptomatic treatment starting during the interval | ES: Emergent symptoms

Figure 1. Proportion of participants endorsing individual MDS-UPDRS Part IB and II scale items at baseline and at follow-up study visits. Emergent symptoms (ES) reported at the follow-up timepoints are divided according to use of antiparkinson therapy (STx-yes and STx-no).



