

## **Speech and language impairments in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia:**

### **A systematic review**

Amandine Geraudie,<sup>1,2</sup> Petronilla Battista,<sup>1,3,4</sup> Adolfo M. García,<sup>3,5,6,7</sup> Isabel E. Allen,<sup>3,8</sup>  
Zachary A. Miller,<sup>1</sup> Maria Luisa Gorno-Tempini,<sup>1,3</sup> Maxime Montembeault<sup>1\*</sup>

---

\* Corresponding author: Maxime Montembeault, Ph.D., Memory and Aging Center, Department of Neurology, University of California San Francisco, 675 Nelson Rising Lane, Suite 190, San Francisco, CA, USA, 94158. E-mail: maxime.montembeault@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Memory and Aging Center, Department of Neurology, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA

<sup>2</sup> Neurology Department, Toulouse University Hospital, Toulouse, France

<sup>3</sup> Global Brain Health Institute, University of California, San Francisco, USA

<sup>4</sup> Istituti Clinici Scientifici Maugeri IRCCS, Institute of Bari, Via Generale Nicola Bellomo, Bari, Italy

<sup>5</sup> Universidad de San Andrés, Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>6</sup> National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET), Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>7</sup> Departamento de Lingüística y Literatura, Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Santiago, Chile

<sup>8</sup> Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA

## **Abstract**

Although behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia (bvFTD) is classically defined by behavioral and socio-emotional changes, impairments often extend to other cognitive functions. These include early speech and language deficits related to the disease's core neural disruptions. Yet, their scope and clinical relevance remains poorly understood. This systematic review characterizes such disturbances in bvFTD, considering clinically, neuroanatomically, genetically, and neuropathologically defined subgroups. We included 181 experimental studies, with at least 5 bvFTD patients diagnosed using accepted criteria, comparing speech and language outcomes between bvFTD patients and healthy controls or between bvFTD subgroups. Results reveal extensive and heterogeneous deficits across cohorts, with (a) consistent lexico-semantic, orthographic, and prosodic impairments; (b) inconsistent deficits in motor speech and grammar; and (c) relative preservation of phonological skills. Also, preliminary findings suggest that the severity of speech and language deficits might be associated with global cognitive impairment, predominantly temporal or fronto-temporal atrophy and *MAPT* mutations (vs *C9orf72*). Although under-recognized, these impairments contribute to patient characterization and phenotyping, while potentially informing diagnosis and prognosis.

**Keywords:** behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia, speech, language, phonology, orthography, lexico-semantics, grammar, prosody, systematic review

## 1. Introduction

The behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia (bvFTD) is a neurodegenerative disorder characterized by a progressive decline in social cognitive functions and changes in personality and behavior (Neary et al., 1998; Rascovsky et al., 2011). Current diagnostic criteria include early behavioral disinhibition, apathy or inertia, loss of sympathy or empathy, stereotyped behaviour, hyperorality, dietary changes, deficits in executive functions and spared memory and visuo-spatial functions (Rascovsky et al., 2011). Yet, substantial deficits are being increasingly recognized in other domains. Crucially, these include speech and language deficits, which often emerge in early disease stages (Cheran et al., 2019) and affect daily functionality (Lima-Silva et al., 2015). To understand the scope and clinical relevance of these disruptions, we conducted the first systematic review of speech and language deficits in bvFTD, considering their relationship with clinical, neural, genetic, and neuropathological factors.

Beyond a brief mention of stereotypy of speech, current diagnostic criteria of bvFTD make no reference to speech and language. Yet, the article describing the criteria report specific speech and language deficits in as many 20% of patients (Rascovsky et al., 2011), in line with earlier characterizations highlighting altered speech output (spontaneity or press of speech), stereotypies, echolalia, perseveration, and mutism (Neary et al., 1998). More recently, evidence from a large bvFTD sample (Saxon et al., 2017) shows that naming deficits are as frequent as hyperorality (a core diagnostic feature) in the sample informing Rascovsky's criteria (55%) (Rascovsky et al., 2011). In bvFTD, speech and language symptoms extend to multiple language domains and go beyond executive dysfunction (Hardy et al., 2016). They can appear very early in the disease, even at pre-symptomatic stages (Cheran et al., 2019), and they worsen as disease progresses (Ash et al., 2019). They are related to damage in cerebral regions that are targeted in bvFTD as well as part of the speech and language brain networks (Hardy et al., 2016). They can also pose differential diagnosis challenges with language-predominant neurodegenerative diseases such as primary progressive aphasia (PPA) (Pozueta et al., 2019). Thus, the neglect of speech and language in bvFTD may hinder valuable opportunities for disease characterization and phenotyping, calling for comprehensive overviews of existing evidence.

Yet, no study has provided a comprehensive and systematic overview of speech and language in bvFTD. Although a few primary studies have focused on language symptoms in bvFTD, they most often include low sample sizes, given the low prevalence of this syndrome, or they only provide partial coverage of relevant language domains. Fortunately, multiple

bvFTD reports also include language tests as part of their secondary outcome measures. A systematic review of all this evidence would provide a detailed account of speech and language in bvFTD, potentially revealing underexplored markers to complement diagnosis (especially in contexts lacking gold-standard pathological or genetic data), prognosis (as communication difficulties may influence behavioural changes (Harris et al., 2016)), and management (given that such difficulties increase caregiver burden (Savundranayagam et al., 2005)).

The goal of this study is to systematically review the existing studies covering language functioning in bvFTD. First, we aim to determine the impaired and preserved language domains in bvFTD by reviewing studies comparing bvFTD patients to controls. Given the fact that we expect some heterogeneity in language outcomes in bvFTD patients, the second aim of this study is to investigate which bvFTD features are associated with more severe language impairments. To do so, we will review studies comparing patients' subgroups based on clinical (for example, according to severity of the global cognitive impairment), neural (for example, temporal vs. frontal atrophy), genetic (for example, no mutation, *C9orf72*, *MAPT* or *GRN* mutations), and neuropathological (for example, frontotemporal lobar degeneration tau [FTLD-tau] vs. FTLD-TDP) profiles. A better characterization of language profile in these patients may contribute to a more fine-grained phenotyping, differential diagnosis as well as prognosis in bvFTD patients.

## **2. Methods**

This work was performed and reported following Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al., 2021).

### **2.1. Search strategy**

A systematic review of the literature was conducted on the following databases: PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, PsycINFO and Cochrane CENTRAL, with the help of a university librarian. In PubMed, the search was conducted with the following search terms: ("language disorders" (as a MeSH term), "Aphasia" (as a MeSH term), "language", "linguistic", "aphasia", "aphasic", "speech", "naming", "anomic", "anomia", "semantic", "semantics", "syntax", "syntactic", "prosody", "prosodic", "phonology", "phonological", "discourse", "picture description", "fluency", "grammar", "agrammatism", "agrammatic", "writing", "write", "reading", "read", "comprehension", "repetition", "dysarthria", "spell", "spelling", "communication", "word", "sentence", "verb", "verbal", "noun", "lexical",

“lexicon”, “dyslexia”, “dyslexic”, “alexia”, “alexia”) AND (“bvFTD” or (“behavioral” or “behavioural”) and (“frontotemporal lobar degeneration” (as a MeSH term) or “ftld”) or (“behavioral” or “behavioural”) and (“frontotemporal” or “fronto-temporal”) and (“dementia” or “dementias” or “degeneration”)) or (“behavioral” or “behavioural”) and (“ftd”)). The same terms were used for a generic search (without PubMed field tags) in other databases. The search was conducted on February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020. Additionally, reference lists of identified papers were manually reviewed for additional relevant articles. Duplicates were removed and only published articles or articles in press were retained.

## **2.2. Study selection**

Articles were selected by two independent raters (AG and MM) based on the following criteria: (i) article written in English; (ii) experimental study in humans (excluding reviews and animal studies); (iii) inclusion of at least five bvFTD patients (excluding FTD-ALS patients or general FTD group); (iv) bvFTD patients diagnosed with accepted international consensus criteria (Neary et al., 1998; Rascovsky et al., 2011) – in light of this criterion, articles published before 1998 have therefore been excluded; when the diagnostic approach was not clear, the corresponding author of the paper was contacted by email (in case of no response or unavailability of relevant information from the researchers, the study was excluded); (v) comparison group of interest (healthy controls or subgroups of bvFTD patients); (vi) report of the performance in a relevant speech or language domain for bvFTD patients alongside a statistical comparison between groups. We targeted the following speech and language domains: global language screening, motor speech (including motor speech examination and motor speech features extracted from connected speech), phonology (including phonological manipulation and repetition tests), orthography (including reading and writing tasks), lexico-semantics (including word retrieval, word comprehension, semantic knowledge and semantic features extracted from connected speech), grammar (including sentence comprehension and grammatical features extracted from connected speech), and prosody (including receptive and productive tasks). To determine inclusion, the two authors (AG, MM) separately reviewed first the titles and abstract and then the full-text papers. For studies in which there was a disagreement, consensus was reached through discussion between both authors.

## **2.3. Data extraction**

Our final selection comprised 181 papers (Figure 1), each of which was used to extract the following information: (i) bvFTD sample characteristics (sample size, mean age, mean disease duration, mean severity using Mini-Mental State Exam), (ii) sample size of the comparison group, (iii) language tests administered, (iv) results of statistical comparison for language measures, (v) participant's language, (vi) research or clinical center in which patients were recruited. Since the same patient cohort may have been used for multiple studies from a single research team, we flagged results on the exact same language measures from the same team and used a systematic approach to ensure exhaustivity and reduce population bias. First, we reported all studies (no matter the research center) in order to give a complete overview of the literature (Table 1). However, in the Results section and in Figure 2, if two or more studies from the same research center included the exact same language task, only the article with the largest sample of bvFTD patients was considered for interpretation.

## **2.4. Study quality assessment**

The risk of bias in studies was assessed at the study level with an adapted version of the Newcastle Ottawa Scale (Wells et al., 2000), recommended for non-randomized studies, including case-control and cohort studies. We assessed each study for (i) sample representativeness, (ii) sample size, (iii) comparability between patients and controls, (iv) ascertainment of language symptoms, and (v) statistical quality (Supplementary material). For the interpretation of the total scores, ranging from 0 to 5, studies were judged to be of low risk of bias ( $\geq 3$  points) or high risk of bias ( $< 3$  points). Therefore, a higher score on this tool represents a lower risk of bias.

## **3. Results**

### **3.1. Impaired and preserved language domains in bvFTD**

From the 181 selected studies (Figure 1), 156 compared bvFTD to healthy control participants on at least one language measure (Table 1, Figure 2).

#### **3.1.1. Global language performance**

Language has been globally evaluated through measures from diverse batteries: the language subscale of the Addenbrooke Cognitive Examination Revised (ACE-R; including naming, comprehension, repetition, reading, and writing), the Aachen Aphasia Test (including detailed evaluation of spontaneous language, token tests, repetition, writing, naming and

comprehension), the Language Aphasia Screening Test (LAST) (including picture naming, repetition, counting from 1 to 10, word-to-picture matching, and comprehension of instructions with three levels of complexity), the Sydney Language Battery (including naming, word-picture matching, picture-to-picture matching, and word repetition tasks), and the Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD) language subtest (including verbal fluency and picture naming).

A global language impairment was found in bvFTD when using some global language batteries (language subscale of ACE-R: Lima-Silva et al., 2015; Oliver et al., 2015; Salimi et al., 2019, Aachen aphasia test: Van den Stock et al., 2015). However, other batteries failed to find any difference in bvFTD compared to controls (LAST: Johnen et al., 2018, the Sydney Language Battery: Hsieh et al., 2013 and the language subsection of CERAD: Semler et al., 2019). These mixed results may reflect differences in sample sizes between studies (Hsieh et al., 2013; Semler et al., 2019) or difference in the tasks included in these batteries (for example, LAST do not include reading and writing assessment but ACE-R language do).

### **3.1.2. Motor speech**

Motor speech encompasses diverse mechanisms involved in planning, programming, controlling, coordinating, and executing speech production. Various aspects of this domain (e.g., voice sound, pronunciation, articulation, speech errors) can be assessed through highly controlled tasks or through connected speech.

#### *3.1.2.1. Motor speech examination*

Motor speech as assessed using controlled tasks seems relatively preserved in bvFTD. Vogel et al. extensively characterized motor speech signatures in 24 bvFTD using perceptual and acoustical analyses of tasks from the Progressive Aphasia Language Scale (saying the day of the week, sequential motion rate and alternating motion rate tasks (i.e., repeating /papa/ or /pataka/), pronouncing a sustained vowel). Objective and listener-based analysis showed that while motor speech is globally preserved, two-thirds of bvFTD showed more subtle motor speech changes (i.e., shorter phrases, longer pauses, strangled-strained voice and articulation difficulties, impaired diadochokinetic performance) (Vogel et al., 2017). Mandelli et al. also showed preserved verbal agility (Mandelli et al., 2016).



### *3.1.2.2. Motor speech through connected speech*

Despite partly contradictory evidence (Vogel et al., 2017), speech rate seems globally preserved in bvFTD (Ash et al., 2013; Gunawardena et al., 2010; Pressman et al., 2019; Wilson et al., 2010). Indeed, even in the infrequent reports showing decreased speech rate, this deficit disappears upon excluding long pauses (Ash et al., 2016). Consistently, compared with controls, bvFTD patients produce more frequent, variable, and extended silent pauses (Nevler et al., 2017; Vogel et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2010), with no differences in the number of filled pauses and shorter speech segments (Nevler et al., 2017; Vogel et al., 2017). However, the rate of global speech errors (Ash et al., 2009, 2019; Gunawardena et al., 2010) and phonemic errors (Ash et al., 2013), as well as phonetic errors and distortions (Ash et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2010) is similar between bvFTD patients and healthy persons.

### **3.1.3. Phonology**

The term phonology refers to abstract categories capturing partial recurrent similarities between speech sounds. Phonology may be evaluated through sound manipulation or word/sentence repetition tasks.

#### *3.1.3.1. Phonological manipulation*

bvFTD patients showed preserved phonological abilities when assessed with minimal pairs discriminations of the PALPA3 (i.e. discriminating pairs of words that differ in a single phonemic consonant, for example, ‘cut’ and ‘gut’) (Hardy et al., 2016).

#### *3.1.3.2. Repetition tasks*

Repetition capacities are preserved for both words and sentences in bvFTD (Chen et al., 2018; Hardy et al., 2016; Mandelli et al., 2016; Viskontas et al., 2011; Vogel et al., 2017).

### **3.1.4. Orthography**

Orthography refers to a system of conventions for reading or writing a language. Reading appears impaired in bvFTD. Most studies used the National Adult Reading Test (NART), assessing irregular single word reading (Downey et al., 2015; Gregory et al., 2002; Snowden et al., 2008; Virani et al., 2013), and one study focused on non-word reading (Hardy et al., 2016). Decreased text-reading abilities have also been shown in bvFTD patients, with slower articulation rate, elevated number of pauses, and finally, longer and more variable pauses (Vogel et al., 2017; Yunusova et al., 2016).

Writing, as investigated with the Graded difficulty Spelling Test (assessing spelling of orthographically ambiguous words which could plausibly be written in more than one way while retaining the same sound) is also impaired in bvFTD patients (Hardy et al., 2016).

### **3.1.5. Lexico-semantic**

Lexico-semantic refers to the mapping of canonical conceptual information onto particular lexical units. This can be measured in both production and comprehension, with dedicated tasks tapping on sub-domains such as word retrieval, word comprehension, and semantic knowledge. Lexico-semantic can also be assessed more ecologically through connected speech tasks.

#### *3.1.5.1. Word retrieval*

Naming, as assessed using traditional tasks, is most frequently impaired in bvFTD patients. The most frequently used task was the Boston Naming Test (BNT), with 12 studies revealing impairments (Ash et al., 2016; Banks & Weintraub, 2008; Couto et al., 2013; De Winter et al., 2016b; Fernandez-Duque & Black, 2007; Lin et al., 2016; Peelle et al., 2008; Russo et al., 2014; Tan et al., 2015; Torralva et al., 2007; Whitwell et al., 2009; Wicklund et al., 2007) and six reporting preserved abilities (Chan et al., 2015; Gleichgerrcht et al., 2012; Kamminga et al., 2014; McKinnon et al., 2008; Rankin et al., 2007; Scherling et al., 2014). Overall, longer versions of the BNT (i.e., 30 or 60 items) seem more powerful to reveal deficits than shorter versions (i.e., 15 or 20 items), which provide mixed results. Using the DO-80 task, two studies showed impairment with the full-length version (Matuszewski et al., 2006; Piolino et al., 2007) but one study using the abbreviated version did not show any differences between the two groups (Rousseaux et al., 2010). Studies using the Graded Naming Test (GNT) provided mixed results, ranging from impaired (Downey et al., 2015; Gregory et al., 2002) to preserved (Snowden et al., 2008) performance.

Additional evidence suggests that naming deficits in bvFTD may be driven by specific lexical categories. Hardy et al. investigated verb naming and revealed a decreased performance bvFTD (Hardy et al., 2016). Indeed, action naming may be impaired despite preserved object naming abilities in bvFTD (Cotelli et al., 2006). As for famous face naming (Cotelli et al., 2006), results are mixed as some studies showed altered capacities (Clague et al., 2005; Kamminga et al., 2015) whereas others found no differences (Clague et al., 2005; Keane et al., 2002). Finally, studies using non-verbal stimuli also provided mixed findings: two studies of odor naming provided diverging results (Luzzi et al., 2007; Orasji et al., 2016),

while studies of sound naming showed no difference in comparison with healthy controls (Chow et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2016).

#### *3.1.5.2. Word comprehension*

Word comprehension, as assessed using word-picture matching tasks, appears impaired in bvFTD (Chen et al., 2018; Cotelli et al., 2006; Downey et al., 2015; Rhee et al., 2001; Rogers et al., 2006; Sturm et al., 2018; Vignando et al., 2020; Vogel et al., 2017), although other studies did not show any difference between bvFTD and healthy controls (Irish et al., 2011; Luzzi et al., 2007; Miller et al., 2012; Stopford et al., 2012). Of note, these studies included fewer patients, and with shorter disease duration (Table 1). Patients with bvFTD were also impaired on a word definition task (Downey et al., 2015).

#### *3.1.5.3. Verbal semantic knowledge*

Verbal semantic processing through semantic associations (matching two semantically-linked words together) is most frequently impaired in bvFTD (Cousins et al., 2016; Rogers et al., 2006 vs. Cosentino et al., 2006 with only 12 patients in this study).

Semantic knowledge (as assessed through the categorical or attribute knowledge of objects or public events) is also decreased in bvFTD (Irish et al., 2016; Johnson et al., 2011; Matuszewski et al., 2006). Deficits have also been revealed through tasks tapping on analogy processing (Krawczyk et al., 2008; Morrison et al., 2004) as well as proverb or idiom comprehension (Luzzi et al., 2020; Reyes et al., 2018). Semantic categorization (defining which item belongs to a target category) is also impaired in bvFTD (Hughes et al., 2011; Koenig et al., 2006 vs. Grossman et al., 2004). As for synonyms matching task, results are more mixed: some studies show impaired performance (Fletcher et al., 2016) while others show preserved abilities (Hsieh et al., 2012). More specifically, Hardy et al. showed that performance is spared for abstract synonyms and impaired for concrete synonyms in these patients (Hardy et al., 2016). Emotional semantics is also impaired in bvFTD (Eckart et al., 2012; Hsieh et al., 2012). Finally, semantic difficulties in bvFTD also impact more global tasks like judging or understanding the organization of actions in scripts (for example, for 'going fishing': 'open can of worms / place worm on hook') (Cosentino et al., 2006; Farag et al., 2010).

#### *3.1.5.4. Non-verbal semantic knowledge*

Although not a linguistic domain per se, non-verbal semantic knowledge is a critical domain to assess in parallel with verbal semantic knowledge. This allows disentangling the extent to which deficits in lexico-semantic tasks are driven by lexical (e.g. word category) vs. conceptual (e.g. semantic features) factors. Non-verbal semantic knowledge is most frequently impaired in bvFTD patients when assessed using pictorial semantic associations (matching two semantically associated pictures) (Ash et al., 2013; Gleichgerrcht et al., 2012; Gunawardena et al., 2010; Rogers et al., 2006; Tan et al., 2015; Torralva et al., 2007 vs. McKinnon et al., 2008; Orasji et al., 2016 with less than nine patients in each of these studies). Semantic knowledge of odours is also globally impaired in bvFTD (Luzzi et al., 2007; Magerova et al., 2014; Orasji et al., 2016 vs. Omar et al., 2013) without difference for flavors (Omar et al., 2013).

Studies on semantic knowledge for sounds provide mixed results: some showed impairments (Clark et al., 2017; Fletcher et al., 2015, 2016) while others revealed no difference compared to controls (Chow et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2016). Semantic knowledge for people (face-name matching tasks) are also mixed: one study revealed lower scores in bvFTD (De Winter et al., 2016b) while two studies failed to reveal any difference with controls (Clague et al., 2005; Keane et al., 2002).

#### *3.1.5.5. Lexico-semantics through connected speech*

Lexico-semantic abilities using connected speech provide mixed results in bvFTD. Word-level measures are comparable to healthy controls, while discourse-level measures are typically impaired.

In terms of word-level features, the use of lexical categories (nouns, pronouns, verbs, open-class words, closed-class words) does not differ between bvFTD and controls (Ash et al., 2009, 2013, 2016; Hardy et al., 2016; Wilson et al., 2010), except for quantifiers, which occur less commonly in bvFTD patients' discourse (Ash et al., 2016). Average lexical frequency of the words and nouns used is also comparable to healthy controls (Hardy et al., 2016; Wilson et al., 2010). Considering errors, results are mixed for semantic paraphasias and word-finding difficulties (Ash et al., 2006; Wilson et al., 2010: no difference vs. Rousseaux et al., 2010: more frequent).

In terms of discourse-level features, accuracy of the discourse (as judged through global organization, complexity or the ability to remain on topic) seems to be preserved when

investigated with a global index (Gola et al., 2015; Mendez et al., 2014), but more fine-grained examinations reveal impairments in accurately reporting events and precisely guiding communication (with insufficient or superfluous responses) (Ash et al., 2006; Healey et al., 2019; Healey et al., 2015). As for connectedness, even if measures of action or evaluation clauses and temporal organization revealed no difference (Gola et al., 2015), other studies revealed impairments in global connectedness, maintenance of a theme and discourse organization (Ash et al., 2006; Rousseaux et al., 2010).

### **3.1.6 Grammar**

Grammar refers to the system of Sequencing of hierarchically organized morphosyntactic patterns, determining the well-formedness or ill-formedness of sentences and words. It underlies both sentence comprehension and production (although no study investigated sentence production in bvFTD). Grammatical features can also be extracted from connected speech.

#### *3.1.6.1. Sentence comprehension*

Overall, in bvFTD, sentence comprehension was most frequently preserved when using simple sentence comprehension tasks, but impaired when using more complex experimental sentence comprehension assessments.

Most studies on simple sentence comprehension employed sentence-picture matching tasks (selecting which of many pictures matches a given sentence). Four of them showed preserved abilities (Cotelli et al., 2007; Hardy et al., 2016; Johnson et al., 2011; Rosen et al., 2004) and two showed decreased scores (Charles et al., 2014; Mandelli et al., 2016). Other studies used instructions tasks (e.g., asking the patient to follow instructions that are variable in length and linguistic complexity such as ‘Point to a square’ or ‘Put the small red square on the large blue circle’). Three showed preserved performance (Gleichgerricht et al., 2012; Torralva et al., 2007; Vogel et al., 2017) and one showed impaired abilities (Giovagnoli et al., 2008). Finally, some studies assessed sentence comprehension using comprehension questions on sentences: two showed preserved abilities (Ash et al., 2009; Peelle et al., 2008) and one revealed difficulties with comparative questions (Smits et al., 2015).

Contrary to simple sentence comprehension tasks, those employing more complex materials have mainly revealed deficits, such as difficulties during a discourse task (Grossman et al., 2005; Luzzi et al., 2020; Rousseaux et al., 2010) or with ambiguous sentences (McMillan et al., 2013; Spotorno et al., 2015a). Other authors have found a partial sensitivity

to syntactic violations (Murray et al., 2007; Peelle et al., 2007). For example, patients were impaired in grammatically judging an unknown verb used with correct or violated grammatical rules (Murray et al., 2007). They were also less sensitive to syntactic errors (as, for example, ‘The book is being closely pick/picked by the group of curious students’ or ‘The friend is being reunion/met in the shopping mall entrance’) (Peelle et al., 2007).

#### *3.1.6.2. Grammar through connected speech*

Connected speech analyses reveal preserved grammar in bvFTD patients (Ash et al., 2013, 2016, 2019; Gunawardena et al., 2010; Rousseaux et al., 2010; Vogel et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2010). More precisely, patients do not significantly differ from controls in utterance length (Ash et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2010), word and clause complexity (Ash et al., 2013, 2016, 2019; Gunawardena et al., 2010; Wilson et al., 2010), and correct and incorrect sentences (Ash et al., 2013; Rousseaux et al., 2010; Vogel et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2010).

#### **3.1.7. Prosody**

Prosody is a supra-segmental feature of language using modulation of intonation, rhythm, and intensity to convey emotional or linguistic distinctions.

Receptive prosody appears impaired in bvFTD. The most frequently used tasks are emotion labelling tasks, in which the participant must listen to stimuli with distinct prosodic features and pick an emotional label (e.g., anger, sadness, happiness). Most studies revealed global impaired recognition of prosody using vocal signals or sentences (Keane et al., 2002; Shany-Ur et al., 2012; Snowden et al., 2008), although two studies did not find any significant difference in bvFTD patients (Omar et al., 2011; Rankin et al., 2009). Another study suggested that this impairment in bvFTD may depend on emotion type: impaired recognition of happiness, sadness, surprise, and anger but preserved recognition of fear and disgust (Keane et al., 2002).

Fewer studies have assessed prosody during speech production in bvFTD. These studies showed reduced stress (Vogel et al., 2017), mixed results for pitch modulation (altered in Nevler et al., 2017 but preserved in Pressman et al., 2019 and Vogel et al., 2017), and preserved intensity (Pressman et al., 2019).

### **3.2. Language profiles according to bvFTD subgroups**

From the 181 studies assessing language in bvFTD (Figure 1), 26 compared patient subgroups divided upon four criteria (Table 2): clinical, neural, genetic or neuropathological subgroups. Such comparisons aim to identify which features may be more associated with language impairments and potentially informing on the heterogeneity of language profiles across the bvFTD population.

#### **3.2.1. Comparisons between clinically defined bvFTD subgroups**

Few clinical factors influencing language profiles in bvFTD have been identified so far. First, bvFTD patients with impaired global cognitive performance had more severe deficits in picture naming (Manes et al., 2011; Roca et al., 2013), sentence comprehension (Torralva et al., 2009) and semantic knowledge (Roca et al., 2013). Furthermore, patients with poverty of speech had more pressure of speech, tangentiality (i.e. digressions, free associations of ideas), derailment, and clanging (associations of words based upon sounds) than those without this feature (Mendez et al., 2017). The level of confidence of the diagnosis (probable vs. possible bvFTD) provided conflicting results. While Kipps et al. found a difference in picture naming in patients with a diagnosis of probable bvFTD versus possible bvFTD (Kipps et al., 2009), Borroni et al. and Kramer et al. did not find any significant difference in the language profile of probable and possible bvFTD patients (Borroni et al., 2015; Kramer et al., 2018).

None of the other investigated clinical factors had an impact on language measures. Global language skills do not seem affected by the presence or absence of parkinsonism (Park et al., 2017). Naming abilities are not influenced by the presence or absence of memory deficits (Bertoux et al., 2014, 2016; Fernández-Matarrubia et al., 2017), moral judgment profiles (Gleichgerrcht et al., 2011) or a medical history of vascular disease (Torralva et al., 2015) or traumatic brain injury (Deutsch et al., 2015). Finally, sentence comprehension seems unaffected by age at onset (Ye et al., 2015) or profession (Massimo et al., 2019).

#### **3.2.2. Comparisons between neuroanatomically defined bvFTD subgroups**

First, a frontal dominant vs. temporo-limbic dominant atrophy pattern seems to impact sentence comprehension. Frontal predominant bvFTD show more difficulties in the Token task than temporo-limbic predominant bvFTD (Cerami et al., 2016).

The laterality of atrophy, or right vs. left predominant atrophy, significantly affects naming abilities, with left-lateralized bvFTD patients showing lower performance than right-lateralized cases (Mendez & Lim, 2004).

Finally, one study investigated differences between bvFTD subgroups based on their patterns of network degeneration (with a predominance in the semantic appraisal network (SAN), in the salience network (SN), subdivided in frontal (SN-F) and fronto-temporal (SN-FT) predominant subgroups, or in the subcortical network (subcortical)). While affect naming did not differ between all the subgroups, picture naming was lower in the SAN bvFTD subgroup. The SN-FT bvFTD subgroup had the second lowest scores without significant difference with other groups. Sentence comprehension was lower in the SN-FT subgroup, differing significantly from SN-F and subcortical subgroups. The SAN bvFTD subgroup had the second lowest scores, without significant difference with other groups (Ranasinghe, 2016). Irregular words reading, repetition as well as verbal agility did not differ between all the subgroups (Ranasinghe et al., 2016).

### **3.2.3. Comparisons between genetically defined bvFTD subgroups**

First, a global genetic origin (familial bvFTD vs. sporadic bvFTD) does not affect repetition and reading abilities (Heuer et al., 2020).

More specifically, relative to patients with *C9orf72* expansions, those with *MAPT* mutations exhibit greater deficits in writing, object naming and in two different tasks of single word comprehension (Downey et al., 2014; Hardy et al., 2016). However, other studies reported that the *MAPT* mutations, in comparison to other genetic mutations (*C9orf72* or *GRN*), does not influence performance in repetition, reading (Hardy et al., 2016; Heuer et al., 2020), single-word comprehension (Downey et al., 2014), semantic knowledge (Moore et al., 2020) or sentence comprehension (Hardy et al., 2016) disproportionately.

However, the presence of a *C9orf72* or *GRN* expansion does not lead to more severe language impairments for any of the measures investigated, in comparison to other genetic mutations (Downey et al., 2014; Hardy et al., 2016; Heuer et al., 2020; Moore et al., 2020; Sha et al., 2012; Suhonen et al., 2017).

### **3.2.4. Comparisons between neuropathologically defined bvFTD subgroups**

When comparing bvFTD linked to FTL vs. AD pathologies, no difference was found in naming (Mendez & Shapira, 2013; Perry et al., 2017) or word comprehension, but repetition scores were lower in AD than in FTL patients (Perry et al., 2017).



Considering major FTLD molecular class, no language difference was found between FTLD-tau, TDP and FUS (Perry et al., 2017) nor between tau-positive and tau-negative bvFTD patients (Mendez & Shapira, 2013). However, Perry et al. also compared bvFTD linked to different FTLD subtypes: CBD, PSP, FTLD-TDP (type A, B, C, D or unclassified) and FUS, when sample size permitted. They found that patients with a FTLD-TDP type C pathology performed significantly lower in picture naming in comparison to PSP and FTLD-TDP unclassified, but not CBD, FTLD-TDP type A or FTLD-TDP type B. Also, patients with a FTLD-TPD type B performed significantly lower in word comprehension, in comparison to FTLD-TDP unclassified (Perry et al., 2017).

### **3.3. Study quality assessment**

Based on our assessment for the risk of bias 130 studies had a low risk of bias and 51 studies had a high risk of bias. Table S1 indicates, for each study, the risk of bias in each item assessed (e.g., representativeness, sample size, comparability, outcome, and statistics). The highest risk of bias was due to small sample size (i.e., less than 20 patients overall), to inadequate comparability of the healthy controls with the bvFTD (i.e., cases and controls were only partially matched on basic demographic variables), and to partial independent validation and/or description of patient selection criteria (Figure 3). Most studies employed validated neuropsychological tools to test speech and language outcomes, while studies without validated measurement tools mainly included experimental tasks and/or measures derived from spontaneous, narrative or connected speech.

## **4. Discussion**

In this review, we investigated the scope of speech and language impairments in bvFTD, considering multiple domains (motor speech, phonology, orthography, lexico-semantic, grammar, and prosody) and modulating (clinical, neural, genetic, neuropathological) factors. Overall, we found that bvFTD patients present with extensive but heterogeneous deficits. These were more consistently reported in lexico-semantic, orthographic, and prosodic domains. Assessments of motor speech and grammar provided mixed results, with a slight majority of studies showing preserved performance. Finally, no study showed phonological impairments. Also, speech and language impairments were more pronounced in patients with (i) more severe global cognitive impairment, (ii) probable (as opposed to possible) bvFTD diagnosis, (iii) predominant frontotemporal atrophy (vs. frontal-

or subcortical-predominant) or semantic appraisal network damage, and (iv) *MAPT* mutations (vs. *C9orf72*). The impact of underlying neuropathology remains underexplored. Overall, our study suggests that despite being under-recognized, speech and language impairments in bvFTD could afford sensitive biomarkers for both diagnosis and prognosis.

#### **4.1. Characterization of language in bvFTD**

Three language domains were found to be consistently impaired (more than 60% of reports) in bvFTD: lexico-semantics, orthography, and prosody. First, bvFTD are impaired in the lexico-semantic domains, more precisely in word retrieval, word comprehension and semantic knowledge. Of note, the semantic impairment in bvFTD patients did not appear to be restricted to verbal stimuli but also extended to non-verbal information. However, these lexico-semantic deficits are not always observed in connected speech studies, but fine-grained examinations revealed impairments at the discourse level (connectedness, accuracy, theme maintenance, etc.). In bvFTD patients, lexico-semantic impairments have been related to left anterior temporal lobe and left inferior frontal gyrus (Hardy et al., 2016), which are core regions of the semantic network (Lambon Ralph et al., 2017) and also atrophied in bvFTD patients (Bejanin et al., 2020). Interestingly, lexico-semantic difficulties may be more marked for actions (verbs) than for objects (nouns) in bvFTD (in naming: Cotelli et al., 2006; Hardy et al., 2016; word comprehension: Rhee et al., 2001, semantic knowledge: Bak & Hodges, 2003). This may suggest a larger involvement of frontal lobe and more specifically motor regions (Birba et al., 2017; García et al., 2018), as well as more executive resources in verbs than nouns processing (Bak et al., 2001). Second, reading capacities are also altered in bvFTD patients, which has most frequently been shown for irregular words, but also for non-words and text. Reading irregular words is related to semantic abilities and involves the anterior temporal role (Wilson et al., 2009), a region targeted by neurodegeneration in bvFTD. Nonetheless, more fine-grained studies involving reading different types of words are needed in bvFTD, as well as more studies of writing abilities. Third, prosody recognition was impaired in most reports. Previous studies showed that this function depends on medial and orbitofrontal regions and on anterior temporal poles which are core regions of neurodegeneration (Pichon & Kell, 2013; Schirmer & Kotz, 2006). bvFTD patients also have impaired expressive prosody, which has been linked to left inferior frontal, anterior cingulate, insula, left fusiform and right inferior frontal gyri (Nevler et al., 2017), regions also atrophied in bvFTD and involved in social and behavioral disorders (Massimo et al., 2019). These results highlight the relevance of prosodic markers in bvFTD, especially given the

relationship of prosody with socio-emotional behavior, a core impairment in bvFTD (Rascovsky et al., 2011).

Two language domains showed mixed results in bvFTD, with a slight majority of studies showing preserved performance: motor speech and grammar. Motor speech is globally preserved, even if subtle changes appear when more detailly investigated, related to inferior frontal gyrus, insula and right precentral gyrus (Vogel et al., 2017). These regions have been linked to various motor speech aspects in healthy participants: left anterior insula for articulation, SMA and pre-SMA for initiation and execution of speech (Price, 2010). Grammar appears to be globally preserved when assessed with simple comprehension tasks or in its production during connected speech, but more altered when assessed with complex tasks. This might be due to increased executive demands. In a task-based fMRI study of grammar processing, decreased activation in the dorsal inferior frontal cortex has been found in bvFTD patients in comparison to healthy controls (Cooke et al., 2003). Previous studies in healthy controls have also highlighted the role of left frontal regions in grammar (Cooke et al., 2002; Grossman et al., 2002; McMillan et al., 2013).

One language domain showed consistently preserved performance in bvFTD: phonology. This was observed in studies assessing phonology with both phonological manipulation and repetition of words and sentences. These results are in line with the implication of posterior temporo-parietal regions in this language domains, more posterior than the atrophied regions in bvFTD (Forkel et al., 2020).

#### **4.2. The heterogeneity of language impairments in bvFTD**

We have also identified factors that are associated with more speech and language impairments in bvFTD patients. Unsurprisingly, a more severe global cognitive impairment leads to more alterations in speech and language in bvFTD patients, which highlight the role of speech and language tasks as additional tools that are sensitive to disease progression and severity. The level of certainty of diagnosis (possible versus probable) also affects the severity of language impairments. This may be related to the fact that within individuals with a diagnosis of possible bvFTD, some may not progress to more severe stages of the disease (“bvFTD phenocopy”) (Hornberger et al., 2009). Consistent with our findings, a previous study also found that there was a higher prevalence of stereotypy of speech in bvFTD progressors, versus non-progressors (Hornberger et al., 2009).

The neurodegeneration pattern may also impact language capacities. A left-predominant pattern of atrophy (vs right-predominant) is associated with more severe naming

impairments, consistently with the role of the left hemisphere in speech and language (Mendez & Lim, 2004). This pattern is also observed in other neurodegenerative diseases such as left-predominant svPPA patients who show more severe naming impairments than right-predominant svPPA patients (Binney et al., 2016). Frontal (vs. temporo-limbic) structural alterations as well as altered fronto-temporal connectivity were associated with more significant sentence comprehension difficulties. This is consistent with the predominant role of the left frontal regions in syntax processing (Cerami et al., 2016; Schell et al., 2017) even if temporal lobes are also involved in this process (Lukic et al., 2021). A more semantic appraisal network predominant pattern alters naming capacities more importantly (Ranasinghe et al., 2016), which is consistent with the role of bilateral anterior temporal lobes in semantic processing (Lambon Ralph et al., 2017).

Furthermore, our review suggests that the presence of a *MAPT* mutations impact language, more specifically lexico-semantics (naming, single-word comprehension) and writing, more significantly than *C9orf72*. In that specific study, writing was assessed with the Graded Spelling Test, in which all words are orthographically ambiguous, in the sense that they can plausibly be written in multiple ways, while retaining the sound of the target item (Hardy et al., 2016). Therefore, this task also includes a semantic component. The more severe lexico-semantic impairment in *MAPT* vs *C9orf72* bvFTD patients may be related to a greater involvement of anterior temporal lobe, a region highly implicated in lexico-semantics, in bvFTD patients with *MAPT* mutations than with *C9orf72* expansion (Josephs et al., 2007; Mahoney et al., 2012). There was no significant difference when investigating other speech and language domains, nor when including *GRN* mutations in the comparison. Overall, these preliminary results are surprising, given that outside of a diagnosis of bvFTD, *GRN* mutations are the most frequently associated with a speech and language predominant diagnosis of PPA (Saracino et al., 2021). More studies on genetic cases of bvFTD are needed to confirm the differential speech and language profiles.

As for the effect of underlying neuropathology, it remains to be determined due to the low number of studies. Nonetheless, a few differences have been reported. Underlying AD pathology may alter repetition more than FTLN pathology (Perry et al., 2017), in line with the posterior predominance of AD (Braak & Braak, 1991) and the involvement of posterior temporo-parietal regions in repetition (Forkel et al., 2020). FTLN-TDP type C seems to lead to more naming difficulties in comparison to PSP and FTLN-TDP unclassified, but not CBD, FTLN-TDP type A or FTLN-TDP type B. This is consistent with the implication of FTLN-TDP type C in a large majority of svPPA cases and in the left anterior temporal lobe, a core

region for naming (Borghesani et al., 2020). Finally, FTLT-DTP type B seems related to more comprehension difficulties in comparison to FTLT-DTP unclassified, consistent with anterior temporal atrophy described in cases of patients with language disturbances related to FTLT-DTP type B (Lee et al., 2020).

In conclusion, the heterogeneity of speech and language symptoms in bvFTD patients is concordant with previous studies assessing the impact of clinical, neuroanatomical, genetic and neuropathological features on such symptoms. In the first aim of this systematic review, we delineated a relatively clear speech and language profile in bvFTD. Nonetheless, the evidence is still too limited to allow clear conclusions for the second aim. Future prospective studies investigating the impact of these features on speech and language symptoms in bvFTD patients will be essential to manage the clinical complexities of this disease at the single-patient level.

#### **4.3. Beyond the characterization of patients: Speech and language measures to improve bvFTD phenotyping and to track disease progression in bvFTD**

The language characterization of bvFTD is needed for a better understanding of the bvFTD syndrome, but it may also be useful for its differential diagnosis from other neurodegenerative disease, especially PPA and AD. The profile of speech and language impairments in bvFTD reported in this review, namely an impairment in lexico-semantics and orthography, with preserved phonological and relatively intact motor speech and grammar, resembles the most to the one described in svPPA. Nonetheless, when compared to svPPA, bvFTD patients show better performance in most lexico-semantic tasks, but do not differ in phonology, reading, motor speech and grammar (Ash et al., 2013; Harciarek & Kertesz, 2008; Hardy et al., 2016; Wilson et al., 2010). Furthermore, when compared to lvPPA, bvFTD patients are less impaired in phonology (repetition), naming and syntactic comprehension but have more fluency disruptions in their discourse (Ash et al., 2013; Smits et al., 2015; Wilson et al., 2010). When compared to nfvPPA, bvFTD patients have better performances on tasks involving motor speech, grammar or verb naming, but did not differ in other language domains such as lexico-semantics (Ash et al., 2013; Hardy et al., 2016; Wilson et al., 2010).

Although most studies show that language in bvFTD do not differ from AD (Blair et al., 2007; Diehl et al., 2005; Harciarek & Kertesz, 2008; Smits et al., 2015; Wilson et al., 2010), it was reported that semantic and motor speech abilities are more impaired in bvFTD than in AD (Blair et al., 2007). Finally, other studies have also shown that speech and language can be helpful in the differential diagnosis of bvFTD versus ALS/FTD (Saxon et al.,

2017), CBS and PSP (Cotelli et al., 2006), DLB and vascular dementia (Smits et al., 2015). Thus, a detailed language investigation seems to allow distinctions between bvFTD and other neurodegenerative disorders.

Although only a few studies have assessed speech and language longitudinally in bvFTD, it is of great interest to know which domains could track disease progression. Global language performances seem to decrease with time (Blair et al., 2007; Schubert et al., 2016). A connected speech study also suggests that syntactic complexity and speech rate declines with time in bvFTD (Ash et al., 2019). As for naming, results are mixed (no change with time in (Ash et al., 2019; Binney et al., 2017; Cousins et al., 2018 vs. decrease in Hardy et al., 2016; Mahoney et al., 2014; Wicklund et al., 2007). This decline may be faster than in AD patients but slower than in PPA patients (Wicklund et al., 2007). Finally, other studies have showed that speech rate (Ash, 2019), reading performance (Irish et al., 2012), word comprehension and semantic abilities (Hardy et al., 2016; Cousins et al., 2018) do not change with time. Overall, these studies suggest that with the advancement of the disease, some speech and language impairments might become more severe in bvFTD patients. More studies are needed to understand the potential of speech and language markers in tracking bvFTD progression.

#### **4.4. Current gaps and future directions**

This systematic review also highlights some limitations which could guide future research in this field.

The first set of limitations concerns the samples included in the reviewed studies. Our review reveals that 80% of the included studies involved less than bvFTD 30 patients (Figure 3), which may lead to a lack of power to detect subtle language impairments. Furthermore, during the selection process, many studies (163) have been excluded because they did not include a comparison group of healthy controls. Finally, most of the articles included came from North America, Western Europe or Australia and included English-speaking participants (Table 1). Therefore, the results of this review may not be generalizable to other underrepresented populations, languages, and cultures. Together, these limitations call for studies involving a greater number of bvFTD patients and compared to a matched group of healthy participants. Multi-center studies should also be led worldwide, including currently underrepresented regions such as Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe or South America.

The second set of limitations is related to the speech and language assessments. Although a large number of studies were included in the present review, most of them

investigated language as a secondary outcome measure using quick assessment tools. Therefore, the results were rarely interpreted or discussed in the original papers. Also, some domains such as motor speech, phonology and prosody have been scarcely studied until now (Figure 2), although some of them show potential as clinical markers of bvFTD. Furthermore, the assessment tools used in the literature are highly heterogeneous across studies, making it impossible to use meta-analytic statistical approaches. Because a complete speech and language assessment can be lengthy, connected speech approaches are gaining in popularity because of their high cost-effectiveness. Indeed, these approaches are quick, they allow for an assessment of multiple speech and language subdomains simultaneously and they are becoming more automated. Previous studies have shown their utility in PPA to distinguish the 3 subtypes and have studied neural correlates of connected speech components (Wilson et al., 2010a). Once further validated, they will be highly helpful in the characterization of bvFTD patients. In our review, we showed that connected speech seem to be sensitive to impairments in most speech and language domains, except for grammar.

Finally, more studies investigating the heterogeneity of speech and language symptoms in bvFTD, by comparing bvFTD subgroups, are needed to confirm the preliminary conclusions proposed in this review.

#### **4.6. Conclusion**

Through this review, our aim was to investigate language impairments in bvFTD syndrome, yet mostly characterized by behavioral and personality changes. Our review shed light on both extensive and heterogeneous speech and language alterations in bvFTD patients, more consistent in lexico-semantic, orthography and prosody domains. It also highlights that a globally altered cognitive status, a frontotemporal predominant atrophy and the presence of a *MAPT* mutation may be key features for language impairments. A better acknowledgement of these language and speech difficulties may help a better characterization of bvFTD and it may be helpful for both differential diagnosis and follow-up.

## **Acknowledgements**

We thank Dr. Evans Whitaker from the UCSF Health Sciences Library for his help with the literature search strategy.

AG received an internship grant from the French Society of Neurology.

AMG is supported by CONICET; ANID, FONDECYT Regular [grant numbers 1210176 and 1210195]; Programa Interdisciplinario de Investigación Experimental en Comunicación y Cognición (PIIECC), Facultad de Humanidades, USACH.

MM is supported by postdoctoral funding from Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and Fonds Québécois de Recherche en Santé (FRQS).

**Declaration of interest :** None

**Funding :** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.



## References

- Agosta, F., Galantucci, S., Magnani, G., Marcone, A., Martinelli, D., Antonietta Volontè, M., Riva, N., Iannaccone, S., Ferraro, P. M., Caso, F., Chiò, A., Comi, G., Falini, A., & Filippi, M. (2015). MRI signatures of the frontotemporal lobar degeneration continuum. *Human Brain Mapping, 36*(7), 2602–2614. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22794>
- Ash, S., Moore, P., Antani, S., McCawley, G., Work, M., & Grossman, M. (2006). Trying to tell a tale: Discourse impairments in progressive aphasia and frontotemporal dementia. *Neurology, 66*(9), 1405–1413. <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000210435.72614.38>
- Ash, S., Moore, P., Vesely, L., Gunawardena, D., McMillan, C., Anderson, C., Avants, B., & Grossman, M. (2009). Non-Fluent Speech in Frontotemporal Lobar Degeneration. *Journal of Neurolinguistics, 22*(4), 370–383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2008.12.001>
- Ash, S., Evans, E., O'Shea, J., Powers, J., Boller, A., Weinberg, D., Haley, J., McMillan, C., Irwin, D. J., Rascovsky, K., & Grossman, M. (2013). Differentiating primary progressive aphasias in a brief sample of connected speech. *Neurology, 81*(4), 329–336. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e31829c5d0e>
- Ash, S., Ternes, K., Bisbing, T., Min, N. E., Moran, E., York, C., McMillan, C. T., Irwin, D. J., & Grossman, M. (2016). Dissociation of quantifiers and object nouns in speech in focal neurodegenerative disease. *Neuropsychologia, 89*, 141–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.06.013>
- Ash, S., Nevler, N., Phillips, J., Irwin, D. J., McMillan, C. T., Rascovsky, K., & Grossman, M. (2019). A longitudinal study of speech production in primary progressive aphasia and behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Brain and Language, 194*, 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2019.04.006>
- Bak, T. H., O'Donovan, D. G., Xuereb, J. H., Boniface, S., & Hodges, J. R. (2001). Selective impairment of verb processing associated with pathological changes in Brodmann areas 44 and 45 in the motor neurone disease-dementia-aphasia syndrome. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology, 124*(Pt 1), 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/124.1.103>
- Bak, T. H., & Hodges, J. R. (2003). Kissing and dancing—A test to distinguish the lexical and conceptual contributions to noun/verb and action/object dissociation. Preliminary results in patients with frontotemporal dementia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics, 16*(2), 169–181. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044\(02\)00011-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044(02)00011-8)
- Banks, S., & Weintraub, S. (2008). Self-awareness and self-monitoring of cognitive and behavioral deficits in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia, primary progressive aphasia and probable Alzheimer's disease. *Brain and Cognition, 67*(1), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2007.11.004>
- Bejanin, A., Tammewar, G., Marx, G., Cobigo, Y., Iaccarino, L., Kornak, J., Staffaroni, A. M., Dickerson, B. C., Boeve, B. F., Knopman, D. S., Gorno-Tempini, M., Miller, B. L., Jagust, W. J., Boxer, A. L., Rosen, H. J., & Rabinovici, G. D. (2020). Longitudinal structural and metabolic changes in frontotemporal dementia. *Neurology, 95*(2), e140–e154. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000009760>
- Bertoux, M., de Souza, L. C., Corlier, F., Lamari, F., Bottlaender, M., Dubois, B., & Sarazin, M. (2014). Two distinct amnesic profiles in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Biological Psychiatry, 75*(7), 582–588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.08.017>
- Bertoux, M., de Souza, L. C., O'Callaghan, C., Greve, A., Sarazin, M., Dubois, B., & Hornberger, M. (2016). Social Cognition Deficits: The Key to Discriminate Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia from Alzheimer's Disease Regardless of Amnesia? *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD, 49*(4), 1065–1074. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-150686>
- Binney, R. J., Henry, M. L., Babiak, M., Pressman, P. S., Santos-Santos, M. A., Narvid, J., Mandelli, M. L., Strain, P. J., Miller, B. L., Rankin, K. P., Rosen, H. J., & Gorno-Tempini, M. L. (2016). Reading words and other people: A comparison of exception word, familiar face and affect processing in the left and right temporal variants of primary progressive aphasia. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior, 82*, 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.05.014>
- Binney, R. J., Pankov, A., Marx, G., He, X., McKenna, F., Staffaroni, A. M., Kornak, J., Attygalle, S., Boxer, A. L., Schuff, N., Gorno-Tempini, M.-L., Weiner, M. W., Kramer, J. H., Miller, B. L., & Rosen, H. J. (2017). Data-driven regions of interest for longitudinal change in three variants of frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Brain and Behavior, 7*(4), e00675. <https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.675>
- Birba, A., García-Cordero, I., Kozono, G., Legaz, A., Ibáñez, A., Sedeño, L., & García, A. M. (2017). Losing ground: Frontostriatal atrophy disrupts language embodiment in Parkinson's and Huntington's disease. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 80*, 673–687. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.07.011>
- Blair, M., Marczyński, C. A., Davis-Faroque, N., & Kertesz, A. (2007). A longitudinal study of language decline in Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal dementia. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society: JINS, 13*(2), 237–245. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617707070269>
- Borghesani, V., Battistella, G., Mandelli, M. L., Welch, A., Weis, E., Younes, K., Neuhaus, J., Grinberg, L. T., Seeley, W. M., Spina, S., Miller, B., Miller, Z., & Gorno-Tempini, M. L. (2020). Regional and hemispheric susceptibility of the temporal lobe to FTL-D-TDP type C pathology. *NeuroImage. Clinical, 28*, 102369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102369>
- Borroni, B., Cosseddu, M., Pilotto, A., Premi, E., Archetti, S., Gasparotti, R., Cappa, S., & Padovani, A. (2015). Early stage of behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia: Clinical and neuroimaging correlates. *Neurobiology of Aging, 36*(11), 3108–3115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2015.07.019>
- Braak, H., & Braak, E. (1991). Neuropathological staging of Alzheimer-related changes. *Acta Neuropathologica, 82*(4), 239–259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00308809>
- Brambati, S. M., Myers, D., Wilson, A., Rankin, K. P., Allison, S. C., Rosen, H. J., Miller, B. L., & Gorno-Tempini, M. L. (2006). The Anatomy of Category-specific Object Naming in Neurodegenerative Diseases. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 18*(10), 1644–1653. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2006.18.10.1644>

- Cerami, C., Dodich, A., Lettieri, G., Iannaccone, S., Magnani, G., Marcone, A., Gianolli, L., Cappa, S. F., & Perani, D. (2016). Different FDG-PET metabolic patterns at single-subject level in the behavioral variant of fronto-temporal dementia. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior*, 83, 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.07.008>
- Chan, H.-M., Stolwyk, R., Neath, J., Kelso, W., Walterfang, M., Mocellin, R., Pantelis, C., & Velakoulis, D. (2015). Neurocognitive similarities between severe chronic schizophrenia and behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Psychiatry Research*, 225(3), 658–666. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2014.11.029>
- Charles, D., Olm, C., Powers, J., Ash, S., Irwin, D. J., McMillan, C. T., Rascovsky, K., & Grossman, M. (2014). Grammatical comprehension deficits in non-fluent/agrammatic primary progressive aphasia. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, 85(3), 249–256. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2013-305749>
- Chen, Y., Kumfor, F., Landin-Romero, R., Irish, M., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2018). Cerebellar atrophy and its contribution to cognition in frontotemporal dementias. *Annals of Neurology*, 84(1), 98–109. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.25271>
- Cheran, G., Wu, L., Lee, S., Manoochehri, M., Cines, S., Fallon, E., Lynch, T., Heidebrink, J., Paulson, H., Goldman, J., Huey, E., & Cosentino, S. (2019). Cognitive Indicators of Preclinical Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia in MAPT Carriers. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society: JINS*, 25(2), 184–194. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617718001005>
- Chiong, W., Wilson, S. M., D'Esposito, M., Kayser, A. S., Grossman, S. N., Poorzand, P., Seeley, W. W., Miller, B. L., & Rankin, K. P. (2013). The salience network causally influences default mode network activity during moral reasoning. *Brain*, 136(6), 1929–1941. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awt066>
- Chow, M. L., Brambati, S. M., Gorno-Tempini, M. L., Miller, B. L., & Johnson, J. K. (2010). Sound naming in neurodegenerative disease. *Brain and Cognition*, 72(3), 423–429. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2009.12.003>
- Clague, F., Dudas, R. B., Thompson, S. A., Graham, K. S., & Hodges, J. R. (2005). Multidimensional measures of person knowledge and spatial associative learning: Can these be applied to the differentiation of Alzheimer's disease from frontotemporal and vascular dementia? *Neuropsychologia*, 43(9), 1338–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.11.023>
- Clark, C. N., Nicholas, J. M., Henley, S. M. D., Downey, L. E., Woollacott, I. O., Golden, H. L., Fletcher, P. D., Mummery, C. J., Schott, J. M., Rohrer, J. D., Crutch, S. J., & Warren, J. D. (2015). Humour processing in frontotemporal lobar degeneration: A behavioural and neuroanatomical analysis. *Cortex*, 69, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.03.024>
- Clark, C. N., Nicholas, J. M., Gordon, E., Golden, H. L., Cohen, M. H., Woodward, F. J., Macpherson, K., Slattery, C. F., Mummery, C. J., Schott, J. M., Rohrer, J. D., & Warren, J. D. (2016). Altered Sense of Humor in Dementia. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, 49(1), 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-150413>
- Clark, C. N., Nicholas, J. M., Agustus, J. L., Hardy, C. J. D., Russell, L. L., Brotherhood, E. V., Dick, K. M., Marshall, C. R., Mummery, C. J., Rohrer, J. D., & Warren, J. D. (2017). Auditory conflict and congruence in frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, 104, 144–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2017.08.009>
- Clark, C. N., Golden, H. L., McCallion, O., Nicholas, J. M., Cohen, M. H., Slattery, C. F., Paterson, R. W., Fletcher, P. D., Mummery, C. J., Rohrer, J. D., Crutch, S. J., & Warren, J. D. (2018). Music models aberrant rule decoding and reward valuation in dementia. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 13(2), 192–202. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsx140>
- Cohen, M. H., Carton, A. M., Hardy, C. J., Golden, H. L., Clark, C. N., Fletcher, P. D., Jaisin, K., Marshall, C. R., Henley, S. M. D., Rohrer, J. D., Crutch, S. J., & Warren, J. D. (2016). Processing emotion from abstract art in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Neuropsychologia*, 81, 245–254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.12.031>
- Cooke, A., Zurif, E. B., DeVita, C., Alsop, D., Koenig, P., Detre, J., Gee, J., Pinãngo, M., Balogh, J., & Grossman, M. (2002). Neural basis for sentence comprehension: Grammatical and short-term memory components. *Human Brain Mapping*, 15(2), 80–94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.10006>
- Cooke, A., DeVita, C., Gee, J., Alsop, D., Detre, J., Chen, W., & Grossman, M. (2003). Neural basis for sentence comprehension deficits in frontotemporal dementia. *Brain and Language*, 85(2), 211–221. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X\(02\)00562-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(02)00562-X)
- Cosentino, S., Chute, D., Libon, D., Moore, P., & Grossman, M. (2006). How does the brain support script comprehension? A study of executive processes and semantic knowledge in dementia. *Neuropsychology*, 20(3), 307–318. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.20.3.307>
- Cotelli, M., Borroni, B., Manenti, R., Alberici, A., Calabria, M., Agosti, C., Arévalo, A., Ginex, V., Ortelli, P., Binetti, G., Zanetti, O., Padovani, A., & Cappa, S. F. (2006). Action and object naming in frontotemporal dementia, progressive supranuclear palsy, and corticobasal degeneration. *Neuropsychology*, 20(5), 558–565. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.20.5.558>
- Cotelli, M., Borroni, B., Manenti, R., Ginex, V., Calabria, M., Moro, A., Alberici, A., Zanetti, M., Zanetti, O., Cappa, S. F., & Padovani, A. (2007). Universal grammar in the frontotemporal dementia spectrum: Evidence of a selective disorder in the corticobasal degeneration syndrome. *Neuropsychologia*, 45(13), 3015–3023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.05.012>
- Cousins, K. A. Q., York, C., Bauer, L., & Grossman, M. (2016). Cognitive and anatomic double dissociation in the representation of concrete and abstract words in semantic variant and behavioral variant frontotemporal degeneration. *Neuropsychologia*, 84, 244–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.02.025>
- Couto, B., Manes, F., Montañés, P., Matallana, D., Reyes, P., Velasquez, M., Yoris, A., Baez, S., & Ibáñez, A. (2013). Structural neuroimaging of social cognition in progressive non-fluent aphasia and behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7, 467. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00467>

- De Winter, F.-L., Van den Stock, J., de Gelder, B., Peeters, R., Jastorff, J., Sunaert, S., Vanduffel, W., Vandenberghe, R., & Vandenbulcke, M. (2016a). Amygdala atrophy affects emotion-related activity in face-responsive regions in frontotemporal degeneration. *Cortex*, 82, 179–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.06.001>
- De Winter, F.-L., Timmers, D., de Gelder, B., Van Orshoven, M., Vieren, M., Bouckaert, M., Cypers, G., Caekebeke, J., Van de Vliet, L., Goffin, K., Van Laere, K., Sunaert, S., Vandenberghe, R., Vandenbulcke, M., & Van den Stock, J. (2016b). Face shape and face identity processing in behavioral variant fronto-temporal dementia: A specific deficit for familiarity and name recognition of famous faces. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 11, 368–377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2016.03.001>
- Dermody, N., Hornberger, M., Piguet, O., Hodges, J. R., & Irish, M. (2016a). Prospective Memory Impairments in Alzheimer's Disease and Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia: Clinical and Neural Correlates. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, 50(2), 425–441. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-150871>
- Dermody, N., Wong, S., Ahmed, R., Piguet, O., Hodges, J. R., & Irish, M. (2016b). Uncovering the Neural Bases of Cognitive and Affective Empathy Deficits in Alzheimer's Disease and the Behavioral-Variant of Frontotemporal Dementia. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, 53(3), 801–816. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-160175>
- Deutsch, M. B., Mendez, M. F., & Teng, E. (2015). Interactions between Traumatic Brain Injury and Frontotemporal Degeneration. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*, 39(3–4), 143–153. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000369787>
- Diehl, J., Monsch, A. U., Aebi, C., Wagenpfeil, S., Krapp, S., Grimmer, T., Seeley, W., Förstl, H., & Kurz, A. (2005). Frontotemporal dementia, semantic dementia, and Alzheimer's disease: The contribution of standard neuropsychological tests to differential diagnosis. *Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry and Neurology*, 18(1), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891988704272309>
- Downey, L. E., Blezat, A., Nicholas, J., Omar, R., Golden, H. L., Mahoney, C. J., Crutch, S. J., & Warren, J. D. (2013). Mentalising music in frontotemporal dementia. *Cortex*, 49(7), 1844–1855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.09.011>
- Downey, L. E., Fletcher, P. D., Golden, H. L., Mahoney, C. J., Agustus, J. L., Schott, J. M., Rohrer, J. D., Beck, J., Mead, S., Rossor, M. N., Crutch, S. J., & Warren, J. D. (2014). Altered body schema processing in frontotemporal dementia with C9ORF72 mutations. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, 85(9), 1016–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2013-306995>
- Downey, L. E., Mahoney, C. J., Buckley, A. H., Golden, H. L., Henley, S. M., Schmitz, N., Schott, J. M., Simpson, I. J., Ourselin, S., Fox, N. C., Crutch, S. J., & Warren, J. D. (2015). White matter tract signatures of impaired social cognition in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 8, 640–651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2015.06.005>
- Eckart, J. A., Sturm, V. E., Miller, B. L., & Levenson, R. W. (2012). Diminished disgust reactivity in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, 50(5), 786–790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.01.012>
- Farag, C., Troiani, V., Bonner, M., Powers, C., Avants, B., Gee, J., & Grossman, M. (2010). Hierarchical Organization of Scripts: Converging Evidence from fMRI and Frontotemporal Degeneration. *Cerebral Cortex*, 20(10), 2453–2463. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhp313>
- Fernandez-Duque, D., & Black, S. (2007). Metacognitive judgment and denial of deficit: Evidence from frontotemporal dementia. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 2, 359–370.
- Fernández-Matarrubia, M., Matías-Guiu, J. A., Cabrera-Martín, M. N., Moreno-Ramos, T., Valles-Salgado, M., Carreras, J. L., & Matías-Guiu, J. (2017). Episodic Memory Dysfunction in Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia: A Clinical And FDG-PET Study. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, 57(4), 1251–1264. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-160874>
- Filippi, M., Agosta, F., Scola, E., Canu, E., Magnani, G., Marcone, A., Valsasina, P., Caso, F., Copetti, M., Comi, G., Cappa, S. F., & Falini, A. (2013). Functional network connectivity in the behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Cortex*, 49(9), 2389–2401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.09.017>
- Filippi, M., Basaia, S., Canu, E., Imperiale, F., Meani, A., Caso, F., Magnani, G., Falautano, M., Comi, G., Falini, A., & Agosta, F. (2017). Brain network connectivity differs in early-onset neurodegenerative dementia. *Neurology*, 89(17), 1764–1772. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000004577>
- Fletcher, P. D., Nicholas, J. M., Shakespeare, T. J., Downey, L. E., Golden, H. L., Agustus, J. L., Clark, C. N., Mummery, C. J., Schott, J. M., Crutch, S. J., & Warren, J. D. (2015). Dementias show differential physiological responses to salient sounds. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00073>
- Fletcher, P. D., Nicholas, J. M., Downey, L. E., Golden, H. L., Clark, C. N., Pires, C., Agustus, J. L., Mummery, C. J., Schott, J. M., Rohrer, J. D., Crutch, S. J., & Warren, J. D. (2016). A physiological signature of sound meaning in dementia. *Cortex*, 77, 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.01.007>
- Forkel, S. J., Rogalski, E., Drossinos Sancho, N., D'Anna, L., Luque Laguna, P., Sridhar, J., Dell'Acqua, F., Weintraub, S., Thompson, C., Mesulam, M.-M., & Catani, M. (2020). Anatomical evidence of an indirect pathway for word repetition. *Neurology*, 94(6), e594–e606. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.00000000000008746>
- Frings, L., Dressel, K., Abel, S., Saur, D., Kümmerer, D., Mader, I., Weiller, C., & Hüll, M. (2010). Reduced Precuneus Deactivation during Object Naming in Patients with Mild Cognitive Impairment, Alzheimer's Disease, and Frontotemporal Lobar Degeneration. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*, 30(4), 334–343. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000320991>
- Galton, C. J., Gomez-Anson, B., Antoun, N., Scheltens, P., Patterson, K., Graves, M., Sahakian, B. J., & Hodges, J. R. (2001). Temporal lobe rating scale: Application to Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal dementia. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 70(2), 165–173. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.70.2.165>
- García, A. M., Bocanegra, Y., Herrera, E., Moreno, L., Carmona, J., Baena, A., Lopera, F., Pineda, D., Melloni, M., Legaz, A., Muñoz, E., Sedeño, L., Baez, S., & Ibáñez, A. (2018). Parkinson's disease compromises the appraisal of action meanings evoked by naturalistic texts. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior*, 100, 111–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.07.003>

- Giovagnoli, A. R., Erbetta, A., Reati, F., & Bugiani, O. (2008). Differential neuropsychological patterns of frontal variant frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease in a study of diagnostic concordance. *Neuropsychologia*, *46*(5), 1495–1504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.12.023>
- Giovagnoli, A. R., Bell, B., Erbetta, A., Paterlini, C., & Bugiani, O. (2019). Analyzing theory of mind impairment in patients with behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Neurological Sciences*, *40*(9), 1893–1900. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10072-019-03911-6>
- Gleichgerricht, E., Torralva, T., Roca, M., Pose, M., & Manes, F. (2011). The role of social cognition in moral judgment in frontotemporal dementia. *Social Neuroscience*, *6*(2), 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2010.506751>
- Gleichgerricht, E., Torralva, T., Roca, M., Szenkman, D., Ibanez, A., Richly, P., Pose, M., & Manes, F. (2012). Decision Making Cognition in Primary Progressive Aphasia. *Behavioural Neurology*, *25*(1), 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.3233/BEN-2012-0352>
- Gola, K. A., Thorne, A., Veldhuisen, L. D., Felix, C. M., Hankinson, S., Pham, J., Shany-Ur, T., Schauer, G. P., Stanley, C. M., Glenn, S., Miller, B. L., & Rankin, K. P. (2015). Neural substrates of spontaneous narrative production in focal neurodegenerative disease. *Neuropsychologia*, *79*, 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.10.022>
- Gregory, C., Lough, S., Stone, V., Erzinclioglu, S., Martin, L., Baron-Cohen, S., & Hodges, J. R. (2002). Theory of mind in patients with frontal variant frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease: Theoretical and practical implications. *Brain*, *125*(4), 752–764. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awf079>
- Grossman, M., Cooke, A., DeVita, C., Alsop, D., Detre, J., Chen, W., & Gee, J. (2002). Age-related changes in working memory during sentence comprehension: An fMRI study. *NeuroImage*, *15*(2), 302–317. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2001.0971>
- Grossman, M., McMillan, C., Moore, P., Ding, L., Glosser, G., Work, M., & Gee, J. (2004). What's in a name: Voxel-based morphometric analyses of MRI and naming difficulty in Alzheimer's disease, frontotemporal dementia and corticobasal degeneration. *Brain*, *127*(3), 628–649. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awh075>
- Grossman, M., Rhee, J., & Moore, P. (2005). Sentence Processing in Frontotemporal Dementia. *Cortex*, *41*(6), 764–777. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452\(08\)70295-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452(08)70295-8)
- Gunawardena, D., Ash, S., McMillan, C., Avants, B., Gee, J., & Grossman, M. (2010). Why are patients with progressive nonfluent aphasia nonfluent? *Neurology*, *75*(7), 588–594. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181ed9c7d>
- Harciarek, M., & Kertesz, A. (2008). The prevalence of misidentification syndromes in neurodegenerative diseases. *Alzheimer Disease and Associated Disorders*, *22*(2), 163–169. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WAD.0b013e3181641341>
- Hardy, C. J. D., Buckley, A. H., Downey, L. E., Lehmann, M., Zimmerer, V. C., Varley, R. A., Crutch, S. J., Rohrer, J. D., Warrington, E. K., & Warren, J. D. (2016). The Language Profile of Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, *50*(2), 359–371. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-150806>
- Harris, J. M., Jones, M., Gall, C., Richardson, A. M. T., Neary, D., du Plessis, D., Pal, P., Mann, D. M. A., Snowden, J. S., & Thompson, J. C. (2016). Co-Occurrence of Language and Behavioural Change in Frontotemporal Lobar Degeneration. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders Extra*, *6*(2), 205–213. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000444848>
- Healey, M. L., McMillan, C. T., Golob, S., Spotorno, N., Rascovsky, K., Irwin, D. J., Clark, R., & Grossman, M. (2015). Getting on the same page: The neural basis for social coordination deficits in behavioral variant frontotemporal degeneration. *Neuropsychologia*, *69*, 56–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.01.028>
- Healey, M., Spotorno, N., Olm, C., Irwin, D. J., & Grossman, M. (2019). Cognitive and Neuroanatomic Accounts of Referential Communication in Focal Dementia. *ENeuro*, *6*(5). <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0488-18.2019>
- Henley, S. M. D., Downey, L. E., Nicholas, J. M., Kinnunen, K. M., Golden, H. L., Buckley, A., Mahoney, C. J., & Crutch, S. J. (2014). Degradation of cognitive timing mechanisms in behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *65*, 88–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.10.009>
- Heuer, H. W., Wang, P., Rascovsky, K., Wolf, A., Appleby, B., Bove, J., Bordelon, Y., Brannelly, P., Brushaber, D. E., Caso, C., Coppola, G., Dickerson, B., Dickinson, S., Domoto-Reilly, K., Faber, K., Ferrall, J., Fields, J., Fishman, A., Fong, J., ... ARTFL and LEFFTDS consortia. (2020). Comparison of sporadic and familial behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia (FTD) in a North American cohort. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: The Journal of the Alzheimer's Association*, *16*(1), 60–70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.12046>
- Hoefler, M., Allison, S. C., Schauer, G. F., Neuhaus, J. M., Hall, J., Dang, J. N., Weiner, M. W., Miller, B. L., & Rosen, H. J. (2008). Fear conditioning in frontotemporal lobar degeneration and Alzheimer's disease. *Brain*, *131*(6), 1646–1657. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awn082>
- Hornberger, M., Shelley, B. P., Kipps, C. M., Piguet, O., & Hodges, J. R. (2009). Can progressive and non-progressive behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia be distinguished at presentation? *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, *80*(6), 591–593. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2008.163873>
- Hou, C. E., Miller, B. L., & Kramer, J. H. (2005). Patterns of autobiographical memory loss in dementia. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *20*(9), 809–815. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.1361>
- Hsieh, S., Foxe, D., Leslie, F., Savage, S., Piguet, O., & Hodges, J. R. (2012). Grief and joy: Emotion word comprehension in the dementias. *Neuropsychology*, *26*(5), 624–630. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029326>
- Hsieh, S., Schubert, S., Hoon, C., Mioshi, E., & Hodges, J. R. (2013). Validation of the Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination III in frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*, *36*(3–4), 242–250. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000351671>
- Hua, A. Y., Sible, I. J., Perry, D. C., Rankin, K. P., Kramer, J. H., Miller, B. L., Rosen, H. J., & Sturm, V. E. (2018). Enhanced Positive Emotional Reactivity Undermines Empathy in Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia. *Frontiers in Neurology*, *9*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2018.00402>

- Hughes, L. E., Nestor, P. J., Hodges, J. R., & Rowe, J. B. (2011). Magnetoencephalography of frontotemporal dementia: Spatiotemporally localized changes during semantic decisions. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *134*(Pt 9), 2513–2522. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr196>
- Hutchings, R., Hodges, J. R., Piguet, O., & Kumfor, F. (2015). Why Should I Care? Dimensions of Socio-Emotional Cognition in Younger-Onset Dementia. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, *48*(1), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-150245>
- Hutchings, R., Palermo, R., Bruggemann, J., Hodges, J. R., Piguet, O., & Kumfor, F. (2018). Looking but not seeing: Increased eye fixations in behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia. *Cortex*, *103*, 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2018.02.011>
- Irish, M., Hornberger, M., Lah, S., Miller, L., Pengas, G., Nestor, P. J., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2011). Profiles of recent autobiographical memory retrieval in semantic dementia, behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia, and Alzheimer's disease. *Neuropsychologia*, *49*(9), 2694–2702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.05.017>
- Irish, M., Graham, A., Graham, K. S., Hodges, J. R., & Hornberger, M. (2012). Differential impairment of source memory in progressive versus non-progressive behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology: The Official Journal of the National Academy of Neuropsychologists*, *27*(3), 338–347. <https://doi.org/10.1093/arclin/acs033>
- Irish, M., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2013). Episodic future thinking is impaired in the behavioural variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Cortex*, *49*(9), 2377–2388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2013.03.002>
- Irish, M., Hornberger, M., El Wahsh, S., Lam, B. Y. K., Lah, S., Miller, L., Hsieh, S., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2014a). Grey and white matter correlates of recent and remote autobiographical memory retrieval—Insights from the dementias. *PLoS One*, *9*(11), e113081. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0113081>
- Irish, M., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2014b). Right anterior temporal lobe dysfunction underlies theory of mind impairments in semantic dementia. *Brain*, *137*(4), 1241–1253. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awu003>
- Irish, M., Eyre, N., Dermody, N., O'Callaghan, C., Hodges, J. R., Hornberger, M., & Piguet, O. (2016). Neural Substrates of Semantic Prospection—Evidence from the Dementias. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *10*, 96. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00096>
- Jastorff, J., De Winter, F.-L., Van den Stock, J., Vandenbergh, R., Giese, M. A., & Vandenbulcke, M. (2016). Functional dissociation between anterior temporal lobe and inferior frontal gyrus in the processing of dynamic body expressions: Insights from behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Human Brain Mapping*, *37*(12), 4472–4486. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.23322>
- Jenner, C., Reali, G., Puopolo, M., & Silveri, M. C. (2006). Can Cognitive and Behavioural Disorders Differentiate Frontal Variant-Frontotemporal Dementia From Alzheimer's Disease at Early Stages? *Behavioural Neurology*, *17*(2), 89–95. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2006/812760>
- Johnen, A., Frommeyer, J., Modes, F., Wiendl, H., Duning, T., & Lohmann, H. (2016a). Dementia Apraxia Test (DATE): A Brief Tool to Differentiate Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia from Alzheimer's Dementia Based on Apraxia Profiles. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, *49*(3), 593–605. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-150447>
- Johnen, A., Brandstetter, L., Kärgel, C., Wiendl, H., Lohmann, H., & Duning, T. (2016b). Shared neural correlates of limb apraxia in early stages of Alzheimer's dementia and behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Cortex*, *84*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.08.009>
- Johnen, A., Reul, S., Wiendl, H., Meuth, S. G., & Duning, T. (2018). Apraxia profiles—A single cognitive marker to discriminate all variants of frontotemporal lobar degeneration and Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring*, *10*(1), 363–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dadm.2018.04.002>
- Johnson, J. K., Chang, C.-C., Brambati, S. M., Migliaccio, R., Gorno-Tempini, M. L., Miller, B. L., & Janata, P. (2011). Music Recognition in Frontotemporal Lobar Degeneration and Alzheimer Disease. *Cognitive and Behavioral Neurology*, *24*(2), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WNN.0b013e31821de326>
- Josephs, K. A., Ahmed, Z., Katsuse, O., Parisi, J. F., Boeve, B. F., Knopman, D. S., Petersen, R. C., Davies, P., Duara, R., Graff-Radford, N. R., Uitti, R. J., Rademakers, R., Adamson, J., Baker, M., Hutton, M. L., & Dickson, D. W. (2007). Neuropathologic features of frontotemporal lobar degeneration with ubiquitin-positive inclusions with progranulin gene (PGRN) mutations. *Journal of Neuropathology and Experimental Neurology*, *66*(2), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.1097/nen.0b013e31803020cf>
- Kamminga, J., Kumfor, F., Burrell, J. R., Piguet, O., Hodges, J. R., & Irish, M. (2015). Differentiating between right-lateralised semantic dementia and behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia: An examination of clinical characteristics and emotion processing. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, *86*(10), 1082–1088. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2014-309120>
- Kamminga, J., O'Callaghan, C., Hodges, J. R., & Irish, M. (2014). Differential Prospective Memory Profiles in Frontotemporal Dementia Syndromes. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, *38*(3), 669–679. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-131118>
- Kaq, C., S. A., Ca, O., & M, G. (2018). Longitudinal Changes in Semantic Concreteness in Semantic Variant Primary Progressive Aphasia (svPPA). *ENeuro*, *5*(6). <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0197-18.2018>
- Keane, J., Calder, A. J., Hodges, J. R., & Young, A. W. (2002). Face and emotion processing in frontal variant frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *40*(6), 655–665. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(01\)00156-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(01)00156-7)
- Kipps, C. M., Hodges, J. R., Fryer, T. D., & Nestor, P. J. (2009). Combined magnetic resonance imaging and positron emission tomography brain imaging in behavioural variant frontotemporal degeneration: Refining the clinical phenotype. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *132*(Pt 9), 2566–2578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awp077>
- Koenig, P., Smith, E. E., & Grossman, M. (2006). Semantic categorisation of novel objects in frontotemporal dementia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *23*(4), 541–562. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643290542000094>

- Kramer, J. H., Jurik, J., Sha, S. J., Rankin, K. P., Rosen, H. J., Johnson, J. K., & Miller, B. L. (2003). Distinctive Neuropsychological Patterns in Frontotemporal Dementia, Semantic Dementia, And Alzheimer Disease. *Cognitive and Behavioral Neurology*, *16*(4), 211–218.
- Krämer, J., Lueg, G., Schiffler, P., Vrachimis, A., Weckesser, M., Wenning, C., Pawlowski, M., Johnen, A., Teuber, A., Wersching, H., Meuth, S. G., & Dünig, T. (2018). Diagnostic Value of Diffusion Tensor Imaging and Positron Emission Tomography in Early Stages of Frontotemporal Dementia. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, *63*(1), 239–253. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-170224>
- Krawczyk, D. C., Morrison, R. G., Viskontas, I., Holyoak, K. J., Chow, T. W., Mendez, M. F., Miller, B. L., & Knowlton, B. J. (2008). Distraction during relational reasoning: The role of prefrontal cortex in interference control. *Neuropsychologia*, *46*(7), 2020–2032. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.02.001>
- Kumfor, F., Honan, C., McDonald, S., Hazelton, J. L., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2017). Assessing the « social brain » in dementia: Applying TASIT-S. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior*, *93*, 166–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.05.022>
- Kumfor, F., Irish, M., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2013a). Discrete Neural Correlates for the Recognition of Negative Emotions: Insights from Frontotemporal Dementia. *PLoS One*, *8*(6), e67457. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0067457>
- Kumfor, F., Irish, M., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2013b). The orbitofrontal cortex is involved in emotional enhancement of memory: Evidence from the dementias. *Brain*, *136*(10), 2992–3003. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awt185>
- Kumfor, F., Irish, M., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2014). Frontal and temporal lobe contributions to emotional enhancement of memory in behavioral-variant frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *8*, 225. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00225>
- Kumfor, F., Hutchings, R., Irish, M., Hodges, J. R., Rhodes, G., Palermo, R., & Piguet, O. (2015). Do I know you? Examining face and object memory in frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *71*, 101–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.03.020>
- Kumfor, F., Teo, D., Miller, L., Lah, S., Mioshi, E., Hodges, J. R., Piguet, O., & Irish, M. (2016). Examining the Relationship Between Autobiographical Memory Impairment and Carer Burden in Dementia Syndromes. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, *51*(1), 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-150740>
- Laisney, M., Matuszewski, V., Mézenge, F., Belliard, S., de la Sayette, V., Eustache, F., & Desgranges, B. (2009). The underlying mechanisms of verbal fluency deficit in frontotemporal dementia and semantic dementia. *Journal of Neurology*, *256*(7), 1083. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-009-5073-y>
- Lambon Ralph, M. A., Jefferies, E., Patterson, K., & Rogers, T. T. (2017). The neural and computational bases of semantic cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *18*(1), 42–55. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2016.150>
- Lee, D. J., Bigio, E. H., Rogalski, E. J., & Mesulam, M.-M. (2020). Speech and Language Presentations of FTLDP Type B Neuropathology. *Journal of Neuropathology and Experimental Neurology*, *79*(3), 277–283. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnen/nlz132>
- Lima-Silva, T. B., Bahia, V. S., Carvalho, V. A., Guimarães, H. C., Caramelli, P., Balthazar, M. L. F., Damasceno, B., Bottino, C. M. de C., Brucki, S. M. D., Nitrini, R., & Yassuda, M. S. (2015). Direct and indirect assessments of activities of daily living in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer disease. *Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry and Neurology*, *28*(1), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891988714541874>
- Lin, P.-H., Chen, H.-H., Chen, N.-C., Chang, W.-N., Huang, C.-W., Chang, Y.-T., Hsu, S.-W., Hsu, C.-W., & Chang, C.-C. (2016). Anatomical Correlates of Non-Verbal Perception in Dementia Patients. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *8*, 207. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2016.00207>
- Lukic, S., Thompson, C. K., Barbieri, E., Chiappetta, B., Bonakdarpour, B., Kiran, S., Rapp, B., Parrish, T. B., & Caplan, D. (2021). Common and distinct neural substrates of sentence production and comprehension. *NeuroImage*, *224*, 117374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117374>
- Luzzi, S., Snowden, J. S., Neary, D., Coccia, M., Provinciali, L., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2007). Distinct patterns of olfactory impairment in Alzheimer's disease, semantic dementia, frontotemporal dementia, and corticobasal degeneration. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*(8), 1823–1831. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.12.008>
- Luzzi, S., Baldinelli, S., Ranaldi, V., Fiori, C., Plutino, A., Fringuelli, F. M., Silvestrini, M., Baggio, G., & Reverberi, C. (2020). The neural bases of discourse semantic and pragmatic deficits in patients with frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior*, *128*, 174–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.03.012>
- Magerova, H., Vyhnalek, M., Laco, J., Andel, R., Rektorova, I., Kadlecova, A., Bojar, M., & Hort, J. (2014). Odor identification in frontotemporal lobar degeneration subtypes. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementias*, *29*(8), 762–768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1533317514539033>
- Mahoney, C. J., Beck, J., Rohrer, J. D., Lashley, T., Mok, K., Shakespeare, T., Yeatman, T., Warrington, E. K., Schott, J. M., Fox, N. C., Rossor, M. N., Hardy, J., Collinge, J., Revesz, T., Mead, S., & Warren, J. D. (2012). Frontotemporal dementia with the C9ORF72 hexanucleotide repeat expansion: Clinical, neuroanatomical and neuropathological features. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *135*(Pt 3), 736–750. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr361>
- Mahoney, C. J., Ridgway, G. R., Malone, I. B., Downey, L. E., Beck, J., Kinnunen, K. M., Schmitz, N., Golden, H. L., Rohrer, J. D., Schott, J. M., Rossor, M. N., Ourselin, S., Mead, S., Fox, N. C., & Warren, J. D. (2014). Profiles of white matter tract pathology in frontotemporal dementia. *Human Brain Mapping*, *35*(8), 4163–4179. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22468>
- Mahoney, C. J., Simpson, I. J. A., Nicholas, J. M., Fletcher, P. D., Downey, L. E., Golden, H. L., Clark, C. N., Schmitz, N., Rohrer, J. D., Schott, J. M., Zhang, H., Ourselin, S., Warren, J. D., & Fox, N. C. (2015). Longitudinal diffusion tensor imaging in frontotemporal dementia. *Annals of Neurology*, *77*(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.24296>

- Mandelli, M. L., Vitali, P., Santos, M., Henry, M., Gola, K., Rosenberg, L., Dronkers, N., Miller, B., Seeley, W. W., & Gorno-Tempini, M. L. (2016). Two insular regions are differentially involved in behavioral variant FTD and nonfluent/agrammatic variant PPA. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior*, *74*, 149–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.10.012>
- Manes, F., Torralva, T., Ibáñez, A., Roca, M., Bekinschtein, T., & Gleichgerrcht, E. (2011). Decision-making in frontotemporal dementia: Clinical, theoretical and legal implications. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*, *32*(1), 11–17. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000329912>
- Manuel, A. L., Foxe, D., Bradshaw, N., Cordato, N. J., Hodges, J. R., Burrell, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2019). Sustained attention failures on a 3-min reaction time task is a sensitive marker of dementia. *Journal of Neurology*, *266*(6), 1323–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-019-09261-9>
- Marshall, C. R., Hardy, C. J. D., Russell, L. L., Clark, C. N., Dick, K. M., Brotherhood, E. V., Bond, R. L., Mummery, C. J., Schott, J. M., Rohrer, J. D., Kilner, J. M., & Warren, J. D. (2017). Impaired Interoceptive Accuracy in Semantic Variant Primary Progressive Aphasia. *Frontiers in Neurology*, *8*, 610. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2017.00610>
- Marshall, C. R., Hardy, C. J. D., Allen, M., Russell, L. L., Clark, C. N., Bond, R. L., Dick, K. M., Brotherhood, E. V., Rohrer, J. D., Kilner, J. M., & Warren, J. D. (2018a). Cardiac responses to viewing facial emotion differentiate frontotemporal dementias. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology*, *5*(6), 687–696. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acn3.563>
- Marshall, C. R., Hardy, C. J. D., Russell, L. L., Clark, C. N., Bond, R. L., Dick, K. M., Brotherhood, E. V., Mummery, C. J., Schott, J. M., Rohrer, J. D., Kilner, J. M., & Warren, J. D. (2018b). Motor signatures of emotional reactivity in frontotemporal dementia. *Scientific Reports*, *8*(1), 1030. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-19528-2>
- Marshall, C. R., Hardy, C. J. D., Russell, L. L., Bond, R. L., Sivasathiseelan, H., Greaves, C., Moore, K. M., Agustus, J. L., van Leeuwen, J. E. P., Wastling, S. J., Rohrer, J. D., Kilner, J. M., & Warren, J. D. (2019). The functional neuroanatomy of emotion processing in frontotemporal dementias. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *142*(9), 2873–2887. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awz204>
- Massimo, L., Xie, S. X., Rennert, L., Fick, D. M., Halpin, A., Placek, K., Williams, A., Rascovsky, K., Irwin, D. J., Grossman, M., & McMillan, C. T. (2019). Occupational attainment influences longitudinal decline in behavioral variant frontotemporal degeneration. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, *13*(1), 293–301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-018-9852-x>
- Matuszewski, V., Piolino, P., de la Sayette, V., Lalevée, C., Pélerin, A., Dupuy, B., Viader, F., Eustache, F., & Desgranges, B. (2006). Retrieval mechanisms for autobiographical memories: Insights from the frontal variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *44*(12), 2386–2397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.04.031>
- McKinnon, M. C., Nica, E. I., Sengdy, P., Kovacevic, N., Moscovitch, M., Freedman, M., Miller, B. L., Black, S. E., & Levine, B. (2008). Autobiographical Memory and Patterns of Brain Atrophy in Fronto-temporal Lobar Degeneration. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *20*(10), 1839–1853. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2008.20126>
- McMillan, C. T., Coleman, D., Clark, R., Liang, T.-W., Gross, R. G., & Grossman, M. (2013). Converging evidence for the processing costs associated with ambiguous quantifier comprehension. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *4*, 153. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00153>
- Mendez, M. F., & Shapira, J. S. (2013). Hypersexual behavior in frontotemporal dementia: A comparison with early-onset Alzheimer's disease. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *42*(3), 501–509. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-0042-4>
- Mendez, M. F., & Lim, G. T. H. (2004). Alterations of the sense of «humanness» in right hemisphere predominant frontotemporal dementia patients. *Cognitive and Behavioral Neurology: Official Journal of the Society for Behavioral and Cognitive Neurology*, *17*(3), 133–138. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.wnn.0000136593.21532.16>
- Mendez, M. F., Fong, S. S., Shapira, J. S., Jimenez, E. E., Kaiser, N. C., Kremen, S. A., & Tsai, P.-H. (2014). Observation of Social Behavior in Frontotemporal Dementia. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease & Other Dementias*, *29*(3), 215–221. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1533317513517035>
- Mendez, M. F., Carr, A. R., & Pahlpak, P. (2017). Psychotic-Like Speech in Frontotemporal Dementia. *The Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, *29*(2), 183–185. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.neuropsych.16030058>
- Mesulam, M.-M., Rogalski, E. J., Wieneke, C., Hurley, R. S., Geula, C., Bigio, E. H., Thompson, C. K., & Weintraub, S. (2014). Primary progressive aphasia and the evolving neurology of the language network. *Nature Reviews. Neurology*, *10*(10), 554–569. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneuro.2014.159>
- Miller, L. A., Hsieh, S., Lah, S., Savage, S., Hodges, J. R., & Piguet, O. (2012). One Size Does Not Fit All: Face Emotion Processing Impairments in Semantic Dementia, Behavioural-Variant Frontotemporal Dementia and Alzheimer's Disease Are Mediated by Distinct Cognitive Deficits. *Behavioural Neurology*, *25*(1), 53–60. <https://doi.org/10.3233/BEN-2012-0349>
- Moore, K., Convery, R., Bocchetta, M., Neason, M., Cash, D. M., Greaves, C., Russell, L. L., Clarke, M. T. M., Peakman, G., van Swieten, J., Jiskoot, L., Moreno, F., Barandiaran, M., Sanchez-Valle, R., Borroni, B., Laforce, R., Doré, M.-C., Masellis, M., Tartaglia, M. C., ... Genetic FTD Initiative, GENFI\*. (2020). A modified Camel and Cactus Test detects presymptomatic semantic impairment in genetic frontotemporal dementia within the GENFI cohort. *Applied Neuropsychology. Adult*, *1*–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23279095.2020.1716357>
- Morrison, R. G., Krawczyk, D. C., Holyoak, K. J., Hummel, J. E., Chow, T. W., Miller, B. L., & Knowlton, B. J. (2004). A neurocomputational model of analogical reasoning and its breakdown in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *16*(2), 260–271. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089892904322984553>
- Murray, R., Koenig, P., Antani, S., McCawley, G., & Grossman, M. (2007). Lexical acquisition in progressive aphasia and frontotemporal dementia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *24*(1), 48–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643290600890657>
- Neary, D., Snowden, J. S., Gustafson, L., Passant, U., Stuss, D., Black, S., Freedman, M., Kertesz, A., Robert, P. H., Albert, M., Boone, K., Miller, B. L., Cummings, J., & Benson, D. F. (1998). Frontotemporal lobar degeneration: A consensus on clinical diagnostic criteria. *Neurology*, *51*(6), 1546–1554. <https://doi.org/10.1212/wnl.51.6.1546>

- Neveler, N., Ash, S., Jester, C., Irwin, D. J., Liberman, M., & Grossman, M. (2017). Automatic measurement of prosody in behavioral variant FTD. *Neurology*, *89*(7), 650–656. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000004236>
- Oliver, L. D., Mitchell, D. G. V., Dziobek, I., MacKinley, J., Coleman, K., Rankin, K. P., & Finger, E. C. (2015). Parsing cognitive and emotional empathy deficits for negative and positive stimuli in frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *67*, 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.11.022>
- Omar, R., Henley, S. M. D., Bartlett, J. W., Hailstone, J. C., Gordon, E., Sauter, D. A., Frost, C., Scott, S. K., & Warren, J. D. (2011). The structural neuroanatomy of music emotion recognition: Evidence from frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *NeuroImage*, *56*(3), 1814–1821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.03.002>
- Omar, R., Mahoney, C. J., Buckley, A. H., & Warren, J. D. (2013). Flavour identification in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, *84*(1), 88–93. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2012-303853>
- Orasji, S. S. S., Mulder, J. L., de Bruijn, S. F. T. M., & Wirtz, P. W. (2016). Olfactory dysfunction in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery*, *141*, 106–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2016.01.003>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, *372*, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Park, H. K., Park, K. H., Yoon, B., Lee, J.-H., Choi, S. H., Joung, J. H., Yoon, S. J., Kim, B. C., Kim, S. H., Kim, E.-J., Na, D. L., & Park, K. W. (2017). Clinical characteristics of parkinsonism in frontotemporal dementia according to subtypes. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, *372*, 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2016.11.033>
- Peelle, J. E., Cooke, A., Moore, P., Vesely, L., & Grossman, M. (2007). Syntactic and thematic components of sentence processing in progressive nonfluent aphasia and nonaphasic frontotemporal dementia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *20*(6), 482–494. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2007.04.002>
- Peelle, J. E., Troiani, V., Gee, J., Moore, P., McMillan, C., Vesely, L., & Grossman, M. (2008). Sentence comprehension and voxel-based morphometry in progressive nonfluent aphasia, semantic dementia, and nonaphasic frontotemporal dementia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *21*(5), 418–432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2008.01.004>
- Perry, D. C., Brown, J. A., Possin, K. L., Datta, S., Trujillo, A., Radke, A., Karydas, A., Komak, J., Sias, A. C., Rabinovici, G. D., Gorno-Tempini, M. L., Boxer, A. L., De May, M., Rankin, K. P., Sturm, V. E., Lee, S. E., Matthews, B. R., Kao, A. W., Vessel, K. A., ... Seeley, W. W. (2017). Clinicopathological correlations in behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *140*(12), 3329–3345. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awx254>
- Perry, R. J., & Hodges, J. R. (2000). Differentiating frontal and temporal variant frontotemporal dementia from Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology*, *54*(12), 2277–2284. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.54.12.2277>
- Pichon, S., & Kell, C. A. (2013). Affective and sensorimotor components of emotional prosody generation. *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, *33*(4), 1640–1650. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3530-12.2013>
- Piolino, P., Chételat, G., Matuszewski, V., Landeau, B., Mézenge, F., Viader, F., de la Sayette, V., Eustache, F., & Desgranges, B. (2007). In search of autobiographical memories: A PET study in the frontal variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*(12), 2730–2743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.04.013>
- Pozueta, A., Lage, C., García-Martínez, M., Kazimierczak, M., Bravo, M., López-García, S., Riancho, J., González-Suarez, A., Vázquez-Higuera, J. L., de Arcocha-Torres, M., Banzo, I., Jiménez-Bonilla, J., Berciano, J., Rodríguez-Rodríguez, E., & Sánchez-Juan, P. (2019). Cognitive and Behavioral Profiles of Left and Right Semantic Dementia: Differential Diagnosis with Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia and Alzheimer's Disease. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, *72*(4), 1129–1144. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-190877>
- Pressman, P. S., Ross, E. D., Cohen, K. B., Chen, K.-H., Miller, B. L., Hunter, L. E., Gorno-Tempini, M. L., & Levenson, R. W. (2019). Interpersonal prosodic correlation in frontotemporal dementia. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology*, *6*(7), 1352–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acn3.50816>
- Price, C. J. (2010). The anatomy of language: A review of 100 fMRI studies published in 2009. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1191*, 62–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2010.05444.x>
- Ranasinghe, K. G., Rankin, K. P., Pressman, P. S., Perry, D. C., Lobach, I. V., Seeley, W. W., Coppola, G., Karydas, A. M., Grinberg, L. T., Shany-Ur, T., Lee, S. E., Rabinovici, G. D., Rosen, H. J., Gorno-Tempini, M. L., Boxer, A. L., Miller, Z. A., Chiong, W., DeMay, M., Kramer, J. H., ... Miller, B. L. (2016). Distinct Subtypes of Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia Based on Patterns of Network Degeneration. *JAMA Neurology*, *73*(9), 1078–1088. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2016.2016>
- Rankin, K. P., Liu, A. A., Howard, S., Slama, H., Hou, C. E., Shuster, K., & Miller, B. L. (2007). A Case-controlled Study of Altered Visual Art Production in Alzheimer's and FTL. *Cognitive and Behavioral Neurology*, *20*(1), 48–61. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WNN.0b013e31803141dd>
- Rankin, K. P., Salazar, A., Gorno-Tempini, M. L., Sollberger, M., Wilson, S. M., Pavlic, D., Stanley, C. M., Glenn, S., Weiner, M. W., & Miller, B. L. (2009). Detecting sarcasm from paralinguistic cues: Anatomic and cognitive correlates in neurodegenerative disease. *NeuroImage*, *47*(4), 2005–2015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.05.077>
- Rascovsky, K., Hodges, J. R., Knopman, D., Mendez, M. F., Kramer, J. H., Neuhaus, J., van Swieten, J. C., Seelaar, H., Dopper, E. G. P., Onyike, C. U., Hillis, A. E., Josephs, K. A., Boeve, B. F., Kertesz, A., Seeley, W. W., Rankin, K. P., Johnson, J. K., Gorno-Tempini, M.-L., Rosen, H., ... Miller, B. L. (2011). Sensitivity of revised diagnostic criteria for the behavioural variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *134*(Pt 9), 2456–2477. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr179>
- Reyes, P., Ortega-Merchan, M. P., Rueda, A., Uriza, F., Santamaria-García, H., Rojas-Serrano, N., Rodriguez-Santos, J., Velasco-Leon, M. C., Rodriguez-Parra, J. D., Mora-Díaz, D. E., & Matallana, D. (2018). Functional Connectivity Changes in




- Behavioral, Semantic, and Nonfluent Variants of Frontotemporal Dementia. *Behavioural Neurology*, 2018, 9684129. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/9684129>
- Reyes, P. A., Rueda, A. D. P., Uriza, F., & Matallana, D. L. (2019). Networks Disrupted in Linguistic Variants of Frontotemporal Dementia. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 10, 903. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2019.00903>
- Rhee, J., Antiquena, P., & Grossman, M. (2001). Verb Comprehension in Frontotemporal Degeneration: The Role of Grammatical, Semantic and Executive Components. *Neurocase*, 7(2), 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.1093/neucas/7.2.173>
- Roca, M., Manes, F., Gleichgerrcht, E., Watson, P., Ibáñez, A., Thompson, R., Torralva, T., & Duncan, J. (2013). Intelligence and executive functions in frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, 51(4), 725–730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.01.008>
- Rogers, T. T., Ivanoiu, A., Patterson, K., & Hodges, J. R. (2006). Semantic memory in Alzheimer's disease and the frontotemporal dementias: A longitudinal study of 236 patients. *Neuropsychology*, 20(3), 319–335. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.20.3.319>
- Rosen, H. J., Gorno-Tempini, M. L., Goldman, W. P., Perry, R. J., Schuff, N., Weiner, M., Feiwell, R., Kramer, J. H., & Miller, B. L. (2002). Patterns of brain atrophy in frontotemporal dementia and semantic dementia. *Neurology*, 58(2), 198–208. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.58.2.198>
- Rosen, H. J., Pace-Savitsky, K., Perry, R. J., Kramer, J. H., Miller, B. L., & Levenson, R. W. (2004). Recognition of Emotion in the Frontal and Temporal Variants of Frontotemporal Dementia. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*, 17(4), 277–281. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000077154>
- Rosen, H. J., Alcantar, O., Zakrzewski, J., Shimamura, A. P., Neuhaus, J., & Miller, B. L. (2014). Metacognition in the behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *Neuropsychology*, 28(3), 436–447. <https://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000012>
- Rousseaux, M., Sève, A., Vallet, M., Pasquier, F., & Mackowiak-Cordoliani, M. A. (2010). An analysis of communication in conversation in patients with dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, 48(13), 3884–3890. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.09.026>
- Russo, G., Russo, M. J., Buyatti, D., Chrem, P., Bagnati, P., Fernández Suarez, M., Campos, J., Cohen, G., Amengual, A., Allegri, R. F., & Knopman, D. S. (2014). Utility of the Spanish version of the FTLD-modified CDR in the diagnosis and staging in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, 344(1–2), 63–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2014.06.024>
- Salimi, S., Irish, M., Foxe, D., Hodges, J. R., Pigué, O., & Burrell, J. R. (2019). Visuospatial dysfunction in Alzheimer's disease and behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, 402, 74–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2019.04.019>
- Santamaría-García, H., Baez, S., Reyes, P., Santamaría-García, J. A., Santacruz-Escudero, J. M., Matallana, D., Arévalo, A., Sigman, M., García, A. M., & Ibáñez, A. (2017). A lesion model of envy and Schadenfreude: Legal, deservingness and moral dimensions as revealed by neurodegeneration. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, 140(12), 3357–3377. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awx269>
- Saracino, D., Ferrieux, S., Noguès-Lassaille, M., Houot, M., Funkiewiez, A., Sellami, L., Deramecourt, V., Pasquier, F., Couratier, P., Pariente, J., Géraudie, A., Epelbaum, S., Wallon, D., Hannequin, D., Martinaud, O., Clot, F., Camuzat, A., Bottani, S., Rinaldi, D., ... Ftd/Ftd-Als, on behalf of the F. R. N. on. (2021). Primary Progressive Aphasia Associated With GRN Mutations: New Insights Into the Nonamyloid Logopenic Variant. *Neurology*, 97(1), e88–e102. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.00000000000012174>
- Savundranayagam, M. Y., Hummert, M. L., & Montgomery, R. J. V. (2005). Investigating the effects of communication problems on caregiver burden. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 60(1), S48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/60.1.s48>
- Saxon, J. A., Thompson, J. C., Jones, M., Harris, J. M., Richardson, A. M., Langheinrich, T., Neary, D., Mann, D. M., & Snowden, J. S. (2017). Examining the language and behavioural profile in FTD and ALS-FTD. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, 88(8), 675–680. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2017-315667>
- Schell, M., Zaccarella, E., & Friederici, A. D. (2017). Differential cortical contribution of syntax and semantics: An fMRI study on two-word phrasal processing. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior*, 96, 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.09.002>
- Scherling, C. S., Hall, T., Berisha, F., Klepac, K., Karydas, A., Coppola, G., Kramer, J. H., Rabinovici, G., Ahljianian, M., Miller, B. L., Seeley, W., Grinberg, L. T., Rosen, H., Meredith, J., & Boxer, A. L. (2014). Cerebrospinal fluid neurofilament concentration reflects disease severity in frontotemporal degeneration. *Annals of Neurology*, 75(1), 116–126. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.24052>
- Scherling, C. S., Zakrzewski, J., Datta, S., Levenson, R. W., Shimamura, A. P., Sturm, V. E., Miller, B. L., & Rosen, H. J. (2017). Mistakes, Too Few to Mention? Impaired Self-conscious Emotional Processing of Errors in the Behavioral Variant of Frontotemporal Dementia. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 11, 189. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2017.00189>
- Schirmer, A., & Kotz, S. A. (2006). Beyond the right hemisphere: Brain mechanisms mediating vocal emotional processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(1), 24–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.11.009>
- Schubert, S., Leyton, C. E., Hodges, J. R., & Pigué, O. (2016). Longitudinal Memory Profiles in Behavioral-Variant Frontotemporal Dementia and Alzheimer's Disease. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, 51(3), 775–782. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-150802>
- Semler, E., Petersdorff, L., Anderl-Straub, S., Böhm, S., Lulé, D., Fangerau, H., Ludolph, A. C., Otto, M., & Uttner, I. (2019). Moral judgment in patients with behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: No impairment of the moral position, but rather its execution. *Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration*, 20(1–2), 12–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21678421.2018.1534972>

- Sha, S. J., Takada, L. T., Rankin, K. P., Yokoyama, J. S., Rutherford, N. J., Fong, J. C., Khan, B., Karydas, A., Baker, M. C., DeJesus-Hernandez, M., Pribadi, M., Coppola, G., Geschwind, D. H., Rademakers, R., Lee, S. E., Seeley, W., Miller, B. L., & Boxer, A. L. (2012). Frontotemporal dementia due to C9ORF72 mutations: Clinical and imaging features. *Neurology*, *79*(10), 1002–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e318268452e>
- Shany-Ur, T., Poorzand, P., Grossman, S. N., Growdon, M. E., Jang, J. Y., Kettle, R. S., Miller, B. L., & Rankin, K. P. (2012). Comprehension of insincere communication in neurodegenerative disease: Lies, sarcasm, and theory of mind. *Cortex*, *48*(10), 1329–1341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2011.08.003>
- Smits, L. L., Harten, A. C. van, Pijnenburg, Y. a. L., Koedam, E. L. G. E., Bouwman, F. H., Sistermans, N., Reuling, I. E. W., Prins, N. D., Lemstra, A. W., Scheltens, P., & Flier, W. M. van der. (2015). Trajectories of cognitive decline in different types of dementia. *Psychological Medicine*, *45*(5), 1051–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291714002153>
- Snowden, J. S., Austin, N. A., Sembi, S., Thompson, J. C., Craufurd, D., & Neary, D. (2008). Emotion recognition in Huntington's disease and frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *46*(11), 2638–2649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.04.018>
- Spotorno, N., Healey, M., McMillan, C. T., Rascovsky, K., Irwin, D. J., Clark, R., & Grossman, M. (2015). Processing ambiguity in a linguistic context: Decision-making difficulties in non-aphasic patients with behavioral variant frontotemporal degeneration. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *9*, 583. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00583>
- Spotorno, N., McMillan, C. T., Rascovsky, K., Irwin, D. J., Clark, R., & Grossman, M. (2015). Beyond words: Pragmatic inference in behavioral variant of frontotemporal degeneration. *Neuropsychologia*, *75*, 556–564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.07.002>
- Stock, J. V. den, Stam, D., Winter, F.-L. D., Mantini, D., Szmezcanyi, B., Laere, K. V., Vandenberghe, R., & Vandenbulcke, M. (2017). Moral processing deficit in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia is associated with facial emotion recognition and brain changes in default mode and salience network areas. *Brain and Behavior*, *7*(12), e00843. <https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.843>
- Stopford, C. L., Thompson, J. C., Neary, D., Richardson, A. M. T., & Snowden, J. S. (2012). Working memory, attention, and executive function in Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal dementia. *Cortex*, *48*(4), 429–446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2010.12.002>
- Sturm, V. E., Sible, I. J., Datta, S., Hua, A. Y., Perry, D. C., Kramer, J. H., Miller, B. L., Seeley, W. W., & Rosen, H. J. (2018). Resting parasympathetic dysfunction predicts prosocial helping deficits in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Cortex*, *109*, 141–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2018.09.006>
- Suhonen, N.-M., Haanpää, R. M., Korhonen, V., Jokelainen, J., Pitkäniemi, A., Heikkinen, A.-L., Krüger, J., Hartikainen, P., Helisalme, S., Hiltunen, M., Hänninen, T., & Remes, A. M. (2017). Neuropsychological Profile in the C9ORF72 Associated Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, *58*(2), 479–489. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-161142>
- Tan, R. H., Devenney, E., Kiernan, M. C., Halliday, G. M., Hodges, J. R., & Hornberger, M. (2015). Terra incognita-cerebellar contributions to neuropsychiatric and cognitive dysfunction in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *7*, 121. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2015.00121>
- Torralva, T., Kipps, C. M., Hodges, J. R., Clark, L., Bekinshtein, T., Roca, M., Calcagno, M. L., & Manes, F. (2007). The relationship between affective decision-making and theory of mind in the frontal variant of fronto-temporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*(2), 342–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.05.031>
- Torralva, T., Roca, M., Gleichgerrcht, E., Bekinshtein, T., & Manes, F. (2009). A neuropsychological battery to detect specific executive and social cognitive impairments in early frontotemporal dementia. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *132*(Pt 5), 1299–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awp041>
- Torralva, T., Sposato, L. A., Riccio, P. M., Gleichgerrcht, E., Roca, M., Toledo, J. B., Trojanowski, J. Q., Kukull, W. A., Manes, F., & Hachinski, V. (2015). Role of brain infarcts in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia: Clinicopathological characterization in the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center database. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *36*(10), 2861–2868. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2015.06.026>
- Van den Stock, J., De Winter, F.-L., de Gelder, B., Rangarajan, J. R., Cypers, G., Maes, F., Sunaert, S., Goffin, K., Vandenberghe, R., & Vandenbulcke, M. (2015). Impaired recognition of body expressions in the behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *75*, 496–504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.06.035>
- Van den Stock, J., De Winter, F.-L., Stam, D., Van de Vliet, L., Huang, Y.-A., Dries, E., Van Assche, L., Emsell, L., Bouckaert, F., & Vandenbulcke, M. (2019). Reduced tendency to attribute mental states to abstract shapes in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia links with cerebellar structural integrity. *NeuroImage. Clinical*, *22*, 101770. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2019.101770>
- Vignando, M., Rumiati, R. I., Manganotti, P., Cattaruzza, T., & Aiello, M. (2020). Establishing links between abnormal eating behaviours and semantic deficits in dementia. *Journal of Neuropsychology*, *14*(3), 431–448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jnp.12195>
- Virani, K., Jesso, S., Kertesz, A., Mitchell, D., & Finger, E. (2013). Functional neural correlates of emotional expression processing deficits in behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Journal of Psychiatry & Neuroscience: JPN*, *38*(3), 174–182. <https://doi.org/10.1503/jpn.120008>
- Viskontas, I. V., Boxer, A. L., Fesenko, J., Matlin, A., Heuer, H. W., Mirsky, J., & Miller, B. L. (2011). Visual search patterns in semantic dementia show paradoxical facilitation of binding processes. *Neuropsychologia*, *49*(3), 468–478. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.12.039>
- Vogel, A. P., Poole, M. L., Pemberton, H., Caverlé, M. W. J., Boonstra, F. M. C., Low, E., Darby, D., & Brodtmann, A. (2017). Motor speech signature of behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia: Refining the phenotype. *Neurology*, *89*(8), 837–844. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000004248>


























- Wells, G. A., Shea, B., O'Connell, D. A., Peterson, J., Welch, V., Losos, M., & Tugwell, P. (2000). *The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses*. [http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\\_epidemiology/oxford.asp](http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp)
- Whitwell, J. L., Przybelski, S. A., Weigand, S. D., Ivnik, R. J., Vemuri, P., Gunter, J. L., Senjem, M. L., Shiung, M. M., Boeve, B. F., Knopman, D. S., Parisi, J. E., Dickson, D. W., Petersen, R. C., Jack, C. R., & Josephs, K. A. (2009). Distinct anatomical subtypes of the behavioural variant of frontotemporal dementia: A cluster analysis study. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *132*(Pt 11), 2932–2946. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awp232>
- Wicklund, A. H., Johnson, N., & Weintraub, S. (2004). Preservation of Reasoning in Primary Progressive Aphasia: Further Differentiation from Alzheimer's Disease and the Behavioral Presentation of Frontotemporal Dementia. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *26*(3), 347–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803390490510077>
- Wicklund, A. H., Rademaker, A., Johnson, N., Weitner, B. B., & Weintraub, S. (2007). Rate of Cognitive Change Measured by Neuropsychologic Test Performance in 3 Distinct Dementia Syndromes. *Alzheimer Disease & Associated Disorders*, *21*(4), S70. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WAD.0b013e31815bf8a5>
- Wilson, N.-A., Ramanan, S., Roquet, D., Goldberg, Z.-L., Hodges, J. R., Piguet, O., & Irish, M. (2020). Scene construction impairments in frontotemporal dementia: Evidence for a primary hippocampal contribution. *Neuropsychologia*, *137*, 107327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2019.107327>
- Wilson, S. M., Brambati, S. M., Henry, R. G., Handwerker, D. A., Agosta, F., Miller, B. L., Wilkins, D. P., Ogar, J. M., & Gorno-Tempini, M. L. (2009). The neural basis of surface dyslexia in semantic dementia. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *132*(Pt 1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awn300>
- Wilson, S. M., Henry, M. L., Besbris, M., Ogar, J. M., Dronkers, N. F., Jarrold, W., Miller, B. L., & Gorno-Tempini, M. L. (2010a). Connected speech production in three variants of primary progressive aphasia. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *133*(Pt 7), 2069–2088. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awq129>
- Wilson, S. M., Henry, M. L., Besbris, M., Ogar, J. M., Dronkers, N. F., Jarrold, W., Miller, B. L., & Gorno-Tempini, M. L. (2010b). Connected speech production in three variants of primary progressive aphasia. *Brain*, *133*(7), 2069–2088. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awq129>
- Wilson, S. M., DeMarco, A. T., Henry, M. L., Gesierich, B., Babiak, M., Mandelli, M. L., Miller, B. L., & Gorno-Tempini, M. L. (2014). What role does the anterior temporal lobe play in sentence-level processing? Neural correlates of syntactic processing in semantic variant primary progressive aphasia. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *26*(5), 970–985. [https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn\\_a\\_00550](https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00550)
- Ye, B. S., Choi, S. H., Han, S.-H., Kim, S., Yang, D.-W., Park, K. H., Han, H. J., Youn, Y. C., Choi, B.-O., Kim, S. H., Woo, S., Na, D. L., & Kim, E.-J. (2015). Clinical and Neuropsychological Comparisons of Early-Onset Versus Late-Onset Frontotemporal Dementia: A CREDOS-FTD Study. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, *45*(2), 599–608. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-141044>
- Yunusova, Y., Graham, N. L., Shellikeri, S., Phuong, K., Kulkarni, M., Rochon, E., Tang-Wai, D. F., Chow, T. W., Black, S. E., Zinman, L. H., & Green, J. R. (2016). Profiling Speech and Pausing in Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) and Frontotemporal Dementia (FTD). *PLOS ONE*, *11*(1), e0147573. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0147573>
- Zhou, J., Greicius, M. D., Gennatas, E. D., Growdon, M. E., Jang, J. Y., Rabinovici, G. D., Kramer, J. H., Weiner, M., Miller, B. L., & Seeley, W. W. (2010). Divergent network connectivity changes in behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *Brain*, *133*(5), 1352–1367. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awq075>

## Figures


**Figure 1:** PRISMA Flowchart of literature search.



**Figure 2:** Summary of impaired and preserved language domains in bvFTD, in comparison to healthy controls. For each language subdomains, the number of studies in which the subdomain was altered (red bars) or spared (green bars) is indicated.

	<b>Impaired</b>		<b>No difference</b>
Global	 4	3	
Motor speech			
- Motor speech	 1	1	
- Connected speech	 3	7	
Phonology			
- Phonological manipulation	0	1	
- Repetition	0	5	
Orthography			
- Reading	 7	0	
- Writing	 1	0	
Lexico-semantic			
- Word retrieval	 31	18	
- Word comprehension	 8	4	
- Semantic knowledge	 28	7	
- Connected speech	 6	9	
Grammar/syntax			
- Sentence comprehension	 12	10	
- Connected speech	0	8	
Prosody			
- Receptive	 3	2	
- Productive	 2	1	

**Figure 3:** Risk of bias assessment



## Tables

**Table 1. Summary of all included studies comparing bvFTD patients with healthy controls on at least one language measure (Arrow pointing down signifies decreased performance in bvFTD versus healthy controls; Equal sign signifies no significant difference versus healthy controls; Both arrow pointing down and equal sign signifies mixed results; Asterisk signifies that article was not described in the text since another study from the same group and same language measure had a larger sample size).**

Authors, year	HC (n)	bvFTD (n)	Criteria	Language	Age (yo)	MMSE : m (sd)	Symptoms (y)	Global	Motor speech	Phonology	Orthography	Semantic/lexical	Grammar/syntax	Prosody
Agosta et al., 2015	25	14	2011	Italian	61.6 (8.2)	-	3.2 (2.2)						↓*	
Ash et al., 2006	10	12	1998	English	64.8 (13.1)	25.0 (6.8)	4.5 (1.5)		↓*			=		
Ash et al., 2009	10	12	1998	English	64.8 (13.2)	25.3 (6.5)	4.1 (1.6)		↓* =				=	
Ash et al., 2013	12	17	2011	English	64.1 (9.1)	26.3 (2.7)	5.5 (3.8)		=			↓		
Ash et al., 2016	27	54	2011	English	63.7 (8.9)	23.2 (6.0)	4.2 (2.0)		=			↓		
Ash et al., 2019	26	14	2011	English	67.1 (9.9)	26.7 (2.6)	4.1 (3.1)		↓* =			↓*		
Banks & Weintraub, 2008	15	11	1998	English	63.8 (6.3)	24.5 (4.2)	5.6 (3.3)					↓		
Brambati et al., 2006	35	27	1998	English	59.9 (6.1)	25.5 (3.8)	-					=		
Chan et al., 2015	18	12	1998	English	52.5 (10.4)	-	3.3 (2.1)					=		
Charles et al., 2014	12	27	2011	English	62.0 (7.1)	25.6 (3.9)	-						↓	
Chen et al., 2018	35	45	2011	English	60.9 (8.0)	-	3.3 (1.9)			=		↓		
Chiong et al., 2013	16	10	2011	English	61.2 (6.5)	28.3 (1.4)	-			↓*		↓*		
Chow et al., 2010	10	9	1998	English	59.2 (6.4)	27.3 (2.0)	-					=		
Clague et al., 2005 exp 1	41	11	1998	English	60.3 (6.9)	27.1 (2.0)	-					↓ =		
Clague et al., 2005 exp 2	23	11	1998	English	61.3 (5.3)	28.1 (2)	-					=		
Clark et al., 2015	21	22	2011	English	67 (7.7)	25 (3.5)	9 (5.4)				↓*	↓*		
Clark et al., 2016	21	15	2011	English	65 (7.3)	25 (4)	6.3 (3.4)				=*	↓* =*		
Clark et al., 2017	20	19	2011	English	64 (7.2)	24.3 (4.5)	8.1 (6.3)				↓*	↓* ↓		
Clark et al., 2018	22	11	2011	English	65.8 (7.6)	25 (3.8)	9.8 (5.5)				↓*	↓*		
Cohen et al., 2016	29	11	2011	English	68 (8.6)	25.1 (2.8)	8.5 (5.3)					↓* =*		
Cooke et al., 2003	11	5	1998	English	64.4 (13.1)	24.4 (4.3)	-						↓	
Cosentino et al., 2006	15	12	1998	English	67.4 (11.7)	22.6 (6.4)	6.0 (3.1)					=		
Cotelli et al., 2006	10	16	1998	Italian	64.8 (9.1)	20.3 (6.1)	-					↓		
Cotelli et al., 2007	10	9	1998	Italian	65.8 (8.7)	25.6 (1.6)	7.8 (3.8)						=	





Hughes et al., 2011	16	12	1998	English	59.8	23.3	4.1			↓
Hutchings et al., 2015	17	16	2011	English	64.1 (10.3)	-	5.1 (5.4)			=*
Hutchings et al., 2018	21	20	2011	English	62.2 (7.4)	-	4.6 (2.6)	↓*		
Irish et al., 2011	19	15	2011	English	61.6 (7.4)	26.0 (2.8)	3.2 (2.2)			↓ =
Irish et al., 2013	10	10	2011	English	62.8 (7.7)	-	4.8 (2.7)			=*
Irish et al., 2014a	14	11	2011	English	62.4 (7.3)	-	3.7 (2.5)			=*
Irish et al., 2014b	14	10	2011	English	63.6 (7.3)	-	5.0 (2.6)			↓*
Irish et al., 2016	20	15	2011	English	63.5 (7.7)	-	3.8 (2.6)			↓*
Jastorff et al., 2016	19	14	2011	Dutch	67.2 (8.4)	26.6 (1.5)	-			↓*
Jenner et al., 2006	22	24	1998	Italian	73.4 (8.5)	23.7 (3.0)	-			↓
Johnen et al., 2016a	35	24	2011	German	64.9 (8.0)	24.7 (5.0)	2.7 (1.8)	↓*		
Johnen et al., 2016b	34	18	2011	German	65.7 (8.4)	23.9 (5.5)	2.6 (1.5)	↓*		
Johnen et al., 2018	34	31	2011	German	64 (8)	28 (18)	2.3 (1.5)	=		
Johnson et al., 2011	17	11	1998	English	59.8 (6.5)	26.3 (3.4)	-			↓ =*
Kammaing et al., 2014	11	8	2011	English	64.1 (2.5)	-	4.6 (2.3)			=
Kammaing et al., 2015	20	19	2011	English	60.5 (8.5)	-	4.3 (2.8)			↓ =*
Keane et al., 2002	12	6	1998	English	58.7 (4.8)	27.3 (2.5)	4.0 (2.6)			=
Koenig et al., 2006	20	6	1998	English	66.5 (10.6)	22.8 (4.3)	3.4 (0.5)			↓
Kramer et al., 2003	25	21	1998	English	63.0 (11.9)	24.3 (4.0)	-			=*
Krawczyk et al., 2008	10	10	1998	English	61	25.9	9			↓
Kumfor et al., 2013a	27	18	2011	English	63.8 (8.2)	-	5.4 (2.3)			↓*
Kumfor et al., 2013b	15	11	2011	English	66.7 (9.8)	-	6.1 (3.5)			=*
Kumfor et al., 2014	12	12	2011	English	66.5 (9.4)	-	5.8 (3.1)			=*
Kumfor et al., 2015	11	13	2011	English	62.5 (9.4)	-	5.5 (3.8)			↓*
Kumfor et al., 2016	16	13	2011	English	60.2 (8.7)	-	4.3 (2.6)	=*		↓* =*
Kumfor et al., 2017	25	25	2011	English	65.0 (8.6)	-	4.3 (2.3)			↓*
Hutchings et al., 2018	20	19	2011	English	62.7 (8.7)	-	6.4 (3.2)			↓*
Laisney et al., 2009	18	18	1998	French	67.2 (7.9)	24.9 (3.0)	2.7 (1.6)			=*
Lima-Silva et al., 2015	34	20	1998	Portuguese	67.1 (6.6)	23.5 (4.3)	-	↓		
Lin et al., 2016	15	15	1998	Mandarin	62.1 (6.7)	23.3 (4.8)	-			↓ =
Luzzi et al., 2007	20	11	1998	Italian	64 (7)	24 (6)	4 (2)			↓ =
Luzzi et al., 2020	32	24	1998	Italian	64.6 (8.7)	23.3 (2.6)	-			↓
Magerova et al., 2014	15	9	1998	Czech	63.1 (9.2)	24.1 (4.8)	-			↓
Mahoney et al., 2014	18	23	2011	English	63.8 (10.0)	25.3 (4.2)	6.7 (5.1)			↓*

Mahoney et al., 2015	20	27	2011	English	62.5 (9.0)	24.2 (5.9)	6.5 (4.9)				↓*
Mandelli et al., 2016	34	23	2011	English	62.9 (6.5)	26.6 (3.5)	-	=	=		=*
Manuel et al., 2019	25	35	2011	English	61.4 (8.7)	-	5.6 (3.9)				↓*
Marshall et al., 2017	19	16	2011	English	65.8 (7.3)	24.6 (4.5)	7.6 (4.7)				↓*
Marshall et al., 2018a	19	10	2011	English	67 (6.3)	24.1 (4.9)	8.2 (5.3)				↓*
Marshall et al., 2018b	21	13	2011	English	66.2 (6.3)	24.5 (4.6)	7.7 (6.0)				↓*
Marshall et al., 2019	22	17	2011	English	68.6 (6.8)	23.7 (4.8)	7.2 (6.3)				↓*
Matuszewski et al., 2006	21	20	1998	French	67.9 (9.1)	24.3 (4.0)	-				↓
McKinnon et al., 2008	16	8	1998	English	59 (6.0)	25.9 (3.3)	3.0 [2-10]				=
McMillan et al., 2013	16	16	2011	English	64.3 (2.0)	24.7 (1.2)	-				↓
Mendez et al., 2014	20	10	2011	English	59.2 (6.9)	25.4 (3.2)	2.3 (2.1)				↓
Miller et al., 2012	36	17	1998	English	61 (7.8)	27.7 (1.3)	3.7 (2.4)				=
Morrison et al., 2004	8	7	1998	English	64.7	25.7	-				↓
Murray et al., 2007	17	8	1998	English	63.8 (14.8)	28 (1.7)	-				↓
Nevler et al., 2017	17	32	2011	English	63 (8.5)	24.4 (4.5)	4 (3.1)	↓			↓
Oliver et al., 2015	22	23	2011	French	64.7 (8.5)	22.0 (5.1)	6.0 (3.4)	↓			↓
Omar et al., 2011	21	16	1998	English	64.7 (8.0)	26.9 (3.9)	6.9 (4.1)				=
Omar et al., 2013	17	12	1998	English	66.1 (7.6)	23.5 (6.0)	-			↓*	=*
Orasji et al., 2016	11	9	1998	Dutch	73.1 (10.3)	25 (3)	-				↓=
Peelle et al., 2007	20	7	1998	English	60 (10.4)	24 (5.1)	-				=
Peelle et al., 2008	29	32	1998	English	65.5 (13.0)	21.7 (5.4)	3.5 (2.8)	=			↓
Perry & Hodges, 2000	10	10	1998	English	59.4 (7.6)	26.7 (1.6)	-				=*
Piolino et al., 2007	21	13	1998	English	67.2 (7.9)	24.8 (4)	-				↓
Pressman et al., 2019	170	29	2011	English	60.9 (8.8)	25.1 (4.8)	-	=			=
Rankin et al., 2007	15	9	1998	English	57.0 (6.0)	23.1 (6.1)	-				=
Rankin et al., 2009	13	20	1998	English	60.0 (8.1)	24.6 (5.7)	-				=
Reyes et al., 2018	32	50	2011	Spanish	65.9 (8.1)	22.5 (6.5)	7.3 (5.6)				↓
Reyes et al., 2019	33	26	2011	Spanish	64.4 (5.7)	-	6.2 (5.1)				=
Rhee et al., 2001	10	10	1998	English	65.2 (7.4)	24.4 (3.0)	-				↓
Rogers et al., 2006	106	40	1998	English	58.6 (7.3)	-	-				↓
Rosen et al., 2002	10	8	1998	English	61.8 [45-73]	23.3 (4.4)	-		=*		=*
Rosen et al., 2004	22	22	1998	English	61.1 (7.4)	24.1 (4.4)	-				=
Rosen et al., 2014	35	12	1998	English	59 (7.1)	27.1 (2.7)	-				↓*
Rousseaux et al., 2010	47	16	1998	French	61 [51-78]	27 [14-30]	-				=↓



**Table 2. Summary of all included studies comparing bvFTD subgroups on at least one language measure**

Author, year	bvFTD subgroups (n)	Language results	Criteria	Language
Bertoux et al., 2014	-Non-amnesic bvFTD (20) -Amnesic bvFTD (24)	Picture naming did not differ between amnesic and non-amnesic bvFTD.	2011	French
Bertoux et al., 2016	-Non-amnesic bvFTD (19) -Amnesic bvFTD (19)	Picture naming did not differ between amnesic and non-amnesic bvFTD.	2011	French
Cerami et al., 2016	-bvFTD frontal (25) -bvFTD temporo-limbic (27)	Instruction comprehension was more impaired in bvFTD frontal than in temporo-limbic predominant.	2011	Italian
Deutsch et al., 2015	-bvFTD without traumatic brain injury (581), -bvFTD with traumatic brain injury (25)	Picture naming did not differ between bvFTD with or without traumatic brain injury	1998	English
Downey et al., 2014	-bvFTD-sporadic (5) -bvFTD-C9 (5) -bvFTD-MAPT (7)	Single word comprehension did not differ between the three bvFTD subgroups. Picture naming scores were higher in bvFTD-C9 than in bvFTD-MAPT and controls.	2011	English
Fernández-Matarrubia et al., 2017	-Non-amnesic bvFTD (13) -Amnesic bvFTD (13) -CTRL (24)	Picture naming did not differ between amnesic and non-amnesic bvFTD.	2011	Spanish
Gleicherricht et al., 2011	-Non-utilitarian bvFTD (13) -Utilitarian bvFTD (9)	No difference in picture naming or comprehension of instructions between utilitarian and non-utilitarian bvFTD profiles.	1998	Spanish
Hardy et al., 2016	-bvFTD-MAPT (6) -bvFTD-C9 (4) -CTRL (24)	Word comprehension and picture naming were lower in bvFTD-MAPT than bvFTD-C9. Concrete and abstract synonyms as well as writing scores were lower in bvFTD-MAPT than in bvFTD-C9. Verb naming, words and non-words reading, auditory processing, words repetition and sentence-picture matching did not differ between bvFD-MAPT and bvFTD-C9.	2011	English
Heuer et al., 2020	-bvFTD (135) -bvFTD familial (99) -bvFTD-C9 (43) -bvFTD-GRN (14) -bvFTD-MAPT (28)	Regular words, irregular words, sentence reading and sentence repetition did not differ between the bvFTD subgroups.	2011	English
Kipps et al., 2009	-bvFTD MRI abnormal (15) -bvFTD MRI normal (9) -CTRL (10)	Picture naming did not differ between bvFTD with normal or abnormal MRI.	1998	English
Kramer et al., 2018	-bvFTD with abnormal PET (20) -bvFTD with normal PET(10)	Naming did not differ between bvFTD with a normal or abnormal FDG-PET	2011	German
Manes et al., 2011	-bvFTD with impaired neuropsychologic performance (30) -bvFTD with normal neuropsychologic performance (13) -CTRL(14)	Picture naming scores were lower in bvFTD with impaired neuropsychologic performance than in ones with normal neuropsychologic performance.	1998	Spanish
Massimo et al., 2019	-bvFTD professionals (50) -bvFTD non professionals (13)	Picture naming performance did not differ between professionals and non professionals bvFTD.	2011	English
Mendez et al., 2017	-bvFTD PvSp + (9) -bvFTD PvSp – (3)	Pressure of speech, tangeantiality, derailment and clanging were more frequent in bvFTD with poverty of speech than without, but the amount of neologisms, word approximations and perseverations, echolalia or blocking, the poverty of the content of speech, its incoherence, illogicality and loss of goal did not differ between the two bvFTD subgroups	2011	English
Mendez & Lim, 2004	-right bvFTD (8) -left bvFTD (8) -CTRL (24)	Picture naming was lower in right bvFTD compared to left bvFTD	1998	English
Mendez & Shapira, 2013	-bvFTD-FTLD (74) -bvFTD-AD (21) -bvFTD-tau negative (51)	Picture naming did not differ between bvFTD-FTLD and bvFTD-AD, nor between bvFTD-tau positive and bvFTD-tau negative	1998; 2011	English

	-bvFTD-tau positive (23)			
Moore et al., 2020	-bvFTD-MAPT (15) -bvFTD-C9 (56) -bvFTD-GRN (33) -CTRL (248)	Semantic association scores did not differ between bvFTD due to a MAPT mutation and bvFTD-C9 or bvFTD-GRN.	2011	English
Park et al., 2017	-bvFTD with parkinsonism (33) -bvFTD without parkinsonism (38)	A global language score did not differ between bvFTD with or without parkinsonism.	2011	Korean
Perry et al., 2017	- bvFTD-AD (7) - bvFTD-FTLD (50) - bvFTD-FTLD-tau (15) - bvFTD-FTLD-TDP (31) -bvFTD-FTLD-FUS (4) - bvFTD-CBD (6) - bvFTD-PSP (5) - bvFTD-TDP-A (5) - bvFTD-TDP-B (15) - bvFTD-TDP-C (5) - bvFTD-TDP-U (6) - bvFD-aFTLDu (4)	Repetition scores were lower in bvFTD-AD than in bvFTD-FTLD and did not differ between bvFTD-FTLD subgroups. Semantic association scores were lower in bvFTD-TDP B than in bvFTD-TDP U. Picture naming scores were lower in bvFTD-TDP C than in bvFTD linked to CBD, TDP U and aFTLD-U. Verbal agility did not differ between the bvFTD subgroups.	2011	English
Ranasinghe et al., 2016	-bvFTD Salience Network Frontal-Temporal (SN-FT) (21) -bvFTD Semantic Appraisal Network (SAN) (8) -bvFTD Salience Network Frontal (SN-F) (27) -bvFTD subcortical (30)	Syntax comprehension scores were lower in bvFTD SN-FT than in bvFTD SN-F and bvFTD subcortical. Picture naming scores were lower in bvFTD SAN than in bvFTD SN-F and bvFTD subcortical. Verbal agility, affect naming, reading irregular words and repetition did not differ between the bvFTD subgroups.	2011	English
Roca et al., 2013	-Low-functioning bvFTD (19) -High-functioning bvFTD (16) -CTRL (14)	Picture naming scores were lower in low-functioning bvFTD when compared to high-functioning bvFTD and controls. Semantic associations were impaired in low-functioning bvFTD when compared to controls but the other subgroups.	1998	Spanish
Sha et al., 2012	-bvFTD without C9 (48) -bvFTD-C9 (15)	Syntax, naming, reading and repetition did not differ between bvFTD-C9 and bvFTD without C9	2011	English
Suhonen et al., 2017	-bvFTD without C9 (44) -bvFTD-C9 (16)	Picture naming and semantic processing did not differ between bvFTD-C9 and bvFTD without C9 expansion.	2011	Finnish
Torralva et al., 2009	-bvFTD with low score on Addenbrooke Cognitive Examination (19) -bvFTD with high score on Addenbrooke Cognitive Examination (16) -CTRL (14)	Picture naming was lower in bvFTD with low score on Addenbrooke Cognitive Examination than in bvFTD with high score on Addenbrooke Cognitive Examination. Instructions comprehension was lower bvFTD with low score on Addenbrooke Cognitive Examination than in bvFTD with high score on Addrenbroke Cognitive Assessment.	1998	Spanish
Torralva et al., 2015	-Non-vascular bvFTD (66) -Vascular bvFTD (23)	Picture naming did not differ between vascular and non-vascular bvFTD.	1998	Spanish
Ye et al., 2015	-bvFTD early onset (47) -bvFTD late onset (29)	Picture naming did not differ between early and late onset bvFTD.	2011	Korean

## Supplementary materials

### Appendix. Modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale and scoring guide.

[http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\\_epidemiology/oxford.asp](http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp)

#### (1) Representativeness of the sample (is the case definition adequate?)

1 point: Requires some independent validation by a multidisciplinary team. The case was defined using multiple sources of information (neurology, neuropsychology, etc.)

0.5 point: No independent validation, but the case was defined using multiple sources of information (neurology, neuropsychology, etc.)

0 point: No description, not done

#### (2) Sample size

1 point: Sample size was greater than 30 participants.

0.5 point: Sample size was between 20 and 30 participants.

0 point: Sample size was less than 20 participants or a convenience sample.

#### (3) Comparability of cases and controls based on the design or analysis

1 point: Either cases and controls must be matched in the design or confounders (i.e., age, sex, education) must be adjusted for in the analysis.

0.5 point: Cases and controls are only partially matched in the design or confounders (i.e., age, sex, education).

0 point: Both cases and control are not matched in the design and confounders are not adjusted for in the analysis.

#### (4) Ascertainment of language impairment

1 point: Validated measurement tool.

0.5 point: Both validated and non-validated measurement tool.

0 point: no description.

#### (5) Quality of descriptive statistics reporting

1 point: Reported descriptive statistics to describe the population (*e.g.*, language measures) with a proper measure of dispersion (*e.g.*, standard deviation, standard error, effect size, range, distribution on the graph).

0 point: Descriptive statistics were not reported, were incomplete, or did not include proper measures of dispersion.

**Legend: This scale, the scoring of which ranges from 0 to 5, assesses quality in several domains: sample representativeness and size, comparability between patients and controls, ascertainment of language impairment, and statistical quality. Studies were judged to be of low risk of bias ( $\geq 3$  points) or high risk of bias ( $< 3$  points).**

**Supplementary table 1: Risk of bias assessment for each study included in the systematic review**

First Author & Year	Representativeness	Size	Comparability	Outcome	Statistics	Total
Agosta et al., 2015	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Ash et al., 2006	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	3
Ash et al., 2009	1	0	1	0.5	1	3.5
Ash et al., 2013	1	0	0	0.5	1	2.5
Ash et al., 2016	1	1	1	0.5	1	4.5
Ash et al., 2019	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	3
Banks & Weintraub, 2008	1	0	0	1	1	3
Bertoux et al., 2014	0.5	1	1	1	1	4.5
Bertoux et al., 2015	1	1	1	1	1	5
Brambati et al., 2006	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4
Cerami et al., 2016	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Chan et al., 2015	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Charles et al., 2014	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4
Chen et al., 2018	1	1	1	1	1	5
Chiong et al., 2013	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Chow et al., 2010	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Clague et al., 2005	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Clark et al., 2015	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Clark et al., 2016	1	0	1	1	1	4
Clark et al., 2017	1	0	1	1	1	4
Clark et al., 2018	1	0	1	1	1	4
Cohen et al., 2016	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Cooke et al., 2003	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	3
Cosentino et al., 2006	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	3
Cotelli et al., 2006	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Cotelli et al., 2007	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Cousins et al., 2016	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	2.5
Couto et al., 2013	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Dermody et al., 2016	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4

Dermody et al., 2016	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Deutsch, 2015	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
DeWinter et al., 2016a	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
DeWinter et al., 2016b	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Downey et al., 2013	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Downey et al., 2014	1	0	1	1	1	4
Downey et al., 2015	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Eckart et al., 2012	1	0.5	0.5	1	0	3
Farag et al., 2010	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	3
Fernandez-Duque et al., 2007	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	3
Fernandez-Matarrubia et al., 2017	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Filippi et al., 2013	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Filippi et al., 2017	1	1	1	1	1	5
Fletcher et al., 2015	1	0	1	0.5	1	3.5
Fletcher et al., 2016	1	0	1	0.5	1	3.5
Frings et al., 2010	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	3
Galton et al., 2001	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Giovagnoli et al., 2008	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
Giovagnoli et al., 2019	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Gleichgerrcht, 2011	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Gleichgerrcht et al., 2012	1	1	1	0	0	3
Gola et al., 2015	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	3
Gregory et al., 2002	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Grossman et al., 2004	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	2
Grossman et al., 2005	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	2
Gunawarderna et al., 2010	1	0	1	0.5	1	3.5
Hardy et al., 2016	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	3.5
Healey et al., 2015	1	0	1	1	1	4
Healey et al., 2019	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Henley et al., 2014	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Heuer et al., 2020	0.5	1	1	1	1	4.5
Hoefler et al., 2008	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	1



Hou et al., 2005	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Hsieh et al., 2012	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	2.5
Hsieh et al., 2013	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Hua et al., 2018	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Hughes et al., 2011	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Hutchings et al., 2015	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Hutchings et al., 2018	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Irish et al., 2011	1	0	1	1	1	4
Irish et al., 2013	1	0	1	1	1	4
Irish et al., 2014a	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Irish et al., 2014b	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Irish et al., 2016	1	0	1	0.5	1	3.5
Jastorff et al., 2016	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Jenner et al., 2006	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Johnen et al., 2016a	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Johnen et al., 2016b	1	0	1	1	1	4
Johnen et al., 2018	1	1	0.5	1	1	4.5
Johnson et al., 2011	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	3
Kamminga et al., 2014	1	0	1	1	1	4
Kamminga et al., 2015	1	0	1	1	1	4
Keane et al., 2002	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Kipps et al., 2009	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Koenig et al., 2006	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	3
Kramer et al., 2003	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Kramer et al., 2018	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Krawczyk et al., 2010	0.5	0	0.5	1	0	2
Kumfor et al., 2013a	1	0	1	1	1	4
Kumfor et al., 2013b	1	0	1	1	1	4
Kumfor et al., 2014	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Kumfor et al., 2015	1	0	1	1	0	3
Kumfor et al., 2016	1	0	1	1	1	4
Kumfor et al., 2017	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4

Kumfor et al., 2018	1	0	1	1	1	4
Laisney et al., 2009	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Lima-Silva et al., 2015	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4
Lin et al., 2016	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Luzzi et al., 2007	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Luzzi et al., 2020	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	3.5
Magerova et al., 2014	1	0	0.5	1	0	2.5
Mahoney et al., 2014	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Mahoney et al., 2015	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Mandelli et al., 2016	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Manes et al., 2011	1	1	1	1	1	5
Manuel et al., 2019	1	1	0.5	1	1	4.5
Marshall et al., 2017	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Marshall et al., 2018a	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Marshall et al., 2018b	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Marshall et al., 2019	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Massimo et al., 2019	1	1	0.5	1	1	4.5
Matuszewski et al., 2006	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	3
McKinnon et al., 2008	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
McMillan et al., 2013	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	2
Mendez et al., 2004	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Mendez et al., 2013	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4
Mendez et al., 2014	0.5	0	1	1	0	2.5
Mendez et al., 2017	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Miller et al., 2012	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Moore, 2020	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
Morrison et al., 2004	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	2.5
Murray et al., 2007	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Nevler et al., 2017	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	4
Oliver et al., 2015	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4
Omar et al., 2011	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Omar et al., 2013	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5

Orasji et al., 2016	1	0	1	0	0	2
Park et al., 2017	0.5	1	1	1	1	4.5
Peelle et al., 2007	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	2.5
Peelle et al., 2008	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
Perry et al., 2000	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Perry, 2017	1	1	0.5	1	1	4.5
Piolino et al., 2017	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Pressman et al., 2019	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	3
Ranasinghe et al., 2016	1	1	0.5	1	1	4.5
Rankin et al., 2007	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Rankin et al., 2009	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Reyes et al., 2018	1	1	0.5	1	1	4.5
Reyes et al., 2019	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Rhee et al., 2001	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Roca et al., 2013	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
Rogers et al., 2006	1	1	0.5	1	1	4.5
Rosen et al., 2002	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Rosen et al., 2004	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Rosen et al., 2014	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Rousseaux et al., 2010	1	0	1	0.5	1	3.5
Russo et al., 2014	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4
Salimi et al., 2019	1	1	1	1	1	5
Santamaria-Garcia et al., 2017	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
Scherling et al., 2014	0.5	1	1	1	1	4.5
Scherling et al., 2017	1	0	1	1	1	4
Schubert et al., 2016	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Semler et al., 2019	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Sha et al., 2012	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	3
Shany-Ur et al., 2012	1	1	0.5	0	0	2.5
Smits, 2015	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
Snowden et al., 2008	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Spotorno et al., 2015a	1	0	1	1	1	4

Spotorno et al., 2015b	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Stopford et al., 2012	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Sturm et al., 2018	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	4
Suhonen et al., 2017	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Tan et al., 2015	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4
Torralva et al., 2007	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	4
Torralva et al., 2009	0.5	1	1	1	1	4.5
Torralva et al., 2015	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
VanDenStock et al., 2015	1	0.5	1	1	1	4.5
VanDenStock et al., 2017	1	0	0.5	0.5	0	2
VanDenStock et al., 2019	1	0	0.5	1	1	3.5
Vignando et al., 2019	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	3
Virani et al., 2013	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	3.5
Viskontas et al., 2011	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Vogel et al., 2017	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	3
Whitwell et al., 2009	1	1	1	1	1	5
Wicklund et al., 2004	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Wicklund et al., 2007	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
Wilson et al., 2010	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	3
Wilson et al., 2020	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	2.5
Ye et al., 2015	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	4
Yunusova et al., 2016	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	2.5
Zhou et al., 2010	1	0	1	1	1	4



# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	YES
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	YES
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	YES
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	YES
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	YES
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	YES
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	YES
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	YES
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	YES
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	YES
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	YES
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	YES
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	YES
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	YES
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	YES
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	YES
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	YES
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	YES
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N.A.
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	YES
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N.A.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.10.21260313>; this version posted July 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	YES
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	YES
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	YES
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	YES
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	YES
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	YES
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	YES
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	YES
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N.A.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	YES
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N.A.
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	YES
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	YES
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	YES
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	YES
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N.A.
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N.A.
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	N.A.
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	YES
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	YES
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	YES

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.10.21260313>; this version posted July 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>