Full title: White matter hyperintensity load varies depending on definition of subjective cognitive decline

Running title: WMH burden differences in SCD

Cassandra Morrison[1,2] (PhD), Mahsa Dadar[3,4] (PhD), D. Louis Collins[1,2] (PhD) for Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative‡

[1]McConnell Brain Imaging Centre, Montreal Neurological Institute, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

[2] Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

[3]Department of Psychiatry, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

[4]Douglas Mental Health University Institute, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

‡ Data used in preparation of this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.usc.edu). As such, the investigators within the ADNI contributed to the design and implementation of ADNI and/or provided data but did not participate in analysis or writing of this report. A complete listing of ADNI investigators can be found at: http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/how_to_apply/ADNI_Acknowledgement_List.pdf

Corresponding author:

Cassandra Morrison, Montreal Neurological Institute, 3801 University Street, Montreal QC, H3A 2B4 email: cassandra.morrison@mail.mcgill.ca

Keywords: Older adults, Subjective Cognitive Decline, White Matter Hyperintensities

Acknowledgments: Data collection and sharing for this project was funded by the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (National Institutes of Health Grant U01 AG024904) and DOD ADNI (Department of Defense award number W81XWH-12-2-0012). ADNI is funded by the National Institute on Aging, the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, and through generous contributions from the following: AbbVie, Alzheimer's Association; Alzheimer's Drug Discovery Foundation; Araclon Biotech; BioClinica, Inc.; Biogen; Bristol-Myers Squibb Company; CereSpir, Inc.; Cogstate; Eisai Inc.; Elan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Eli Lilly and Company; EuroImmun; F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd and its affiliated company Genentech, Inc.; Fujirebio; GE Healthcare; IXICO Ltd.; Janssen Alzheimer Immunotherapy Research & Development, LLC.; Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceutical Research & Development LLC.; Lumosity; Lundbeck; Merck & Co., Inc.; Meso Scale Diagnostics, LLC.; NeuroRx Research; Neurotrack Technologies; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation; Pfizer Inc.; Piramal Imaging; Servier; Takeda Pharmaceutical Company; and Transition Therapeutics. The Canadian Institutes of Health Research is providing funds to support ADNI clinical sites in

Canada. Private sector contributions are facilitated by the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health (www.fnih.org). The grantee organization is the Northern California Institute for Research and Education, and the study is coordinated by the Alzheimer's Therapeutic Research Institute at the University of Southern California. ADNI data are disseminated by the Laboratory for Neuro Imaging at the University of Southern California.

Funding information

Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative; This research was supported by a grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

Financial Disclosures

Dr. Morrison is supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Funding Reference Number: MFE-176608.

Dr. Dadar reports receiving research funding from the Healthy Brains for Healthy Lives (HBHL), Alzheimer Society Research Program (ASRP), and Douglas Research Centre (DRC).

Dr. Collins reports receiving research funding from Canadian Institutes of Health research, the Canadian National Science and Engineering Research Council, Brain Canada, the Weston Foundation, and the Famille Louise & André Charron.

Background: Increased age and cognitive impairment is associated with an increase in cerebrovascular pathology often seen as increased signal in T2-weighted and FLAIR structural MRIs and known as white matter hyperintensities (WMHs). Whether WMHs differ between healthy older adults with subjective cognitive decline (SCD+) and without subjective cognitive decline (SCD-) remains conflicting. The goal of this study was to examine if four common methods of defining SCD provide different patterns of WMH accumulation between SCD+ and SCD-.

Methods: A total of 535 cognitively normal older adults with 1353 time points from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative were included in this study. SCD was operationalized using four different methods: Cognitive Change Index (CCI), Everyday Cognition Scale (ECog), ECog+Worry, and Worry. Linear mixed-effects models were used to investigate the associations between SCD status and overall and regional WMH burden at baseline and over time.

Results: No differences in WMH burden were found at baseline for any SCD definition, however SCD+ vs. SCD- WMH group differences over time varied based on the SCD definition used. Higher WMH burden change over time was observed in SCD+ compared to SCD- in only the temporal and parietal regions using the CCI (temporal, p=.01; parietal p=.03) and ECog (temporal, p=.03; parietal p=.01). For both the ECog+Worry and Worry definitions, change in WMH burden over time was increased in SCD+ compared to SCD- for overall, frontal, temporal, and parietal WMH burden (p<.05).

Conclusion: The results observed here show that WMH burden differences in healthy older adults with and without SCD depend on the SCD definition used and the approach used to measure WMHs. The various methods used to define SCD may reflect different types of dementia.

1 Introduction

Subjective cognitive decline (SCD) is defined as self-reported deficits in cognitive functioning in the absence of objective cognitive decline (Jessen et al., 2020). People with SCD are at an increased risk for clinically probable Alzheimer's disease (AD) and show AD-related neurodegeneration (Jessen et al., 2020, 2014; Rabin, Smart, & Amariglio, 2017). The heightened risk for AD and increased neurodegeneration in cognitively healthy older adults with SCD (SCD+) compared to healthy older adults without SCD (SCD-) has led to the understanding that those who experience SCD may be in the "preclinical AD" phase (Jessen et al., 2020, 2014). Nevertheless, many people who report SCD do not develop progressive cognitive decline. A meta-analysis found that in people with SCD, only 27% convert to MCI (and 14% convert to dementia) in a follow-up over 4 years, with an annual conversion rate to dementia and AD ranging from 2.3%-6.6% (Mitchell, Beaumont, Ferguson, Yadegarfar, & Stubbs, 2014). In addition to the ranging conversion rates, whether people with SCD have more neurodegeneration than healthy older adults remains relatively conflicting (see Wang et al., 2020 for review).

Varying conversion rates and neurodegeneration differences in healthy older adults with and without SCD could be related to the numerous methodologies used to operationalize SCD. In our previous study, we observed that four commonly used methods to define SCD yielded distinct patterns of future cognitive decline and atrophy in cognitively healthy older adults (Morrison, Dadar, Shafiee, Villeneuve, & Collins, 2022). The cognitive change index (CCI) was associated with future cognitive decline as measured by the Alzheimer's Disease Assessment scale (ADAS-13) whereas the Everyday Cognition Scale (ECog) was associated with cognitive decline as measured by the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA). When examining atrophy differences, a relationship between hippocampal change and SCD was observed using the CCI

and a question regarding participant “Worry” about their cognition. On the other hand, the ECog was related to atrophy in superior temporal regions but not hippocampal change. These findings suggest that the different methods employed to quantify SCD may measure different types of cognitive decline (i.e., different dementia types).

Other pathologies that occur with increased age and lead to progressive cognitive impairment could provide insight into the type of cognitive decline these different SCD questionnaires measure. A common pathological change in aging and cognitive decline is the result of small vessel cerebrovascular disease that appears as white matter hyperintensities (WMHs) in T2w and FLAIR MRI. This cerebrovascular pathology often occurs as a result of vascular risk factors such as obesity and high systolic and diastolic blood pressure (van der Flier et al., 2018). An increased WMH burden is often associated with cognitive deterioration in healthy aging (Bangen et al., 2018) and cognitive decline in MCI and AD (Dadar, Maranzano, Ducharme, & Collins, 2019) as well as the risk of conversion to MCI and AD in healthy older adults (Boyle et al., 2016; Prins et al., 2004). Researchers have observed that WMHs precede neurodegeneration and cognitive decline (Dadar et al., 2020) and may even be some of the earliest pathological changes observed in aging (Morrison, Dadar, Villeneuve, & Collins 2021).

Few studies have observed WMH load differences between cognitively healthy older adults with and without SCD. When asking cognitively healthy older adults if they have changes in memory or thinking, researchers observed no difference in WMHs in SCD+ vs. SCD- (Bartley et al., 2012). This study identified older adults as SCD+ if they thought they had changes in their memory or thinking, regardless if they endorsed being worried about these cognitive changes. However, being concerned about changes in ones’ memory and thinking is a factor that, when endorsed, increases the risk of progression to dementia (Jessen et al., 2020). In healthy older

adults with worries regarding their memory complaints, researchers observed that older adults with SCD had more WMH load than those without SCD (Van Rooden et al., 2018). Another study, which also examined SCD+ using memory complaints accompanied by worry, found no WMH load differences between SCD+ and SCD- (Caillaud et al., 2020). A recent study, examining SCD+ amyloid positive older adults found that only amyloid positive SCD older adults exhibited increased WMH loads compared to SCD- using both a global and regional approach (Pålhaugen et al., 2021). The difficulty with comparability between this study and the others is again the criteria for SCD, which was included a young age cut-off (40 yrs. old) as well as either informant or self-reports of cognitive impairment and no endorsement of Worry needed. These findings suggest that differences in questionnaires used may affect the outcomes of WMH load group differences. The few studies that have examined WMH in SCD+ older adults also had limited sample size in each group and thus may have insufficient power to detect subtle group differences in the preclinical AD stage.

The current study was designed to examine whether WMH load in healthy older adults with and without SCD varies between four common methods used to define SCD. This research will allow us to examine if the conflicting findings on WMH load differences between SCD+ and SCD- result from the different definitions employed to study SCD. The current study will also provide insight into which SCD definition(s) is/are associated with vascular neuropathology. Taken together with our previous paper examining regional declines in SCD+, we will determine which questionnaires are most associated with AD-related decline.

2 Methods

2.1 *Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative*

Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.usc.edu). The ADNI was launched in 2003 as a public-private partnership, led by Principal Investigator Michael W. Weiner, MD. The primary goal of ADNI has been to test whether serial magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), positron emission tomography (PET), other biological markers, and clinical and neuropsychological assessment can be combined to measure the progression of mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and early Alzheimer's disease (AD). The study received ethical approval from the review boards of all participating institutions. Written informed consent was obtained from participants or their study partner. Participants were selected only from ADNI-2 and ADNI-3 because those are the only two cohorts to complete a questionnaire designed to measure subjective cognitive decline.

2.2 Participants

Full participant inclusion and exclusion criteria are available at www.adni-info.org. Briefly, cognitively healthy older adults were between 55 and 90 at the time of recruitment, exhibiting no evidence of depression. Healthy older adults also exhibited no evidence of memory decline, as measured by the Wechsler Memory Scale and no evidence of impaired global cognition as measured by the Mini Mental Status Examination (MMSE) or Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR). Following the same procedure as our previous paper (Morrison et al., 2022), four different definitions were used to differentiate participants into cognitively healthy older adults with no subjective cognitive decline (SCD-) or cognitively healthy older adults with subjective cognitive decline (SCD+ ; not to be confused with the SCD *plus* definition by Jessen et al., 2014). The four groups were defined as:

- CCI: Participants were considered SCD+ if they had self-reported significant memory concern as quantified by a score of ≥ 16 on the first 12 items (representing memory changes) on the CCI. This score was selected based on previous research by Saykin et al. (2006) and because it is used by ADNI as a criterion to identify participants with significant memory concern (Risacher et al., 2015)
- ECog: Participants were considered SCD+ if they endorsed any item on the ECog with a score ≥ 3. A score of ≥ 3 was used as it represents consistent SCD which has been shown to improve prognostic value of SCD for incident MCI (van Harten, Mielke, Swenson-Dravis, & Hagen, 2018)
- ECog + Worry: Participants were considered SCD+ if they had self-reported consistent SCD+ on any item from the ECog (again ≥ 3) as well as indicated worry/concern about their cognitive decline.
- Worry: Participants were considered SCD+ if they indicated worry/ concern about their memory/thinking abilities, irrespective of their CCI or ECog scores.

A total of 619 cognitively normal older adults took part in ADNI-2 and ADNI-3. Of those, 535 had a total of 1353 MRI scans from which WMH measurements could be extracted from at least one timepoint. Thirty people did not complete the question regarding worry about cognition changes and therefore only 505 people with 1296 follow-ups were included in the ECog +Worry and Worry analyses. Follow-up periods ranged from 12 to 60 months.

Body mass index (BMI), systolic blood pressure, and diastolic blood pressure were included as vascular risk factors for this study. Vascular risk factors were included using information also downloaded from the ADNI public website. To calculate BMI for each person,

height and weight information provided by ADNI for the matching visit to the MRI scan were used.

2.3 Structural MRI acquisition and processing

All participants were imaged using a 3T scanner with T1-weighted imaging parameters (see http://adni.loni.usc.edu/methods/mri-tool/mri-analysis/ for the detailed MRI acquisition protocol). All longitudinal scans were downloaded from the ADNI public website. T1w scans for each participant were pre-processed through our standard pipeline including noise reduction (Coupe et al., 2008), intensity inhomogeneity correction (Sled, Zijdenbos, & Evans, 1998), and intensity normalization into range [0-100]. The pre-processed images were then linearly (9 parameters: 3 translation, 3 rotation, and 3 scaling) (Dadar, Fonov, & Collins, 2018) registered to the MNI-ICBM152-2009c average (Fonov et al., 2011).

2.4 WMH measurements

A previously validated WMH segmentation technique was employed to generate participant WMH measurements. This segmentation technique has been validated in multi-center studies such as the Parkinson's Markers Initiative (Dadar, Fereshtehnejad, et al., 2020) and National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (Anor, Dadar, Collins, & Tartaglia, 2021). Importantly, this technique has also been validated in ADNI (Dadar et al., 2019) where a library of manual segmentations based on 50 ADNI participants (independent of those studied here) was created. WMHs were automatically segmented at baseline using the T1w contrasts, along with a set of location and intensity features obtained from a library of manually segmented scans in combination with a random forest classifier to detect the WMHs in new images (Dadar, Misquitta, et al., 2017; Dadar, Pascoal, et al., 2017). WMH load was defined as the volume of all voxels as WMH in the standard space (in mm^3) and are

thus normalized for head size. The volumes of the WMHs for frontal, parietal, temporal, and occipital lobes as well as the entire brain were calculated based on regional masks from the Hammers atlas (Dadar, Pascoal, et al., 2017; Hammers et al., 2003). WMH volumes were log-transformed to achieve normal distribution. The quality of the registrations and WMH segmentations was visually verified by an experienced rater (author M.D.), blinded to diagnostic group. Only seven datasets did not pass this quality control step and were discarded, resulting in 535 people with 1353 follow-ups used in the analysis below.

2.5 Statistical Analysis

Analyses were performed using MATLAB R2019b. Independent sample t-tests were completed on baseline demographic and clinical information presented in Table 1, sex differences between groups were examined using a chi-square analysis. WMH load differences between SCD- and SCD+ were investigated using linear mixed effects models to examine the association between WMH load (frontal, temporal, parietal, occipital, and total) and each SCD definition. All results were corrected for multiple comparisons using false discovery rate (FDR), p-values are reported as raw values with significance then determined by FDR correction.

The categorical variable of interest was Diagnosis (i.e., SCD- vs SCD+) based on each definition, contrasting the SCD+ cohort against the SCD-. The models also included time from baseline, sex, years of education, age at baseline (*Age_bl*), APOE4 status, body mass index (*BMI*), diastolic and systolic blood pressure (*BP_Diastolic* and *BP_Systolic*) as covariates. Participant ID was included as a categorical random effect.

$$\begin{aligned} &\textit{WMH Score} \sim \textit{Diagnosis:TimeFromBaseline} + \textit{Age_bl} + \textit{Sex} + \textit{APOE4} + \\ &\textit{Education} + \textit{BMI} + \textit{BP_Diastolic} + \textit{BP_Systolic} + \textit{Diagnosis} + \textit{TimeFromBaseline} + (1|\textit{ID}) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

3 Results

3.1 Demographics

Table 1 presents demographic information and clinical characteristics of the participants included in the study. For each of the four definitions, none of the demographic or clinical features were statistically significant after correction for multiple comparisons.

3.2 WMH analysis

Table 2 summarizes the results of the linear mixed effects models for all WMH regions and each definition. For all definitions, baseline age and time from baseline had significant associations at frontal, temporal, parietal, occipital, and total WMH load. That is, with increased age at baseline and time from baseline, WMH load was higher for all regions and all definitions. For vascular risk factors, only systolic blood pressure had significant associations with WMH load for all definitions. After correction for multiple comparisons, systolic blood pressure remained significantly associated with WMH for all regions definitions in the frontal region ($p<.01$) and for the CCI and ECog definition for total WMH load ($p<.03$).

For the CCI definition, there were no main effects of SCD on baseline WMH volume in any region. The interaction between SCD diagnosis and time from baseline on WMH load was significant (after FDR correction) in only temporal ($t=2.56$, $p=.01$) and parietal ($t=2.23$, $p=.03$) regions. Similar results were obtained for the ECog questionnaire. No main effects of SCD diagnosis on WMH volume at baseline were obtained for any region. Significant interactions between SCD diagnosis and time from baseline were observed at the temporal ($t=2.23$, $p=.03$) and parietal ($t=2.50$, $p=.01$) regions, which remained significant after FDR correction These findings indicate that for both the CCI and ECog definitions, that rate of change in WMH load over time was increased for SCD+ vs. SCD- in only the temporal and parietal regions.

Using the ECog+Worry definition, no main effects of SCD on baseline WMH volume remained significant after correction for multiple comparisons. Before correction for multiple comparisons, the main effect of SCD diagnosis was significant for frontal (t=2.01, p=.044), parietal (t=1.93, p=.05), and total (t=1.97, p=.048) baseline WMH volume. These did not remain significant after FDR correction. The interaction between SCD diagnosis and time from baseline was significant for frontal (t=3.48, p<.001), temporal (t=3.28, p=.001), parietal (t=2.95, p=.003), and total (t=3.80 p=.001), but not occipital (t=1.41, p=.16) WMH load. These results remained after FDR correction. The Worry only definition showed a significant main effect for SCD diagnosis on WMH load in only the temporal region (t=2.19, p=.028). Interactions between SCD diagnosis and time from baseline were significant for frontal (t=4.08, p<.001), temporal (t=3.06, p=.002), parietal (t=2.45, p=.01), and total (t=3.86 p<.001), but not occipital (t=1.67, p=.094) WMH load. Frontal, temporal, and total interactions remained significant after FDR correction. These findings indicated that for ECog+Worry and Worry SCD definitions, the rate of change in WMH load over time was increased for SCD+ vs. SCD- for all regions except occipital.

4 Discussion

To discover an early biomarker for AD, research on preclinical AD (i.e., SCD) has increased over the last several years. Although specific SCD characteristics have been defined as the features that are most likely to result in progression to AD (Jessen et al., 2020, 2014), few studies use these characteristics in their methods to define SCD. The current study compared WMH load in SCD+ vs SCD- using four different and commonly used methods of defining SCD, with the goal of examining if the four methods were associated with vascular pathology in the same manner. Although there were few baseline differences between those with SCD+ and SCD-, all

definitions were associated with change in WMH burden over time, albeit in different regions and with different rates. The findings here show that differences in change over time in WMH load between SCD+ and SCD- varies depending on the method used to define SCD.

Similar results were obtained for both CCI and ECog definitions of SCD. Change over time in WMH load in the SCD+ participants was greater compared to the SCD- participants. However, these differences were only observed in the temporal and parietal regions. Previous research examining WMH differences in people with amnestic MCI, who are likely to develop AD, have shown increased WMH in temporal and occipital regions compared to NC (Bangen et al., 2020). Increased WMH volume in only the parietal lobe has also been shown to predict incident AD in cognitively healthy older adults (Brickman et al., 2012). These findings suggest that both CCI and ECog may be associated with WMH burden that is observed in people with AD. Our previous study found that using ECog to define SCD+ was associated with atrophy in the superior temporal region. On the other hand, using CCI to define SCD+ was associated with hippocampal change (Morrison et al., 2022), an area known to be associated with early AD pathology. Taken together, the CCI definition of SCD+ is associated with both WMH burden in the temporal and parietal regions and hippocampal change, suggesting that this definition may be more sensitive to future AD than the ECog definition of SCD+.

Differences in total and frontal WMH burden were observed using the ECog+Worry definition. These differences were driven by the Worry definition, as observed by ECog having no association with SCD+ vs. SCD- group differences in WMH total or the frontal region, whereas Worry was associated with highly significant group differences for both total WMH and the frontal region. These findings suggest that SCD+ as defined by Worry is associated with a more widespread vascular pathology than SCD+ as defined by either the ECog or CCI. Previous

research has observed that non-amnestic MCI is associated with a widespread WMH accumulation (frontal, parietal, temporal, and occipital), whereas amnestic MCI is associated with elevated WMH burden in the temporal and occipital areas relative to normal controls (K. J. Bangen et al., 2020). Thus, in our findings of the Worry SCD+ definition being associated with a widespread WMH burden, this definition of SCD+ may be sensitive to non-amnestic MCI (Petersen & Morris, 2005). Non-amnestic MCI is unlikely to be associated with AD, with clinical outcomes most likely being either vascular dementia, dementia with Lewy bodies, or frontotemporal dementia (Petersen & Morris, 2005). To further support this interpretation of Worry SCD+ being associated with a dementia other than AD, MCI patients from a memory clinic with high WMH burden were most likely to develop vascular or mixed dementia (Bombois et al., 2008).

Previous findings investigating WMH volume differences between SCD+ and SCD- have been quite mixed. Depending on the definition used for SCD and whether regional or total WMH burden was used, our results here replicate both the findings that observe SCD+ vs. SCD- WMH group differences (Pålhaugen et al., 2021; Van Rooden et al., 2018) and those that do not (Bartley et al., 2012; Caillaud et al., 2020). These current studies have only examined baseline WMH volume as opposed to longitudinal change. This approach could also explain the lack of group differences observed in several of these papers. In our study, only SCD+ defined using Worry was associated with increased baseline WMHs in the temporal region. However, all definitions were associated with increased change in WMH burden over time in those with SCD+. This finding follows previous research suggesting that increased WMHs may occur before symptom onset (Lee et al., 2016). The large sample size in this study has sufficient power

to conclude that subtle WMH differences exist between SCD+ and SCD-, and that these differences are most prominent when examining change over time.

Many studies examining age and cognitive impairment differences in WMH load focus on total WMH burden, with fewer studies examining regional WMH differences. For specific comparisons of SCD+ vs SCD-, most studies examining WMHs used overall WMH burden (Bartley et al., 2012; Caillaud et al., 2020; Van Rooden et al., 2018) as opposed to a regional approach (Pålhaugen et al., 2021). This method of measurement may contribute to the conflicting results as to whether SCD+ have increased WMH burden compared to SCD-. The current findings suggest that examining regional differences will influence whether higher WMH burden is observed in SCD+ compared to SCD-. When examining total WMH burden, both the CCI and ECog definitions show no differences between SCD+ vs. SCD-. However, when examining WMH in a regional approach, group differences are found in the temporal and parietal regions. WMH change over time because of a SCD+ diagnosis in both the temporal and parietal region is subtle and thus may be "washed out" when WMHs are examined in a whole brain metric. Future research should use regional approaches when examining WMH differences in healthy older adults.

There are a few limitations of the current study that should be noted. Participants in the ADNI dataset are highly educated, thus the results here may be limited in generalizability to more representative samples. Although the SCD working group has suggested specific criteria which make someone most likely to convert to AD (SCD *plus*, Jessen et al., 2020), this study used four other methods that are commonly used to measure SCD in research settings. Future research should examine the relationship between SCD *plus* and WMH burden to determine early WMH change in people who are most likely to develop clinical AD. Unfortunately, this

study could not include SCD *plus* because information for several SCD *plus* requirements are not available in the ADNI cohort.

5 Conclusion

The current study examined the association between WMH burden and SCD in cognitively healthy older adults using four different methods to define SCD. This study shows that change in WMH burden observed in SCD+ populations depends on both the definition used to define SCD and whether a regional or whole brain approach is used to measure WMH burden. While CCI and ECog are associated with temporal and parietal WMH burden, the Worry definition is associated with a more widespread WMH accumulation. Based on these findings, the four definitions of SCD may be associated with different types of clinical outcomes. Additionally, neuropathological changes in SCD may be too subtle to observe in a whole brain approach. Future research needs to examine WMH changes in SCD+ populations using a regional approach to accurately examine pathological changes.

Table 1: Demographic and clinical characteristics for cognitively normal older adults with and without subjective cognitive decline for the four definitions

Demographic Information	CCI		ECOG		Ecog+Worry		Worry	
	SCD- n = 270	SCD+ n = 265	SCD- n = 288	SCD+ n = 247	SCD- n = 337	SCD+ n = 168	SCD- n = 264	SCD+ n = 241
Age	72.9 ± 6.6	72.1 ± 6.4	72.2 ± 6.4	73.4 ± 6.5 *	72.2 ± 6.5	73.3 ± 6.2	72.3 ± 6.6	72.7 ± 6.3
Education	16.7 ± 2.4	16.8 ± 2.4	16.8 ± 2.5	16.6 ± 2.3	16.9 ± 2.4	16.4 ± 2.4 *	17.01 ± 16.4	16.4 ± 2.5 *
Av45	1.16 ± 0.3	1.12 ± 0.2	1.13 ± 0.2	1.14 ± 0.2	1.13 ± 0.2	1.15 ± 0.2	1.12 ± 0.2	1.16 ± 0.2
APOE □4+[a]	77 (29%)	91 (36%)	74 (26%)	74 (34%)	105 (32%)	54 (33%)	72 (28%)	87 (37%) *
Male sex	122 (45%)	103 (39%)	119 (41%)	106 (43%)	151 (45%)	64 (38%)	120 (45%)	95 (36%)
Diastolic BP	74.3 ± 10.5	75.2 ± 8.3	74.9 ± 9.2	74.7 ± 9.8	75.1 ± 9.0	74.6 ± 10.1	75.2 ± 9.1	74.7 ± 9.6
Systolic BP	134.1 ± 18.9	135.2 ± 15.8	134.1 ± 17.3	135.2 ± 17.6	134.3 ± 16.7	135.1 ± 18.8	133.4 ± 16.4	135.8 ± 18.4
BMI	27.3 ± 5.2	27.7 ± 5.2	27.2 ± 5.3	27.8 ± 5.1	27.3 ± 5.2	27.8 ± 5.3	27.5 ± 5.4	27.5 ± 5.0

Notes: values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation, or number of participants (percentage %). * = statistically significant differences between SCD- and SCD+ (at the $p<0.05$ level); however, none of these differences remain significant after correction for multiple comparisons. APOE □4+ = number and percentage of people with at least one □4 allele. [a] = APOE □4+ status was missing for 15 participants. CCI = Cognitive Change Index. ECog = Everyday Cognition Scale. SCD- = Cognitively normal older adults without subjective cognitive decline. SCD+ = cognitively normal older adults with subjective cognitive decline. BMI = body mass index. BP = blood pressure.

Table 2: Linear regression model results showing differences between cognitively healthy older adults with and without cognitive impairment

	CCI	ECog	ECog+Worry	Worry
Total				
Age_bl	***t*=9.19, *p*<.001***	***t*=9.05, *p*<.001***	***t*=9.00, *p*<.001***	***t*=9.10, *p*<.001***
TimeFromBaseline	***t*=18.35, *p*<.001***	***t*=14.38, *p*<.001***	***t*=15.88, *p*<.001***	***t*=13.95, *p*<.001***
BMI	*t*=0.71, *p*=.48	*t*=0.69, *p*=.48	*t*=0.44, *p*=.66	*t*=0.47, *p*=.64
Systolic BP	***t*=2.21, *p*=.028***	***t*=2.21, *p*=.027***	*t*=2.06, *p*=.039*	*t*=2.07, *p*=.038*
Diastolic BP	*t*=0.19, *p*=.85	*t*=0.09, *p*=.92	*t*=0.12, *p*=.91	*t*=0.14, *p*=.88
SCD Diagnosis	*t*=-0.22, *p*=.82	*t*=0.77, *p*=.44	*t*=1.97, *p*=.048*	*t*=1.83, *p*=.067
SCD:TimeFromBaseline	*t*=1.03, *p*=.30	*t*=1.63, *p*=.10	***t*=3.80 *p*=.001***	***t*=3.86, *p*<.001***
Frontal				
Age_bl	***t*=8.93, *p*<.001***	***t*=8.79, *p*<.001***	***t*=8.76, *p*<.001***	***t*=8.85, *p*<.001***
TimeFromBaseline	***t*=16.81, *p*<.001***	***t*=13.47, *p*<.001***	***t*=14.04, *p*<.001***	***t*=11.96, *p*<.001***
BMI	*t*=1.33, *p*=.18	*t*=1.31, *p*=.19	*t*=1.01, *p*=.31	*t*=1.01, *p*=.31
Systolic BP	***t*=2.72, *p*=.007***	***t*=2.73, *p*=.007***	***t*=2.58, *p*=.01***	***t*=2.61, *p*=.008***
Diastolic BP	*t*=-0.48, *p*=.63	*t*=-0.52, *p*=.60	*t*=-0.37, *p*=.71	*t*=-0.37, *p*=.71
SCD Diagnosis	*t*=0.29, *p*=.78	*t*=0.73, *p*=.47	*t*=2.01, *p*=.044*	*t*=1.41, *p*=.16
SCD:TimeFromBaseline	*t*=0.34, *p*=.73	*t*=0.69, *p*=.49	***t*=3.48, *p*<.001***	***t*=4.08, *p*<.001***
Temporal				
Age_bl	***t*=7.60, *p*<.001***	***t*=7.50, *p*<.001***	***t*=7.44, *p*<.001***	***t*=7.50, *p*<.001***
TimeFromBaseline	***t*=12.73, *p*<.001***	***t*=10.02, *p*<.001***	***t*=11.82, *p*<.001***	***t*=10.49, *p*<.001***
BMI	*t*=-0.34, *p*=.73	*t*=-0.27, *p*=.79	*t*=-0.43, *p*=.67	*t*=-0.40, *p*=.69
Systolic BP	*t*=0.48, *p*=.63	*t*=0.43, *p*=.66	*t*=0.35, *p*=.72	*t*=0.33, *p*=.74
Diastolic BP	*t*=1.16, *p*=.24	*t*=1.04, *p*=.30	*t*=0.86, *p*=.39	*t*=0.90, *p*=.37
SCD Diagnosis	*t*=-0.34, *p*=.73	*t*=0.43, *p*=.79	*t*=1.47, *p*=.14	***t*=2.19, *p*=.028***
SCD:TimeFromBaseline	***t*=2.56, *p*=.01***	***t*=2.23, *p*=.03***	***t*=3.28, *p*=.001***	***t*=3.06, *p*=.002***
Parietal				
Age_bl	***t*=8.90, *p*<.001***	***t*=8.83, *p*<.001***	***t*=8.82, *p*<.001***	***t*=8.91, *p*<.001***
TimeFromBaseline	***t*=17.09, *p*<.001***	***t*=13.27, *p*<.001***	***t*=15.81, *p*<.001***	***t*=14.34, *p*<.001***
BMI	*t*=0.19, *p*=.85	*t*=0.20, *p*=.84	*t*=0.04, *p*=.97	*t*=0.12, *p*=.91
Systolic BP	*t*=0.63, *p*=.53	*t*=0.59, *p*=.55	*t*=0.56, *p*=.58	*t*=0.55, *p*=.58
Diastolic BP	*t*=0.73, *p*=.47	*t*=0.58, *p*=.56	*t*=0.59, *p*=.55	*t*=0.63, *p*=.53

SCD Diagnosis	*t*=-1.16, *p*=.25	*t*=1.07, *p*=.28	***t*=**1.93, *p*=.05*	*t*=1.72, *p*=.085
SCD:TimeFromBaseline	***t*=2.23, *p*=.03***	***t*=2.50, *p*=.01***	***t*=2.95, *p*=.003***	***t*=2.45, *p*=.01***
Occipital				
Age_bl	***t*=2.61, *p*=.009***	***t*=2.58, *p*=.009***	***t*=2.51, *p*=.01***	***t*=2.49, *p*=.01***
TimeFromBaseline	***t*=7.17, *p*<.001***	***t*=5.22, *p*<.001***	***t*=5.77, *p*<.001***	***t*=4.89, *p*<.001***
BMI	*t*=-0.51, *p*=.61	*t*=-0.56, *p*=.57	*t*=-0.56, *p*=.57	*t*=-0.58, *p*=.56
Systolic BP	*t*=1.99, *p*=.047*	*t*=2.02 *p*=.044*	*t*=1.99 *p*=.046*	*t*=1.97 *p*=.049*
Diastolic BP	*t*=-0.18, *p*=.86	*t*=-0.21, *p*=.83	*t*=-0.37, *p*=.71	*t*=-0.36, *p*=.72
SCD Diagnosis	*t*=0.01, *p*=.99	*t*=0.09, *p*=.93	*t*=0.66, *p*=.51	*t*=1.95, *p*=.051
SCD:TimeFromBaseline	*t*=-0.68, *p*=.50	*t*=0.47, *p*=.64	*t*=1.41, *p*=.16	*t*=1.67, *p*=.094

Notes: CCI = Cognitive Change Index. ECog = Everyday Cognition Scale. BMI = body mass index, BP = blood pressure * Represents results that are significant when uncorrected and bolded values represent those that remained significant after correction for multiple comparisons using FDR.

Anor, C. J., Dadar, M., Collins, D. L., & Tartaglia, M. C. (2021). The longitudinal assessment of neuropsychiatric symptoms in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease and their association with white matter hyperintensities in the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center's uniform data set. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, *6*(1), 70-78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2020.03.006

Bangen, K. J., Thomas, K. R., Weigand, A. J., Sanchez, D. L., Delano-Wood, L., Edmonds, E. C., ... & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. (2020). Pattern of regional white matter hyperintensity volume in mild cognitive impairment subtypes and associations with decline in daily functioning. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *86*, 134-142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2019.10.016.Pattern

Bangen, K. J., Preis, S. R., Delano-Wood, L., Wolf, P. A., Libon, D. J., Bondi, M. W., ... & Brickman, A. M. (2018). Baseline white matter hyperintensities and hippocampal volume are associated with conversion from normal cognition to mild cognitive impairment in the Framingham Offspring Study. *Alzheimer Disease and Associated Disorders*, *32*(1), 50. https://doi.org/10.1097/WAD.0000000000000215.Baseline

Bartley, M., Bokde, A. L., Ewers, M., Faluyi, Y. O., Tobin, W. O., Snow, A., ... & O'Neill, D. (2012). Subjective memory complaints in community dwelling healthy older people: the influence of brain and psychopathology. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *27*(8), 836-843. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.2794

Bombois, S., Debette, S., Bruandet, A., Delbeuck, X., Delmaire, C., Leys, D., & Pasquier, F. (2008). Vascular subcortical hyperintensities predict conversion to vascular and mixed dementia in MCI patients. *Stroke*, *39*(7), 2046-2051.**https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.107.505206**

Boyle, P. A., Yu, L., Fleischman, D. A., Leurgans, S., Yang, J., Wilson, R. S., ... & Bennett, D. A. (2016). White matter hyperintensities, incident mild cognitive impairment, and cognitive decline in old age. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology*, *3*(10), 791-800. https://doi.org/10.1002/acn3.343

Brickman, A. M., Provenzano, F. A., Muraskin, J., Manly, J. J., Blum, S., Apa, Z., ... & Mayeux, R. (2012). Regional white matter hyperintensity volume, not hippocampal atrophy, predicts incident Alzheimer disease in the community. *Archives of Neurology*, *69*(12), 1621-1627. https://doi.org/10.1001/archneurol.2012.1527.Regional

Caillaud, M., Hudon, C., Boller, B., Brambati, S., Duchesne, S., Lorrain, D., ... & Belleville, S. (2020). Evidence of a relation between hippocampal volume, white matter hyperintensities, and cognition in subjective cognitive decline and mild cognitive impairment. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, *75*(7), 1382-1392. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbz120

Coupé, P., Yger, P., Prima, S., Hellier, P., Kervrann, C., & Barillot, C. (2008). An optimized blockwise nonlocal means denoising filter for 3-D magnetic resonance images. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, *27*(4), 425-441. https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2007.906087

Dadar, M., Camicioli, R., Duchesne, S., Collins, D. L., & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging

Initiative. (2020). The temporal relationships between white matter hyperintensities, neurodegeneration, amyloid beta, and cognition. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring*, *12*(1), e12091. https://doi.org/10.1002/dad2.12091

Dadar, M., Fereshtehnejad, S. M., Zeighami, Y., Dagher, A., Postuma, R. B., & Collins, D. L. (2020). White matter hyperintensities mediate impact of dysautonomia on cognition in Parkinson's disease. *Movement Disorders Clinical Practice*, *7*(6), 639-647. https://doi.org/10.1002/mdc3.13003

Dadar, M., Fonov, V. S., Collins, D. L., & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. (2018). A comparison of publicly available linear MRI stereotaxic registration techniques. *Neuroimage*, *174*, 191-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.03.025

Dadar, M., Maranzano, J., Ducharme, S., Collins, D. L., & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. (2019). White matter in different regions evolves differently during progression to dementia. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *76*, 71-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2018.12.004

Dadar, M., Maranzano, J., Misquitta, K., Anor, C. J., Fonov, V. S., Tartaglia, M. C., ... & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. (2017). Performance comparison of 10 different classification techniques in segmenting white matter hyperintensities in aging. *NeuroImage*, *157*, 233-249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.06.009

Dadar, M., Pascoal, T. A., Manitsirikul, S., Misquitta, K., Fonov, V. S., Tartaglia, M. C., ... & Collins, D. L. (2017). Validation of a regression technique for segmentation of white matter hyperintensities in Alzheimer's disease. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, *36*(8), 1758-1768. DOI: 10.1109/TMI.2017.2693978

Fonov, V., Evans, A., Botteron, K., Almli, C., McKinstry, R., & Collins, D. BDCG, 2011. Unbiased average age-appropriate atlases for pediatric studies. *NeuroImage*, *54*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.07.033

Hammers, A., Allom, R., Koeep, M., Free, S., Myers, R., Lemieux, L., … Duncan, J. (2003). Validation of T1w-based segmentations of white matter hyperintensity volumes in large-scale datasets of aging. *Human Brain Mapping*, *19*, 224–247.

Jessen, F., Amariglio, R. E., Buckley, R. F., van der Flier, W. M., Han, Y., Molinuevo, J. L., ... & Wagner, M. (2020). The characterisation of subjective cognitive decline. *The Lancet Neurology*, *19*(3), 271-278. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(19)30368-0

Jessen, F., Amariglio, R. E., Van Boxtel, M., Breteler, M., Ceccaldi, M., Chételat, G., ... & Subjective Cognitive Decline Initiative. (2014). A conceptual framework for research on subjective cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, *10*(6), 844-852. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2014.01.001.A

Mitchell, A. J., Beaumont, H., Ferguson, D., Yadegarfar, M., & Stubbs, B. (2014). Risk of dementia and mild cognitive impairment in older people with subjective memory complaints: meta□analysis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *130*(6), 439-451. DOI: 10.1111/acps.12336

Morrison, C., Dadar, M., Villeneuve, S., & Collins, D. L. (2021). White matter hyperintensities may be an early marker for age-related cognitive decline in the ADNI cohort. *bioRxiv*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.23.461560

Morrison, C., Dadar, M., Shafiee, N., Villeneuve, S., Collins, D. L., & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. (2022). Regional brain atrophy and cognitive decline depend on definition of subjective cognitive decline. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, *33*, 102923. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2021.102923

Pålhaugen, L., Sudre, C. H., Tecelao, S., Nakling, A., Almdahl, I. S., Kalheim, L. F., ... & Fladby, T. (2021). Brain amyloid and vascular risk are related to distinct white matter hyperintensity patterns. *Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism*, *41*(5), 1162-1174. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0271678X20957604

Petersen, R. C., & Morris, J. C. (2005). Mild cognitive impairment as a clinical entity and treatment target. *Archives of Neurology*, *62*(7), 1160-1163. https://doi.org/10.1001/archneur.62.7.1160

Prins, N. D., van Dijk, E. J., den Heijer, T., Vermeer, S. E., Koudstaal, P. J., Oudkerk, M., ... & Breteler, M. M. (2004). Cerebral white matter lesions and the risk of dementia. *Archives of Neurology*, *61*(10), 1531-1534. https://doi.org/10.1001/archneur.61.10.1531

Rabin, L. A., Smart, C. M., & Amariglio, R. E. (2017). Subjective cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *13*, 369-396. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032816-045136

Risacher, S. L., Kim, S., Nho, K., Foroud, T., Shen, L., Petersen, R. C., ... & Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI. (2015). APOE effect on Alzheimer's disease biomarkers in older adults with significant memory concern. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, *11*(12), 1417-1429.

van der Flier, W. M., Skoog, I., Schneider, J. A., Pantoni, L., Mok, V., Chen, C. L., & Scheltens, P. (2018). Vascular cognitive impairment. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers*, *4*(1), 1-16.

van Harten, A. C., Mielke, M. M., Swenson-Dravis, D. M., Hagen, C. E., Edwards, K. K., Roberts, R. O., ... & Petersen, R. C. (2018). Subjective cognitive decline and risk of MCI: the Mayo Clinic Study of Aging. *Neurology*, *91*(4), e300-e312. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000005863

Van Rooden, S., van den Berg-Huysmans, A. A., Croll, P. H., Labadie, G., Hayes, J. M., Viviano, R., ... & Damoiseaux, J. S. (2018). Subjective cognitive decline is associated with greater white matter hyperintensity volume. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, *66*(3), 1283-1294. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-180285

Wang, X., Huang, W., Su, L., Xing, Y., Jessen, F., Sun, Y., ... & Han, Y. (2020). Neuroimaging advances regarding subjective cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer’s disease. *Molecular Neurodegeneration*, *15*(1), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13024-020-00395-3