medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

Machine learning-based classification of Alzheimer's disease and its at-risk states using personality traits, anxiety, and depression

Konrad F. Waschkies[1,2], Joram Soch[1,3], Margarita Darna[1,4], Anni Richter[4, 36, 37], Slawek Altenstein[5,6], Aline Beyle[7,31], Frederic Brosseron[7], Friederike Buchholz[5,9], Michaela Butryn[10,32], Laura Dobisch[10], Michael Ewers[11,12], Klaus Fliessbach[7,8], Tatjana Gabelin[9], Wenzel Glanz[10,32], Doreen Goerss[13,14], Daria Gref[9], Daniel Janowitz[12], Ingo Kilimann[13,14], Andrea Lohse[6], Matthias H. Munk[15,16], Boris-Stephan Rauchmann[17,18,19], Ayda Rostamzadeh[20], Nina Roy[7], Eike Jakob Spruth[5,6], Peter Dechent[21], Michael T. Heneka[7], Stefan Hetzer[22], Alfredo Ramirez[7,8, 23,24,25], Klaus Scheffler[26], Katharina Buerger[11,12], Christoph Laske[15,16], Robert Perneczky[11,17,18,27,28], Oliver Peters[5, 9], Josef Priller[5,6,29,30], Anja Schneider[7,8], Annika Spottke[7, 31], Stefan Teipel[13,14], Emrah Düzel[10,32], Frank Jessen[7, 20,33], Jens Wiltfang[1,2,34], Björn H. Schott[#1,2,4], & Jasmin M. Kizilirmak[#1,35]

[1)] German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Göttingen, Germany

[2)] Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

[3)] Bernstein Center for Computational Neuroscience, Berlin, Germany

[4)] Leibniz Institute for Neurobiology, Magdeburg, Germany

[5)] German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Berlin, Germany

[6)] Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Charité, Berlin, Germany

[7)] German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Bonn, Germany

[8)] University of Bonn Medical Center, Dept. of Neurodegenerative Disease and Geriatric Psychiatry/Psychiatry, Bonn, Germany

[9)] Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin-Institute of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy

[10)] German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Magdeburg, Germany

[11)] German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Munich, Germany

[12)] Institute for Stroke and Dementia Research (ISD), University Hospital, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany

[13)] German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Rostock, Germany

[14)] Department of Psychosomatic Medicine, Rostock University Medical Center, Rostock, Germany

[15)] German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Tübingen, Germany

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

[16] Section for Dementia Research, Hertie Institute for Clinical Brain Research and Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

[17] Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany

[18] Sheffield Institute for Translational Neuroscience (SITraN), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

[19] Department of Neuroradiology, University Hospital LMU, Munich, Germany

[20] Department of Psychiatry, University of Cologne, Medical Faculty, Cologne, Germany

[21] MR-Research in Neurosciences, Department of Cognitive Neurology, Georg-August-University Goettingen, Germany

[22] Berlin Center for Advanced Neuroimaging, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

[23] Excellence Cluster on Cellular Stress Responses in Aging-Associated Diseases (CECAD), University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

[24] Division of Neurogenetics and Molecular Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Cologne, University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

[25] Department of Psychiatry & Glenn Biggs Institute for Alzheimer's and Neurodegenerative Diseases, San Antonio, TX, USA

[26] Department for Biomedical Magnetic Resonance, University of Tübingen, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

[27] Munich Cluster for Systems Neurology (SyNergy) Munich, Munich, Germany

[28] Ageing Epidemiology Research Unit (AGE), School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK

[29] School of Medicine, Technical University of Munich; Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Munich, Germany

[30] University of Edinburgh and UK DRI, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

[31] Department of Neurology, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

[32] Institute of Cognitive Neurology and Dementia Research (IKND), Otto-von-Guericke University, Magdeburg, Germany

[33] Excellence Cluster on Cellular Stress Responses in Aging-Associated Diseases (CECAD), University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

[34] Neurosciences and Signaling Group, Institute of Biomedicine (iBiMED), Department of Medical Sciences, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

[35] Neurodidactics and NeuroLab, Institute for Psychology, University of Hildesheim, Hildesheim, Germany

[36] German Center for Mental Health (DZPG)

[37] Center for Intervention and Research on adaptive and maladaptive brain Circuits underlying mental health (C-I-R-C), Jena-Magdeburg-Halle

[#] Correspondence should be addressed to JMK (kizilirmak@uni-hildesheim.de) for methodological and data analysis questions and to BHS (bjoern-hendrik.schott@dzne.de) for clinical questions.

Email addresses

k.waschkies@stud.uni-goettingen.de, Joram.Soch@dzne.de, margarita.darna@lin-magdeburg.de, Anni.Richter@lin-magdeburg.de, slawek.altenstein@charite.de, Aline.Beyle@dzne.de, Frederic.Brosseron@dzne.de, andrea.lohse@charite.de, Michaela.Butryn@dzne.de, laura.dobisch@dzne.de, michael.ewers@med.uni-muenchen.de, Klaus.Fliessbach@ukbonn.de, tatjana.gabelin@charite.de, Wenzel.Glanz@dzne.de, doreen.goerss@dzne.de, daria.gref@charite.de, Daniel.Janowitz@med.uni-muenchen.de, Ingo.Kilimann@dzne.de, friederike.buchholz@charite.de, Matthias.Munk@med.uni-tuebingen.de, boris.rauchmann@med.uni-muenchen.de, ayda.rostamzadeh@uk-koeln.de, nina.roy@dzne.de, eike.spruth@charite.de, pdechen@gwdg.de, Michael.Ewers@med.uni-muenchen.de, Michael.Heneka@dzne.de, stefan.hetzer@charite.de, alfredo.ramirez-zuniga@uk-koeln.de, klaus.scheffler@med.uni-tuebingen.de, katharina.buerger@med.uni-muenchen.de, Christoph.Laske@med.uni-tuebingen.de, Robert.Perneczky@med.uni-muenchen.de, oliver.peters@charite.de, josef.priller@charite.de, anja.schneider@dzne.de, annika.spottke@dzne.de, stefan.teipel@med.uni-rostock.de, emrah.duezel@dzne.de, frank.jessen@uk-koeln.de, jens.wiltfang@med.uni-goettingen.de, Bjoern-Hendrik.Schott@dzne.de, kizilirmak@uni-hildesheim.de

Data availability statement

All scripts (https://github.com/jmkizilirmak/DELCODE162) and the machine learning toolbox for Matlab (https://github.com/JoramSoch/ML4ML) are available online. Data, study protocol, and biomaterials can be shared with collaborators based on individual data and biomaterial transfer agreements with the DZNE.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Funding statement

The study was funded by the German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), reference number BN012.

Conflict of interest disclosure

F. Jessen has received consulting fees from Eli Lilly, Novartis, Roche, BioGene, MSD, Piramal, Janssen, and Lundbeck. E. Düzel is co-founder of neotiv GmbH. The remaining authors report no disclosures relevant to the manuscript.

Ethics approval statement

The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of all participating study centers of the DZNE. The process was led and coordinated by the ethical committee of the medical faculty of the University of Bonn (registration number 117/13).

Patient consent statement

All participants gave written informed consent.

Permission to reproduce material from other sources

Not applicable.

Clinical trial registration

The DELCODE study has been registered as a clinical trial with the German Clinical Trials Register under the study acronym "DELCODE", ID DRKS00007966.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Alzheimer's disease (AD) is often preceded by stages of cognitive impairment, namely subjective cognitive decline (SCD) and mild cognitive impairment (MCI). While cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) biomarkers are established predictors of AD, other non-invasive candidate predictors include personality traits, anxiety, and depression, among others. These predictors offer non-invasive assessment and exhibit changes during AD development and preclinical stages.

Methods: In a cross-sectional design, we comparatively evaluated the predictive value of personality traits (Big Five), geriatric anxiety and depression scores, resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging activity of the default mode network, apoliprotein E (ApoE) genotype, and CSF biomarkers (tTau, pTau181, Aβ42/40 ratio) in a multi-class support vector machine classification. Participants included 189 healthy controls (HC), 338 individuals with SCD, 132 with amnestic MCI, and 74 with mild AD from the multicenter DZNE-Longitudinal Cognitive Impairment and Dementia Study (DELCODE).

Results: Mean predictive accuracy across all participant groups was highest when utilizing a combination of personality, depression, and anxiety scores. HC were best predicted by a feature set comprised of depression and anxiety scores and participants with AD were best predicted by a feature set containing CSF biomarkers. Classification of participants with SCD or aMCI was near chance level for all assessed feature sets.

Conclusion: Our results demonstrate predictive value of personality trait and state scores for AD. Importantly, CSF biomarkers, personality, depression, anxiety, and ApoE genotype show complementary value for classification of AD and its at-risk stages.

Keywords: Alzheimer’s disease, subjective cognitive decline, amnestic mild cognitive impairment, biomarker, cerebrospinal fluid, personality, fMRI, resting-state, support vector machine, machine learning

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Key Points

- Multi-class support vector machine classification was used to compare the predictive value of well-established and non-invasive, easy-to-assess candidate variables for classifying participants with healthy cognition, subjective cognitive decline, amnestic mild cognitive impairment, and mild Alzheimer's disease.
- Personality traits, geriatric anxiety and depression scores, resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging activity of the default mode network, ApoE genotype, and CSF biomarkers were comparatively evaluated.
- A combination of personality, anxiety, and depression scores provided the highest predictive accuracy, comparable to CSF biomarkers, indicating complementary value.
- Established and candidate predictors had limited success in classifying SCD and aMCI, underscoring the heterogeneity of these cognitive states and emphasizing the need for standardizing terminology and diagnostic criteria.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

1 Introduction

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is commonly preceded by cognitive impairment states, namely subjective cognitive decline (SCD) and mild cognitive impairment (MCI). While MCI requires a measurable deviation from normal cognitive performance as assessed by neuropsychological testing, SCD does not. As both are recognized risk factors for AD (Albert et al. 2011; Jessen et al. 2014), effective treatment for AD requires early intervention (Blennow et al. 2010; Sperling et al. 2011; Binnewijzend et al. 2012; Buchhave et al. 2012; Jessen et al. 2014; Badhwar et al. 2017; Jessen et al. 2018).

Established biomarkers for the diagnosis of AD and associated risk stages are altered levels of amyloid beta (Aβ1-42), total tau (tTau), and phosphorylated tau (pTau181) in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF; Blennow et al. 2010; Olsson et al. 2016; Badhwar et al. 2017). Obtaining CSF samples requires an invasive lumbar puncture and is typically only performed in cases of clinical suspicion. Hence, less invasive measures have been proposed. This study undertook a comparative assessment of the predictive value of voxel-wise resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging activity of the default mode network (DMN), personality traits, depression, anxiety, apolipoprotein E (ApoE) genotype, and CSF biomarkers. These predictors were employed in a machine-learning classification framework to distinguish between different groups of participants positioned along the trajectory of Alzheimer's disease or those in a cognitively healthy state (Figure 1).

At an intra-individual level, personality traits (McCrae & Costa 1987) change in premorbid cognitive states and in AD itself. Overall, neuroticism has been observed to increase during the transition from normal cognition to amnestic MCI, while extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness decrease, with limited evidence for lower agreeableness (Mendez Rubio et al. 2013; Yoneda et al. 2016; Terracciano et al. 2017; Caselli et al. 2018). Similarly, at an inter-individual level, individuals with AD display higher neuroticism and lower scores in agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness compared to healthy controls in both self- and informant ratings (Duchek et al. 2007; Robins Wahlin and Byrne 2011). In general, a linear trend reflecting the severity of cognitive decline is apparent in personality trait scores, indicating that alterations in AD are more notable and pronounced compared to its preceding stages.

Personality traits are considered rather stable throughout life, while anxiety and depression are transient states. However, anxiety and depression are widely reported to correlate with personality traits (Kotov et al. 2010; Klein et al. 2011; Hakulinen et al. 2015) and may be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

regarded as proxies for neuroticism (Costa Jr. and McCrae 2008; Soto et al. 2009). Higher levels of depression and anxiety are consistently associated with subjective cognitive decline (SCD) (Hill et al. 2016), aMCI (Ismail et al. 2017; Mirza et al. 2017), and AD (Leung et al. 2021) and may be used as predictors for these cognitive states. Comparisons of affective symptoms between SCD/MCI and SCD/AD have yielded inconsistent results, but higher prevalence of depressive symptoms is observed compared to healthy controls (Hill et al. 2016). Higher anxiety and depression levels increase the risk of converting from (a)MCI to AD (Palmer et al. 2007; Li et al. 2016; Li et al. 2018; Peakman et al. 2020) and treatment of these conditions might potentially reduce the conversion rate (Cooper et al. 2015). Additionally, the rate of cognitive decline is reported to be influenced by the age of depression onset (Ly et al. 2021). There is ongoing debate regarding whether depression constitutes a risk factor or an initial manifestation of AD, or both (Panza et al. 2010; Singh-Manoux et al. 2017; Invernizzi et al. 2021).

Activity of the DMN (Raichle et al. 2001) can be assessed employing resting-state fMRI (Andrews-Hanna et al. 2014) and metrics like PerAF (Jia et al. 2020) by measuring BOLD signal fluctuations. Patterns of AD-typical Aβ plaques deposition and disturbances in DMN functional connectivity of the DMN show considerable overlap (Mohan et al. 2016). DMN functional alterations have been described in individuals with aMCI and AD for a range of measures, including amplitude of low frequency fluctuations, therefore holding potential diagnostic value for identifying AD and its at-risk states (Blennow et al. 2010; Mevel et al. 2011; Cha et al. 2013; Badhwar et al. 2017).

The ε4 allele in the apolipoprotein E (ApoE) gene is a genetic risk factor for AD, showing a gene-dose effect of the ApoE ε4 risk allele, with ApoE ε4 homozygotes having a higher risk than ApoE ε3/ε4 heterozygotes (Blennow et al. 2010; Sperling et al. 2011; Dubois et al. 2014; Jansen et al. 2015; Hansson et al. 2018; Jessen et al. 2018; Leuzy et al. 2021). The ApoE genotype is proposed as a risk marker in individuals with SCD (Jessen et al. 2014).

Previous research has mostly tested the aforementioned predictors individually in discriminating cognitively healthy individuals from those at-risk for or with AD. Here, we assessed their diagnostic value in a cross-sectional multi-class classification approach (Ramzan et al. 2019), including all four participant groups simultaneously. Our primary focus was to evaluate the role of personality traits, both individually and in combination with depression and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

anxiety. Furthermore, we aimed to compare the performance of all assessed feature sets in terms of their respective predictive[1] accuracies, i.e., class and decoding accuracies.

Our hypotheses were as follows:

(1) Measures of personality traits would yield significant predictive accuracies above chance across all participant groups.

(2) Combining personality traits, depression, and anxiety scores would improve predictive accuracies compared to personality traits alone.

(3) A feature set comprising non-invasive predictors (voxel-wise resting-state activity of the DMN, personality traits, depression and anxiety scores, and ApoE genotype) would yield equal or higher predictive accuracies across all groups compared to a feature set consisting of CSF biomarkers (tTau, pTau181, and Aβ42/40 ratio).



Figure 1. Study design. In a cross-sectional design, predictor variables were combined into feature sets that were used in the SVM classification to predict participant groups. The feature set "confounding variables" was included in all other feature sets and also served as the base model.

[1] In this study, the term "predictive" refers to support vector classification performance of feature sets differentiating participant groups in a cross-sectional design, not the prediction of a longitudinal diagnostic outcome.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Participants

For our cross-sectional study, we used baseline data from participants recruited through the DELCODE study. For detailed information on the DELCODE study, see Jessen et al. (2018). We included a large cohort of 733 participants that were assigned to four different groups based on their entry diagnosis: HC, SCD, aMCI, and mild AD. All participants were aged 60 years or older, fluent in German, able to give informed consent, and had a study partner present.

Participants for the study were recruited either through local newspaper advertisements or from memory clinics. Healthy controls self-identified as cognitively healthy and passed a telephone screening for SCD. These individuals were included as HC if their memory test performance was within 1.5 standard deviations (SD) of the age-, gender-, and education-adjusted normal performance on all Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD) subtests and if they did not meet the SCD criteria (Jessen et al. 2014). Conversely, individuals expressing cognitive decline concerns to the memory center physician were categorized as either SCD or aMCI, based on a comprehensive semi-structured interview following the SCD-plus criteria (Jessen et al. 2014) and their CERAD performance. SCD participants outperformed the -1.5 SD below normal, while aMCI patients underperformed (>1.5 SD) on the "recall word list" subtest, thus excluding non-amnestic MCI participants. They did not meet the criteria for dementia, and their inclusion was based on the memory clinic diagnoses, which adhered to the current research criteria for MCI as defined by the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association (Albert et al. 2011; McKhann et al. 2011).

Assignment to the AD group was based on both clinical diagnosis and on the Mini Mental Status Examination (MMSE). Only participants with mild AD (>18 points and <26 points on the MMSE) were included. Aside from HC, all participant groups (SCD, MCI, AD) were memory clinic referrals and underwent clinical assessments at their respective memory centers. These assessments consisted of a medical history review, psychiatric and neurological examinations, neuropsychological testing, blood laboratory analysis, and routine MRI scans. Cognitive function was measured using the CERAD neuropsychological test battery, which was administered at all memory centers.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of predictor variables

	HC	SCD	aMCI	AD	Statistics
N	189	338	132	74	-
age range	60 – 87 yrs	59 – 87 yrs	61 – 86 yrs	60 – 89 yrs	-
mean age ± SD	69.09 ±5.42 yrs	70.72 ±6.05 yrs	72.86 ±5.61 yrs	74.09 ±6.26 yrs	$H(3) = 52.653$, $p < .001$
gender ratio	81/108 m/f	183/155 m/f	71/61 m/f	33/41 m/f	$\chi^2(3, N = 733) = 7{,}79$, $p = .051$
ApoE risk alleles	N (0/1/2): 146/36/3	N (0/1/2): 220/102/10	N (0/1/2): 69/50/9	N (0/1/2): 27/31/15	$\chi^2(6, N = 718) = 72{,}74$, $p < .001$
mean O score*	3.161 ±0.7284	2.888 ±0.7872	3.012 ±0.7421	2.948 ±0.8263	$H(3) = 14.249$, $p = .003$
mean C score*	3.196 ±0.6841	3.196 ±.6645	3.153 ±.6539	2.910 ±.7067	$H(3) = 11.917$, $p = .008$
mean E score*	3.175 ±0.5097	3.076 ±0.6439	3.129 ±0.6744	3.142 ±0.8868	$H(3) = 4.766$, $p = .190$
mean A score*	3.083 ±0.7849	3.148 ±0.7328	3.056 ±0.7678	2.758 ±0.7708	$H(3) = 13.769$, $p = .003$
mean N score*	2.825 ±0.6475	2.885 ±0.6643	3.077 ±0.8166	3.045 ±0.7474	$H(3) = 10.876$, $p = .012$
GDS mean / median score*	0.66 / 0.00	2.04 / 1.00	2.02 / 2.00	2.39 / 2.00	$H(3) = 124.69$, $p < .001$
GAI-SF mean / median score*	0.65 / 0.00	1.19 / 1.00	1.05 / 1.00	1.05 / 1.00	$H(3) = 24.348$, $p < .001$
mean tTau (pg/ml)	369.47 ±148.70	374.20 ±185.04	555.61 ±318.78	791.96 ±399.94	$H(3) = 62.974$, $p < .001$
mean pTau181 (pg/ml)	49.70 ±16.03	54.03 ±23.92	70.74 ±43.02	95.89 ±47.64	$H(3) = 53.933$, $p < .001$
mean Aβ42/40 ratio	0.09650 ±0.02214	0.092397 ±0.027371	0.073111 ±0.030570	0.050423 ±0.019247	$H(3) = 77.923$, $p < .001$

*Note: Demographic information along with statistics from a chi-squared test (gender ratio) and Kruskal-Wallis tests (other metrics). Abbreviations: N = sample size; f = female; m = male; O = Openness; C = Conscientiousness; E = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; N = Neuroticism; GDS = Geriatric Depression Scale; GAI-SF = Geriatric Anxiety Index, Short Form; pg = picogram; ml = milliliter. *see Figure S1 in the Supplementary Information*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

2.2 MRI data acquisition

Structural and functional MRI data were acquired on 3T Siemens scanners following the DELCODE study protocol (Jessen et al. 2018; Düzel et al. 2019). A T1-weighted MPRAGE image (TR = 2.5 s, TE = 4.37 ms, flip-α = 7°; 192 slices, 256 x 256 in-plane resolution, voxel size = 1 x 1 x 1 mm) was acquired for co-registration and improved spatial normalization.

The MPRAGE was followed by a 7:54 min resting-state fMRI (rs-fMRI) acquisition, during which T2*-weighted echo-planar images (EPI; TR = 2.58 s, TE = 30 ms, flip-α = 80°; 47 axial slices, 64 x 64 in-plane resolution, voxel size = 3.5 x 3.5 x 3.5 mm) were acquired in odd-even interleaved-ascending slice order. Participants were instructed to lie inside the scanner with eyes closed, but without falling asleep. Directly after, phase and magnitude fieldmap images were acquired to improve correction for artifacts resulting from magnetic field inhomogeneities via unwarping. This was followed by brief co-planar T1-weighted inversion recovery EPIs.

The complete study protocol included other scanning sequences not used in the analyses reported here (Jessen et al. 2018).

2.3 fMRI data preprocessing and analysis

Data preprocessing and computation of mPerAF maps were performed using Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM12; Wellcome Trust Center for Neuroimaging, University College London, London, UK) and the RESTplus toolbox (Jia et al. 2019), following a recently described protocol (Kizilirmak et al. 2022). EPIs were corrected for acquisition time delay (*slice timing*), head motion (*realignment*), and magnetic field inhomogeneities (*unwarping*), using voxel-displacement maps (VDMs) derived from the fieldmaps. The MPRAGE image was spatially co-registered to the mean unwarped image and *segmented* into six tissue types, using the unified segmentation and normalization algorithm implemented in SPM12. The resulting forward deformation parameters were used to *normalize unwarped* EPIs into a standard stereotactic reference frame (Montreal Neurological Institute, MNI; voxel size = 3 x 3 x 3 mm). Normalized images were spatially *smoothed* using an isotropic Gaussian kernel of 6 mm full width at half maximum.

PerAF is a voxel-wise, scale-independent measure of low-frequency (0.01-0.08 Hz) BOLD signal fluctuations relative to the mean BOLD signal intensity for each time point, averaged across the whole time series (Jia et al. 2020). The global-mean-adjusted PerAF (mPerAF) was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

computed from rs-fMRI using an adapted version[2] of the *RESTplus* toolbox (Jia et al. 2019). A DMN mask (Shirer et al. 2012) was applied, representing a composite of functionally defined regions of interest (ROIs), and the resulting mPerAF maps served as voxel-wise mean-centered predictor variables.

2.4 Clinical and risk factor assessments

Trained study physicians administered the baseline clinical assessments in the DELCODE study. These assessments followed a fixed order and were completed within a single day. Caregivers of participants with AD were allowed to help complete the questionnaires. Clinical assessments included the Geriatric Depression Scale short form (GDS; Sheikh & Yesavage 1986), the Geriatric Anxiety Inventory short form (GAI-SF; Byrne & Pachana 2011), and the Big Five Inventory short form (BFI-10; Rammstedt & John 2007; Rammstedt et al. 2017). Scores on the five personality scales (each calculated as the mean of the two respective items) were included as five standardized predictors. The sum scores of GDS and GAI-SF were included as standardized predictors, respectively.

2.5 ApoE genotyping

The single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) rs7412 and rs429358, which define the ε2, ε3, and ε4 alleles of the ApoE gene, were determined using a TaqMan® SNP Genotyping Assay (ThermoFisher Scientific). ApoE ε4 non-carriers (ε2/ε2, ε2/ε3, ε3/ε3) were coded as 0, heterozygotes (ε2/ε4, ε3/ε4) were coded as 1, and homozygotes (ε4/ε4) were coded as 2.

2.6 Cerebrospinal fluid biomarker assessment

Cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers (tTau, pTau181, and Aβ42/40 ratio; collectively referred to as CSF biomarkers) were measured using commercially available kits according to manufacturers' specifications: V-PLEX Aβ Peptide Panel 1 (6E10) Kit (K15200E) and V-PLEX Human Total Tau Kit (K151LAE) (Mesoscale Diagnostics LLC, Rockville, USA), and Innotest Phospho-Tau(181P) (81581; Fujirebio Germany GmbH, Hannover, Germany).

2.7 Assessment of confounding features

Chronological age was included as a standardized predictor (mean = 0, SD = 1). The acquisition site predictor used in the DELCODE study included ten distinct sites across Germany, which

[2] Since the *RESTplus* toolbox only provides four default masks, a group-level mask fitting the dimensions and voxel sizes of our pre-processed task-based fMRI was generated and added to the mask directory. Additionally, the parallel processing mode using outdated MATLAB commands had to be turned off.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

were represented as dummy-coded predictors using ten binary variables. Gender was included as a dummy-coded predictor with two binary predictors.

2.8 Prediction of outcome from predictor variables and performance assessment

Predictor variables were combined into eight feature sets (Figure 1). In this study, we will employ the terms "predictor(s)" and "feature(s)" interchangeably, as well as "group(s)" and "class(es)", to represent the same concept.

1. **Base model**: age, gender, site
2. **mPerAF**: base model, mPerAF
3. **Personality**: base model, BFI-10
4. **Depression, anxiety**: base model, GDS, GAI-SF
5. **Personality extended**: base model, BFI-10, GDS, GAI-SF
6. **ApoE**: base model, ApoE genotype
7. **CSF**: base model, tTau, pTau181, Aβ42/40 ratio
8. **All w/o CSF**: base model, mPerAF, BFI-10, GDS, GAI-SF, ApoE genotype

To predict the outcome variable (participant group) with the feature sets, we employed Support Vector Classification (SVC) using linear Support Vector Machines (SVMs) with soft-margin parameter $C = 1$ and 10-fold cross-validation. All SVM analyses were implemented using LibSVM in MATLAB via custom scripts available on GitHub (https://github.com/JoramSoch/ML4ML).

Predictive performance of participant classification was assessed using decoding accuracy (DA), that is, the average proportion of correctly classified participants across all groups, and class accuracy (CA), that is, the same proportion, separately for each group, each ranging between 0 and 1.

For each feature set, statistically significant differences from chance-level prediction for DA and CAs were tested, and pairwise comparisons of each feature set against the base model were performed. This was done using one-tailed paired *t*-tests for the classification performance of each feature set against the base model, with each pair consisting of a subsample evaluated using both feature sets. Bonferroni-Holm correction was applied for multiple testing. Additionally, a subsample-by-subsample correlation matrix of DAs across all permutations was computed and incorporated into a general linear model of the pairwise accuracy differences across all subsamples. All scripts used to perform the analyses are available at https://github.com/jmkizilirmak/DELCODE162.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

2.9 Handling of missing values and unbalanced class sizes

Participants with missing data for age, gender, site, mPerAF, BFI-10, GDS, GAI-SF, and ApoE genotype were excluded from analysis (N = 663; 179 HC, 308 SCD, 113 aMCI, 63 AD). Due to additional missing CSF biomarker values, additional exclusions were made for the "CSF" feature set (N = 341; 75 HC, 155 SCD, 71 aMCI, 40 AD) and the “CSF” feature set was excluded from inferential comparisons to maintain statistical power. Supplementary information provides an alternative analysis with equal sample sizes (N = 311; Table S4) across all feature sets, as well as an analysis with SCD and aMCI groups merged into an "at-risk for AD" group (Table S2).

Subsampling was used to ensure equal numbers of participants in each group when performing SVC (Puechmaille 2016). The size of each subsample was based on the smallest group (rounded off to the nearest 10). A total of 30 subsamples were created, and each subsample was subjected to 1000 permutations of group membership to establish a null distribution. Permutations were performed to calculate the p-value of the prediction accuracy.

3 Results

Classification results are reported in Table 2 and inferential statistical comparisons are reported in Table 3. DAs are visualized in Figure 2 and CAs in Figure 3. The four best performing feature sets sorted by decoding accuracy are depicted as a confusion matrix in Figure 4.

3.1 Base model: Low predictive value of combining age, gender, and site

The “base model” produced the lowest overall DA (DA = .345, p = .047) and no CA was significantly different from chance for any group (Figure 3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Decoding accuracies of the evaluated feature sets. The 90% confidence intervals were obtained by averaging the confidence intervals of the 30 subsamples (single dots) on which SVCs were performed.

3.2 mPerAF: Low but above-chance performance of resting-state DMN activity

Feature set "mPerAF" performed significantly above chance (DA = .352, p = .010), along with significant CAs for both HC (CA = .417, p = .026) and AD (CA = .446, p = .016). CAs for SCD (CA = .287, *p* = .299) and aMCI (CA = .258, *p* = .419) were statistically indifferent from chance.

3.3 Personality trait and affective state scores: Highest prediction accuracies for HC and across groups

Feature set "Personality" was consistently outperformed by "Personality extended", which produced the overall highest DA (DA = .414, *p* = .001). Combining scores of geriatric depression and anxiety demonstrated the overall highest class accuracy for healthy controls (CA = .628, *p* = .003) and the overall third-highest DA (.392, *p* = .003).

3.4 ApoE: Third-highest decoding accuracy

Feature set "ApoE" showed the third-best performance (DA = .402, *p* = .002). It also demonstrated significantly above chance CAs for HC (CA = .522, *p* = .021) and AD (CA = .522, *p* = .023).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Class accuracies of the evaluated feature sets. The dotted line represents the chance level. Error bars represent the average 90% confidence interval across all 30 subsamples.

3.5 Relatively poor performance of combined predictors without CSF biomarkers

Across all groups and in terms of DA, prediction accuracies of feature set "All w/o CSF" were consistently lower than those of "Personality" and "Personality extended" and it was not in the top three CAs for any participant group.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Table 2. SVM classification results

Feature set	value	DA	HC	SCD	aMCI	AD
1. Base model	mean accuracy	.345	.484	.248	.320	.326
	90% CI	[.294, .398]	[.374, .596]	[.163, .353]	[.223, .431]	[.227, .438]
	mean *p*	.047	.051	.487	.300	.316
2. mPerAF	mean accuracy	.352	.417	.287	.258	.446
	90% CI	[.301, .406]	[.310, .531]	[.193, .397]	[.168, .366]	[.336, .559]
	mean *p*	.010	.026	.299	.419	.016
3. Personality	mean accuracy	.382	.466	.302	.296	.465
	90% CI	[.330, .436]	[.355, .579]	[.207, .412]	[.201, .406]	[.355, .578]
	mean *p*	.006	.024	.309	.300	.041
4. Depression, anxiety	mean accuracy	.392	.628	.261	.306	.374
	90% CI	[.340, .447]	[.515, .732]	[.173, .368]	[.210, .416]	[.271, .488]
	mean *p*	.003	.003	.448	.311	.186
5. Personality extended	mean accuracy	.414	.564	.311	.296	.485
	90% CI	[.361, .469]	[.451, .673]	[.214, .421]	[.201, .407]	[.374, .598]
	mean *p*	.001	.002	.258	.292	.014
6. ApoE	mean accuracy	.402	.522	.299	.264	.522
	90% CI	[.349, .457]	[.409, .633]	[.206, .409]	[.175, .372]	[.410, .633]
	mean *p*	.002	.021	.342	.445	.023
7. CSF	mean accuracy	.405	.431	.348	.194	.647
	90% CI	[.330, .484]	[.282, .591]	[.210, .510]	[.091, .347]	[.483, .787]
	mean *p*	.017	.156	.301	.675	.009
8. All w/o CSF	mean accuracy	.362	.433	.293	.261	.460
	90% CI	[.310, .416]	[.325, .547]	[.199, .404]	[.170, .369]	[.350, .573]
	mean *p*	.006	.016	.265	.416	.012

Note. Because four groups were included, chance performance was at .25. Mean accuracy, 90% CI and mean *p* correspond to the average across 30 subsamples. The *p*-value of each subsample was obtained by comparing the accuracy value to the null distribution generated from 1000 permutations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

3.6 CSF biomarkers predict AD best, but perform poorly for HC

Feature set "CSF" exhibited the highest CAs for the groups of SCD (CA = .348, p = .301) and AD (CA = .647, p = .009), as well as the second-highest DA (.405, p = .017). CAs for HC (CA= .431, p = .156) and aMCI (CA = .194, p = .675) were non-significant above chance.

3.7 Comparison of feature sets and summary

The highest performance in terms of DA (Figure 4) were achieved by the feature sets "Personality extended" (DA = .414, p = .001) followed by "CSF" (DA = .405, p = .017), "ApoE" (DA = .402, p = .002), and "Depression, anxiety" (DA = .392, p = .003). All feature sets—except "mPerAF"—performed significantly better than the base model in predicting group membership (Table 3).



Figure 4. Confusion matrices of best performing feature sets by decoding accuracy.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Inferential statistical comparisons of decoding accuracy between feature sets

Base model vs.	*t*	*p*	CI	adjusted *p*
mPerAF	1.02	.157	[-0.01, 0.02]	.157
Depression, anxiety	6.30	< .001	[0.03, 0.06]	< .001
Personality	5.49	< .001	[0.02, 0.05]	< .001
Personality extended	8.44	< .001	[0.05, 0.08]	< .001
ApoE	9.48	< .001	[0.04, 0.07]	< .001
All w/o CSF	2.41	.011	[0.00, 0.03]	.022

Note. One-tailed *t*-test results are reported for the difference between the classification performance of each model and the performance of the base model. The "CI" column reports the confidence interval for the mean difference in decoding accuracy. The "p adjusted" column reports p values corrected for multiple comparisons according to the Bonferroni-Holm procedure (Holm 1979).

4 Discussion

In this cross-sectional study, we aimed to evaluate the diagnostic value of several feature sets for Alzheimer's disease, associated at-risk states (SCD, aMCI), and healthy controls using support vector machine classification. We focused on the performance of combining personality traits with scores of depression and anxiety, as well as examining the predictive ability of DMN BOLD amplitude fluctuation measured through resting-state fMRI, ApoE genotype, and CSF biomarkers. All feature sets demonstrated decoding accuracy significantly above chance (Table 2).

The highest decoding accuracy was observed in feature sets: (i) "Personality extended," which combined personality traits with anxiety and depression scores; (ii) "CSF", consisting of tTau, pTau181, and Aβ42/40 ratio; (iii) "ApoE," including the ApoE genotype; and (iv) "Depression, anxiety," comprising depression and anxiety scores. The only feature sets not achieving significant above-chance classification performance for HC were "Base model" and "CSF", with the latter showing the lowest overall accuracy for the aMCI group.

4.1 Inferiority of the combined predictor and poor prediction accuracy of resting-state activity of the DMN

Our hypothesis that combining non-invasive predictors (feature set "All w/o CSF") would outperform CSF biomarkers in prediction accuracy was not supported by our data. The classification accuracies of the "All w/o CSF" feature set were comparably low and similar to the "mPerAF" feature set, suggesting that the inclusion of mPerAF paradoxically reduced

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

classification performance. While DMN resting-state mPerAF performed above chance, its performance did not significantly differ from the "Base model".

The predictive ability of resting-state fMRI of the DMN for AD has yielded inconsistent findings. While certain studies have reported consistent alterations in DMN activity and connectivity in AD (Mevel et al. 2011) and the added value of combining different MRI modalities to classify AD (Schouten et al. 2016), other research suggests that neuropsychiatric measures may have higher predictive ability (Gill et al. 2020).

It is important to note that most DMN studies have focused on functional connectivity rather than voxel-wise amplitude measures like mPerAF. The divergent results could be attributed to our approach of evaluating all groups simultaneously, resembling a fully automated diagnostic process, as opposed to making binary decisions between distinct groups. Furthermore, unequal sample sizes can introduce bias in classification, and various approaches have been proposed to address this issue (Jo et al. 2019).

4.2 A combination of personality, anxiety, and depression scores yield a relatively high overall prediction accuracy

Personality alone demonstrated class accuracies statistically significant above chance for the groups of HC and AD, but not for SCD and aMCI, partially confirming our hypothesis. "Personality" was surpassed by the feature set "Personality extended". However, the accuracy of correctly classifying the aMCI group was equally high, while class accuracies for the SCD and aMCI groups remained nonsignificant, partially supporting our hypothesis. These results indicate that depression and anxiety contribute additional predictive value to the decoding accuracy of the BFI-10. The highest class accuracy for HC, however, was achieved by a feature set containing scores of depression and anxiety, and adding personality traits did not improve class accuracy. Previous studies have indicated that depressive episodes can be prodromal manifestations of neurodegeneration in AD (Panza et al. 2010; Singh-Manoux et al. 2017; Hansen et al. 2021). Possibly, alterations in levels of depression within the SCD and aMCI groups surpass changes in personality traits when contrasted with shifts seen in healthy controls. The predictive ability of the feature set "Depression, anxiety" for HC may be primarily attributed to the GDS as some of the GAI-SF items overlap with those of the BFI-10 neuroticism scale, suggesting depression scores to be well-suited in distinguishing between healthy individuals and participants with cognitive impairment. AD participants were best classified using a combination of CSF biomarkers, consistent with previous findings (Olsson et al. 2016;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Lleó et al. 2019; Düzel et al. 2022). The predictive value of combining CSF biomarkers, personality traits and scores of depression and anxiety should be investigated further.

4.3 Poor classification accuracy for SCD and aMCI with any feature set

Predictions for participant groups with SCD or aMCI were mostly above chance level but not statistically significant (Table 2). This trend persisted after merging SCD and aMCI into an "at-risk for AD" group (Table S2). Neither SCD nor aMCI are specific to AD and can be caused by a variety of conditions, including normal aging. Because the underlying conditions causing SCD or aMCI in DELCODE participants were not assessed at the study's outset, it is reasonable to assume that a proportion of participants did not actually have preclinical AD (see section 2.1). Identification of those individuals with SCD or aMCI not due to AD likely largely failed as we used predictors that are specific to AD, explaining the poor class accuracies for the groups of SCD, aMCI, and "at-risk for AD" (Chételat et al. 2005; Johns et al. 2012; Bessi et al. 2018).

4.4 Limitations

Our study has several limitations. CSF biomarkers were only measured in a portion of the sample, resulting in different sample sizes for feature sets and exclusion of the "CSF" feature set from inferential analysis. Anosognosia is known to be a common occurrence in the early stages of AD (Leicht et al. 2010; Orfei et al. 2010; de Ruijter et al. 2020) and may also have confounded the assessments of the GDS, the GAI-SF (Starkstein 2014), and the BFI-10 (Agüera-Ortiz et al. 2019). Additionally, caregiver influence on self-reports may have affected the accuracy of assessments in the aMCI and AD groups. Another important limitation relates to the demographics of the groups. Despite being composed of confounding variables only, the "Base model" performed above chance. This can be attributed to the association between age and dementia risk (Terracciano & Sutin 2019). On average, AD participants were older than HC or those with SCD (Table 1). However, because age was included in all feature sets, its predictive value was consistently accounted for. Finally, the cross-sectional design is a limitation, as it precludes to track personality change across time and assess the validity of the markers over the natural progression of the participants. This underscores the need for future research to complement our findings with longitudinal data.

4.5 Conclusions

Our results show that no single combination of the evaluated features achieved consistently superior class accuracies for all assessed participant groups. The combination of depression and anxiety scores was most effective in classifying healthy controls, supporting previous findings that regard late-life depression as a prodrome of Alzheimer's disease, while CSF biomarkers

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

were most effective in classifying participants with mild Alzheimer's disease. The highest overall prediction accuracies across all participant groups were achieved by a combination of personality traits with scores of depression and anxiety, closely followed by CSF biomarkers and the ApoE genotype. These findings indicate that a combination of CSF biomarkers, personality, depression and anxiety scores, and the ApoE genotype may have complementary value for classification of AD and associated at-risk states. Further investigation is needed, particularly regarding the predictive value of personality traits and associated affective states as low-cost and easily assessable screening tools. Moreover, our findings highlight the challenge of accurately classifying SCD and aMCI groups using machine learning approaches when the underlying conditions of these cognitive impairments are unknown. Addressing this challenge requires adhering to consensus on terminology and conceptual frameworks.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

5 List of Abbreviations

Aβ: Amyloid beta; AD: Alzheimer's disease; aMCI: amnestic mild cognitive impairment; ANOVA: analysis of variance; BFI: Big Five Inventory; BFI-10: Big Five Inventory 10-item short form; BOLD: blood oxygenation level-dependent; CERAD: Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease; CA: class accuracy; CI: confidence interval; CSF: cerebrospinal fluid; DA: decoding accuracy; DMN: default mode network; DELCODE: DZNE-Longitudinal Cognitive Impairment and Dementia Study; DZNE: Deutsches Zentrum für Neurodegenerative Erkrankungen (English: German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases); EPI: echo-planar imaging; fMRI: functional magnetic resonance imaging; FWHM: full width at half maximum; GAI-SF: Geriatric Anxiety Inventory, Short Form; GDS: Geriatric Depression Scale; HC: healthy controls; Hz: Hertz; MCI: mild cognitive impairment; NIA: National Institute on Aging; MMSE: Mini Mental Status Examination; MNI: Montreal Neurological Institute; mPerAF: mean percent amplitude of fluctuation; MPRAGE: Magnetization Prepared Rapid Gradient Echo; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; NEO PI-R: Revised NEO Personality Inventory; PerAF: percent amplitude of fluctuation; pTau181: phosphorylated tau181; ROI: region of interest; rs-fMRI: resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging; SCD: subjective cognitive decline; SD: standard deviation; SPM: Statistical Parametric Mapping; SVC: support vector classification; SVM: support vector machine; TE: echo time; TR: time to repetition; tTau: total tau; VDM: voxel-displacement map; yrs: years

6 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the participants in the DELCODE study and all the technical, medical, and psychological staff without whom this study would not have been possible. Special thanks go to the MRI centers at the Max-Delbrück-Center for Molecular Medicine (MDC) of the Helmholtz Association, the Center for Cognitive Neuroscience Berlin (CCNB) at the Free University of Berlin, and the Bernstein Center for Computational Neuroscience (BCCN), Berlin.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

7 References

Agüera-Ortiz L, Lyketsos C, Ismail Z (2019): Comment on "Personality Changes During the Transition from Cognitive Health to Mild Cognitive Impairment". Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 67, 190–191

Albert MS, DeKosky ST, Dickson D, Dubois B, Feldman HH, Fox NC, Gamst A, Holtzman DM, Jagust WJ, Petersen RC, et al. (2011): The diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment due to Alzheimer's disease: recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimers Dement 7, 270–279

Andrews-Hanna JR, Smallwood J, Spreng RN (2014): The default network and self-generated thought: component processes, dynamic control, and clinical relevance. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1316, 29–52

Badhwar A, Tam A, Dansereau C, Orban P, Hoffstaedter F, Bellec P (2017): Resting-state network dysfunction in Alzheimer's disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring 8, 73–85

Bessi V, Mazzeo S, Padiglioni S, Piccini C, Nacmias B, Sorbi S, Bracco L (2018): From Subjective Cognitive Decline to Alzheimer's Disease: The Predictive Role of Neuropsychological Assessment, Personality Traits, and Cognitive Reserve. A 7-Year Follow-Up Study. JAD 63, 1523–1535

Binnewijzend MAA, Schoonheim MM, Sanz-Arigita E, Wink AM, van der Flier WM, Tolboom N, Adriaanse SM, Damoiseaux JS, Scheltens P, van Berckel BNM, Barkhof F (2012): Resting-state fMRI changes in Alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment. Neurobiology of Aging 33, 2018–2028

Blennow K, Hampel H, Weiner M, Zetterberg H (2010): Cerebrospinal fluid and plasma biomarkers in Alzheimer disease. Nat Rev Neurol 6, 131–144

Buchhave P, Minthon L, Zetterberg H (2012): Cerebrospinal Fluid Levels of □-Amyloid 1-42, but Not of Tau, Are Fully Changed Already 5 to 10 Years Before the Onset of Alzheimer Dementia. ARCH GEN PSYCHIATRY 69, 9

Byrne GJ, Pachana NA (2011): Development and validation of a short form of the Geriatric Anxiety Inventory – the GAI-SF. Int Psychogeriatr 23, 125–131

Caselli RJ, Langlais BT, Dueck AC, Henslin BR, Johnson TA, Woodruff BK, Hoffman-Snyder C, Locke DEC (2018): Personality Changes During the Transition from Cognitive Health to Mild Cognitive Impairment. J Am Geriatr Soc 66, 671–678

Cha J, Jo HJ, Kim HJ, Seo SW, Kim H-S, Yoon U, Park H, Na DL, Lee J-M (2013): Functional alteration patterns of default mode networks: comparisons of normal aging, amnestic mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. Eur J Neurosci 37, 1916–1924

Chételat G, Landeau B, Eustache F, Mézenge F, Viader F, de la Sayette V, Desgranges B, Baron J-C (2005): Using voxel-based morphometry to map the structural changes associated with rapid conversion in MCI: A longitudinal MRI study. NeuroImage 27, 934–946

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Cooper C, Sommerlad A, Lyketsos CG, Livingston G (2015): Modifiable Predictors of Dementia in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. AJP 172, 323–334

Costa Jr. PT, McCrae RR: The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). In: The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment, Vol 2: Personality measurement and testing. Sage Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA, US 2008, 179–198

de Ruijter NS, Schoonbrood AMG, van Twillert B, Hoff EI (2020): Anosognosia in dementia: A review of current assessment instruments. Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring 12, e12079

Dubois B, Feldman HH, Jacova C, Hampel H, Molinuevo JL, Blennow K, DeKosky ST, Gauthier S, Selkoe D, Bateman R, et al. (2014): Advancing research diagnostic criteria for Alzheimer's disease: the IWG-2 criteria. The Lancet Neurology 13, 614–629

Duchek JM, Balota DA, Storandt M, Larsen R (2007): The Power of Personality in Discriminating Between Healthy Aging and Early-Stage Alzheimer's Disease. The Journals of Gerontology: Series B 62, P353–P361

Düzel E, Acosta-Cabronero J, Berron D, Biessels GJ, Björkman-Burtscher I, Bottlaender M, Bowtell R, Buchem M v, Cardenas-Blanco A, Boumezbeur F, et al. (2019): European Ultrahigh-Field Imaging Network for Neurodegenerative Diseases (EUFIND). Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring 11, 538–549

Düzel E, Ziegler G, Berron D, Maass A, Schütze H, Cardenas-Blanco A, Glanz W, Metzger C, Dobisch L, Reuter M, et al. (2022): Amyloid pathology but not APOE ε4 status is permissive for tau-related hippocampal dysfunction. Brain 145, 1473–1485

Gill S, Mouches P, Hu S, Rajashekar D, MacMaster FP, Smith EE, Forkert ND, Ismail Z, Initiative for the ADN (2020): Using Machine Learning to Predict Dementia from Neuropsychiatric Symptom and Neuroimaging Data. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease 75, 277–288

Hakulinen C, Elovainio M, Pulkki-Råback L, Virtanen M, Kivimäki M, Jokela M (2015): Personality and Depressive Symptoms: Individual Participant Meta-Analysis of 10 Cohort Studies. Depression and Anxiety 32, 461–470

Hansen N, Singh A, Bartels C, Brosseron F, Buerger K, Cetindag AC, Dobisch L, Dechent P, Ertl-Wagner BB, Fliessbach K, et al. (2021): Hippocampal and Hippocampal-Subfield Volumes From Early-Onset Major Depression and Bipolar Disorder to Cognitive Decline. Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience 13

Hansson O, Seibyl J, Stomrud E, Zetterberg H, Trojanowski JQ, Bittner T, Lifke V, Corradini V, Eichenlaub U, Batrla R, et al. (2018): CSF biomarkers of Alzheimer's disease concord with amyloid-β PET and predict clinical progression: A study of fully automated immunoassays in BioFINDER and ADNI cohorts. Alzheimer's & Dementia 14, 1470–1481

Hill NL, Mogle J, Wion R, Munoz E, DePasquale N, Yevchak AM, Parisi JM (2016): Subjective Cognitive Impairment and Affective Symptoms: A Systematic Review. The Gerontologist 56, e109–e127

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Holm S (1979): A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure. Scandinavian Journal of Statistics 6, 65–70

Invernizzi S, Simoes Loureiro I, Kandana Arachchige KG, Lefebvre L (2021): Late-Life Depression, Cognitive Impairment, and Relationship with Alzheimer's Disease. Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders 50, 414–424

Ismail Z, Elbayoumi H, Fischer CE, Hogan DB, Millikin CP, Schweizer T, Mortby ME, Smith EE, Patten SB, Fiest KM (2017): Prevalence of Depression in Patients With Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Psychiatry 74, 58–67

Jansen WJ, Ossenkoppele R, Knol DL, Tijms BM, Scheltens P, Verhey FRJ, Visser PJ, Aalten P, Aarsland D, Alcolea D, et al. (2015): Prevalence of Cerebral Amyloid Pathology in Persons Without Dementia: A Meta-analysis. JAMA 313, 1924

Jessen F, Amariglio RE, Boxtel M, Breteler M, Ceccaldi M, Chételat G, Dubois B, Dufouil C, Ellis KA, Flier WM, et al. (2014): A conceptual framework for research on subjective cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's & Dementia 10, 844–852

Jessen F, Spottke A, Boecker H, Brosseron F, Buerger K, Catak C, Fliessbach K, Franke C, Fuentes M, Heneka MT, et al. (2018): Design and first baseline data of the DZNE multicenter observational study on predementia Alzheimer's disease (DELCODE). Alzheimer's Research & Therapy 10, 15

Jia X-Z, Wang J, Sun HY, Zhang H, Liao W, Wang Z, Yan CG, Song XW, Zang YF (2019): RESTplus: an improved toolkit for resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging data processing. Science Bulletin 64, 953–954

Jia X-Z, Sun J-W, Ji G-J, Liao W, Lv Y-T, Wang J, Wang Z, Zhang H, Liu D-Q, Zang Y-F (2020): Percent amplitude of fluctuation: A simple measure for resting-state fMRI signal at single voxel level. PLOS ONE 15, e0227021

Jo T, Nho K, Saykin AJ (2019): Deep Learning in Alzheimer's Disease: Diagnostic Classification and Prognostic Prediction Using Neuroimaging Data. Front Aging Neurosci 11, 220

Johns EK, Phillips NA, Belleville S, Goupil D, Babins L, Kelner N, Ska B, Gilbert B, Massoud F, Boysson C de, et al. (2012): The Profile of Executive Functioning in Amnestic Mild Cognitive Impairment: Disproportionate Deficits in Inhibitory Control. Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society 18, 541–555

Kizilirmak JM, Soch J, Schütze H, Düzel E, Feldhoff H, Fischer L, Knopf L, Maass A, Raschick M, Schult A, et al. (2022): The relationship between resting-state amplitude fluctuations and memory-related deactivations of the Default Mode Network in young and older adults.

Klein DN, Kotov R, Bufferd SJ (2011): Personality and Depression: Explanatory Models and Review of the Evidence. Annu Rev Clin Psychol 7, 269–295

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Kotov R, Gamez W, Schmidt F, Watson D (2010): Linking "big" personality traits to anxiety, depressive, and substance use disorders: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin 136, 768–821

Lau WKW, Leung M-K, Lee TMC, Law ACK (2016): Resting-state abnormalities in amnestic mild cognitive impairment: a meta-analysis. Transl Psychiatry 6, e790–e790

Leicht H, Berwig M, Gertz H-J (2010): Anosognosia in Alzheimer's disease: The role of impairment levels in assessment of insight across domains. Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society 16, 463–473

Leung DKY, Chan WC, Spector A, Wong GHY (2021): Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and apathy symptoms across dementia stages: A systematic review and meta-analysis. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry 36, 1330–1344

Leuzy A, Ashton NJ, Mattsson-Carlgren N, Dodich A, Boccardi M, Corre J, Drzezga A, Nordberg A, Ossenkoppele R, Zetterberg H, et al. (2021): 2020 update on the clinical validity of cerebrospinal fluid amyloid, tau, and phospho-tau as biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease in the context of a structured 5-phase development framework. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 48, 2121–2139

Li et al. X-X (2018): The impact of anxiety on the progression of mild cognitive impairment to dementia in Chinese and English data bases: a systematic review and meta-analysis. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry 33, 131–140

Li J-Q, Tan Lan, Wang H-F, Tan M-S, Tan Lin, Xu W, Zhao Q-F, Wang J, Jiang T, Yu J-T (2016): Risk factors for predicting progression from mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 87, 476–484

Lleó A, Parnetti L, Belbin O, Wiltfang J (2019): Has the time arrived for cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers in psychiatric disorders? Clinica Chimica Acta 491, 81–84

Ly M, Karim HT, Becker JT, Lopez OL, Anderson SJ, Aizenstein HJ, Reynolds CF, Zmuda MD, Butters MA (2021): Late-life depression and increased risk of dementia: a longitudinal cohort study. Transl Psychiatry 11, 147

McCrae RR, Costa PT (1987): Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 52, 81–90

McKhann GM, Knopman DS, Chertkow H, Hyman BT, Jack CR, Kawas CH, Klunk WE, Koroshetz WJ, Manly JJ, Mayeux R, et al. (2011): The diagnosis of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's & Dementia 7, 263–269

Mendez Rubio M, Antonietti JP, Donati A, Rossier J, von Gunten A (2013): Personality Traits and Behavioural and Psychological Symptoms in Patients with Mild Cognitive Impairment. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 35, 87–97

Mevel K, Chételat G, Eustache F, Desgranges B (2011): The Default Mode Network in Healthy Aging and Alzheimer's Disease. International Journal of Alzheimer's Disease 2011, 1–9

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Mirza SS, Ikram MA, Bos D, Mihaescu R, Hofman A, Tiemeier H (2017): Mild cognitive impairment and risk of depression and anxiety: A population-based study. Alzheimer's & Dementia 13, 130–139

Mohan Akansha, Roberto AJ, Mohan Abhishek, Lorenzo A, Jones K, Carney MJ, Liogier-Weyback L, Hwang S, Lapidus KAB (2016): The Significance of the Default Mode Network (DMN) in Neurological and Neuropsychiatric Disorders: A Review. Yale J Biol Med 89, 49–57

Olsson B, Lautner R, Andreasson U, Öhrfelt A, Portelius E, Bjerke M, Hölttä M, Rosén C, Olsson C, Strobel G, et al. (2016): CSF and blood biomarkers for the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet Neurology 15, 673–684

Orfei MD, Blundo C, Celia E, Casini AR, Caltagirone C, Spalletta G, Varsi AE (2010): Anosognosia in Mild Cognitive Impairment and Mild Alzheimer's Disease: Frequency and Neuropsychological Correlates. The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry 18, 1133–1140

Palmer K, Berger AK, Monastero R, Winblad B, Bäckman L, Fratiglioni L (2007): Predictors of progression from mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer disease. Neurology 68, 1596

Panza F, Frisardi V, Capurso C, D'Introno A, Colacicco AM, Imbimbo BP, Santamato A, Vendemiale G, Seripa D, Pilotto A, et al. (2010): Late-Life Depression, Mild Cognitive Impairment, and Dementia: Possible Continuum? The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry 18, 98–116

Peakman G, Karunatilake N, Seynaeve M, Perera G, Aarsland D, Stewart R, Mueller C (2020): Clinical factors associated with progression to dementia in people with late-life depression: a cohort study of patients in secondary care. BMJ Open 10, e035147

Puechmaille SJ (2016): The program structure does not reliably recover the correct population structure when sampling is uneven: subsampling and new estimators alleviate the problem. Molecular Ecology Resources 16, 608–627

Raichle ME, MacLeod AM, Snyder AZ, Powers WJ, Gusnard DA, Shulman GL (2001): A default mode of brain function. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 98, 676–682

Rammstedt B, John OP (2007): Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. Journal of Research in Personality 41, 203–212

Rammstedt B, Kemper CJ, Klein MC, Beierlein C, Kovaleva A (2017): A Short Scale for Assessing the Big Five Dimensions of Personality: 10 Item Big Five Inventory (BFI-10). methods data, 17 Pages

Ramzan F, Khan MUG, Rehmat A, Iqbal S, Saba T, Rehman A, Mehmood Z (2019): A Deep Learning Approach for Automated Diagnosis and Multi-Class Classification of Alzheimer's Disease Stages Using Resting-State fMRI and Residual Neural Networks. Journal of Medical Systems 44, 37

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .

Robins Wahlin T-B, Byrne GJ (2011): Personality changes in Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry 26, 1019–1029

Schouten TM, Koini M, de Vos F, Seiler S, van der Grond J, Lechner A, Hafkemeijer A, Möller C, Schmidt R, de Rooij M, Rombouts SARB (2016): Combining anatomical, diffusion, and resting state functional magnetic resonance imaging for individual classification of mild and moderate Alzheimer's disease. NeuroImage: Clinical 11, 46–51

Sheikh JI, Yesavage JA (1986): Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): recent evidence and development of a shorter version. Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health

Shirer WR, Ryali S, Rykhlevskaia E, Menon V, Greicius MD (2012): Decoding Subject-Driven Cognitive States with Whole-Brain Connectivity Patterns. Cerebral Cortex 22, 158–165

Singh-Manoux A, Dugravot A, Fournier A, Abell J, Ebmeier K, Kivimäki M, Sabia S (2017): Trajectories of Depressive Symptoms Before Diagnosis of Dementia: A 28-Year Follow-up Study. JAMA Psychiatry 74, 712–718

Soto CJ, et al. (2009): Ten facet scales for the Big Five Inventory: Convergence with NEO PI-R facets, self-peer agreement, and discriminant validity. Journal of Research in Personality 43, 84–90

Sperling RA, Aisen PS, Beckett LA, Bennett DA, Craft S, Fagan AM, Iwatsubo T, Jack CR, Kaye J, Montine TJ, et al. (2011): Toward defining the preclinical stages of Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's & Dementia 7, 280–292

Starkstein SE (2014): Anosognosia in Alzheimer's disease: Diagnosis, frequency, mechanism and clinical correlates. Cortex 61, 64–73

Terracciano A, Sutin AR (2019): Personality and Alzheimer's disease: An integrative review. Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment 10, 4–12

Terracciano A, Stephan Y, Luchetti M, Albanese E, Sutin AR (2017): Personality traits and risk of cognitive impairment and dementia. J Psychiatr Res 89, 22–27

Yoneda T, Rush J, Berg AI, Johansson B, Piccinin AM (2016): Trajectories of Personality Traits Preceding Dementia Diagnosis. GERONB gbw006


Confounding variables
(age, gender, site ID)
Psychometric scores
(Big Five, depression, anxiety)
Resting-state fMRI
(mPerAF)
ApoE genotype
CSF markers
(tTau, pTau181, Aβ42/40)
Assembly of feature sets
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
SVM classification
Participant group
1) Healthy Controls
2) SCD
3) aMCI
4) AD


decoding accuracy
90% confidence intervals
chance level
predictive accuracy
0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
0.5
0.6
base model
mPerAF
personality
depr. & anx.
personality ext.
ApoE
CSF
all w/o CSF
feature set

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.30.22282930; this version posted August 31, 2023. 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 4.0 International license .




Personality extended [BFI-10, GDS, GAI-SF]
DA = .414, p = .001
predicted class
true class
HC
SCD
aMCI
AD
0.564 0.242 0.154 0.167
0.166 0.311 0.227 0.139
0.112 0.211 0.296 0.208
0.158 0.237 0.323 0.485
0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6
CSF markers [tTau, pTau181, and Abeta42/40]
DA = .405, p = .017
predicted class
true class
HC
SCD
aMCI
AD
0.431 0.363 0.220 0.082
0.349 0.348 0.226 0.046
0.147 0.199 0.194 0.226
0.073 0.090 0.360 0.647
0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6
ApoE [E4 presence]
DA = .402, p = .002
predicted class
true class
HC
SCD
aMCI
AD
0.522 0.311 0.178 0.153
0.226 0.299 0.226 0.113
0.119 0.211 0.264 0.212
0.133 0.179 0.333 0.522
0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6
Depression, anxiety [GDS, GAI-SF]
DA = .392, p = .003
predicted class
true class
HC
SCD
aMCI
AD
0.628 0.243 0.166 0.181
0.136 0.261 0.228 0.181
0.117 0.252 0.306 0.264
0.118 0.244 0.301 0.374
0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6