Behavioural changes in frontotemporal dementia and their cognitive and neuroanatomical correlates

Matthew A. Rouse,[1] Masud Husain,[2] Peter Garrard,[3] Karalyn Patterson,[1,4] James B. Rowe,[1,4,5] Matthew A. Lambon Ralph[1]

Author affiliations:
1 MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 7EF, UK
2 Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX3 9DU, UK
3 Molecular and Clinical Sciences Research Institute, St George's, University of London, London, SW17 0RE, UK
4 Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 0SZ, UK
5 Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, CB2 0SZ, UK

Correspondence to: Dr Matthew A. Rouse
MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit
University of Cambridge
CB2 7EF
Cambridge, UK
E-mail: matthew.rouse@mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk

Running title: Behaviour change in frontotemporal dementia

Open Access: For the purpose of open access, the UKRI-funded authors have applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Keywords: behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia, semantic dementia, social behaviour, social-semantic knowledge, transdiagnostic

Abstract

Behavioural changes are a central feature of frontotemporal dementia (FTD); they occur in both behavioural-variant (bvFTD) and semantic dementia (SD)/semantic-variant primary progressive aphasia subtypes. In this study we addressed two current clinical knowledge gaps; (i) are there qualitative or clear distinctions between behavioural profiles in bvFTD and SD, and (ii) what are the precise roles of the prefrontal cortex vs. anterior temporal lobes in supporting social behaviour? Resolving these conundrums is crucial for improving diagnostic accuracy and for the development of targeted interventions to treat challenging behaviours in FTD. Informant questionnaires to assess behavioural changes included the Cambridge Behavioural Inventory-Revised and two targeted measures of apathy and impulsivity. Participants completed a detailed neuropsychological battery to permit investigation of the relationship between cognitive status (including social-semantic knowledge, general semantic processing and executive function) with behaviour change in FTD. To explore changes in regional grey matter volume, a subset of patients had structural MRI. Diagnosis-based group comparisons were supplemented by a transdiagnostic approach which encompassed the spectrum of bvFTD, SD and "mixed" or intermediate cases. Such an approach is sensitive to the systematic graded variation in FTD and allows the neurobiological underpinnings of behaviour change to be explored across the entire FTD spectrum. We found a wide range of behavioural changes across FTD. Although *quantitatively* more severe on average in bvFTD, as expected, the item-level analyses found no evidence for *qualitative* differences in behavioural profiles or "behavioural double dissociations" between bvFTD and SD. Comparisons of self and informant ratings revealed strong discrepancies in the perspective of the caregiver vs. patient. Logistic regression revealed that neuropsychological measures had better discriminative accuracy for bvFTD vs. SD than carer-reported behavioural measures. A principal component analysis of all informant questionnaire domains extracted three components, interpreted as reflecting: (1) apathy, (2) challenging behaviours and (3) activities of daily living. More severe apathy in both FTD subtypes was associated with (a) increased levels of impaired executive function and (b) anterior cingulate cortex atrophy. Questionnaire ratings of impaired behaviour did not correlate with either anterior temporal lobe atrophy or degraded social-semantic knowledge. Together, these findings highlight the presence of a wide range of behavioural changes in both bvFTD and SD, which vary by degree rather than quality. We recommend a transdiagnostic approach for future studies of the neuropsychological and neuroanatomical underpinnings of behavioural deficits in FTD.

Introduction

Behavioural changes are a core manifestation of frontotemporal dementia (FTD) and have a considerable impact on both patients and their caregivers.[1-3] They are classically associated with behavioural-variant FTD (bvFTD) and the prefrontal cortical atrophy in this condition[4-7] yet are also now recognised as common in semantic dementia (SD; encompassing semantic-variant primary progressive aphasia and 'right' semantic dementia or right temporal variant FTD)[8-12] where pathology is centred on the anterior temporal lobes (ATL) leading to degraded semantic memory.[13,14] This study aimed to resolve two key current gaps in clinical knowledge. First, are the behavioural changes in bvFTD and SD largely the same or are there qualitatively distinct behavioural profiles? Identifying discriminative behaviours would improve bvFTD vs. SD diagnostic accuracy, which is particularly relevant for disease-modifying clinical trial stratification, as the two disorders are typically associated with different neuropathologies.[15] Second, what are the precise contributions of the prefrontal cortex and the ATL in supporting social behaviour? Revealing the cognitive and neurobiological mechanisms underlying behaviour change in FTD is vital for informing the development of targeted pharmacological and behavioural interventions. To address these clinical conundrums, we explored the range of behavioural changes that are caused by FTD and the similarities and/or differences between FTD subtypes. Participants also completed extensive neuropsychological testing and structural MRI, to investigate the cognitive and neuroanatomical bases of changed behaviours. This calls for a transdiagnostic approach, including not only archetypal cases of bvFTD and SD but also "mixed" or intermediate cases that express prominent clinical features of both conditions, as part of a continuous clinical spectrum.[16]

People with FTD can behave in ways that reflect a loss of or disregard for social norms or etiquette.[12,17] Apathy and impulsivity are also common and co-occurring features of FTD and may exacerbate these abnormal social behaviours.[18] Behavioural disturbances are the hallmark of bvFTD and have been associated with structural, functional and neurochemical changes in the orbitofrontal cortex, inferior frontal gyrus, anterior cingulate cortex and insula.[19-23] The frontopolar cortex is another area atrophied in bvFTD, with one theory suggesting that this region supports representation of the long-term consequences of social behaviour.[24]

Behavioural changes are also common in SD, despite initial presentation with semantic and language deficits. Indeed, large cohort studies have reported similar rates of behaviour changes in SD and bvFTD.[16,18,25] Unlike bvFTD, the atrophy in SD is primarily centred on the ATLs.[14] In their severest form, the co-occurring semantic and behavioural impairments are reminiscent of the Klüver-Bucy syndrome, which is characterised by a multimodal associative agnosia and chronic behavioural change following bilateral (but not unilateral) ATL ablation in macaques[26,27] (and in rare human cases).[28] Behavioural changes and prosopagnosia are commonly reported in SD patients with asymmetric rightward biased ATL atrophy;[29-31] this clinical observation has led to proposals that the right ATL has a specialised role for social-semantic knowledge[31,32] and that these patients constitute a distinct clinical entity, the right temporal variant FTD.[29,31,33] However, formal assessments have demonstrated that social deficits are also found in SD with left dominant atrophy.[29,34,35] Recent investigations have found that degraded social-semantic knowledge is associated with *bilateral* ATL atrophy in FTD: there is no evidence for selective or greater social-semantic deficits in the presence of R > L atrophy or following selective right ATL resection for surgical treatment of epilepsy.[36,37] Consequently, it appears that the left and right ATLs are both important for social behaviour and need to be investigated in FTD alongside prefrontal cortical regions.

We have proposed a neurocognitive model of impaired social behaviour in FTD - *controlled social-semantic cognition* (CS-SC).[38] According to this CS-SC framework, impaired social behaviour in FTD results from damage to two distinct yet interactive components – (i) ATL-based *social-semantic knowledge*, and (ii) *social control*, which is supported by the prefrontal cortex. Social-semantic knowledge refers to our long-term database of the meaning of words, objects and behaviours acquired over our lifetimes and is critical to understand and generate appropriate behaviours across specific contexts.[32,38,39] In a previous study, we demonstrated that social- and non-social-semantic deficits were highly correlated in FTD and were uniquely associated with *bilateral* ATL atrophy.[36] Social control includes the selection, evaluation, decision-making and inhibition processes supported by the orbitofrontal and medial prefrontal cortices and interacts with ATL-based semantic representations to guide controlled social behaviour.[38] A key hypothesis from the model is that the behavioural changes in SD result predominantly from a degradation of social-semantic knowledge

following bilateral ATL atrophy, whereas the behavioural changes in bvFTD appear to result primarily from difficulties controlling social-semantic knowledge effectively to guide socially appropriate behaviour across changing contexts and scenarios. However, to date, only one study has directly assessed the link between social conceptual deficits and behavioural changes in FTD.[40]

In this study, we measured the range of behavioural changes in FTD (spanning bvFTD, SD and intermediate cases), and their cognitive and neuroanatomical bases. We utilised the Cambridge Behavioural Inventory-Revised and two questionnaires of apathy and impulsivity, together with neuropsychological assessments and structural MRI. For the first time, we systematically explored the link between comprehension of a wide range of social concepts and behaviour change in FTD. The systematic phenotypic variation in FTD and correlated frontotemporal atrophy means that group-level comparisons are limited in localising the precise function of isolated brain regions and revealing the patterns of phenotypic variation across the entire FTD clinical spectrum (including "mixed" FTD cases who do not fall neatly into one diagnostic category).[16,25,36,41] Therefore, we also used a data-driven transdiagnostic approach which treats FTD as a potential spectrum where patients represent phenotypic points along a frontotemporal atrophy continuum,[42] to supplement classical diagnosis-based comparisons with multivariate analytics.

Materials and methods

Participants

Forty-seven people with a clinical diagnosis of FTD were recruited from specialist clinics in the Cambridge Centre for Frontotemporal Dementia at the Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust (Addenbrookes) (N = 40), St George's Hospital, London (N = 4) and John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford (N = 3). Twenty-six people had a primary diagnosis of bvFTD[5] whereas 21 met criteria for SD (encompassing both L > R and R >L patterns of temporal atrophy).[13,14] Eighteen age-matched healthy participants were recruited from the MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge. Most participants provided written informed consent obtained according to the Declaration of Helsinki. Where

participants lacked capacity to consent, their next of kin was consulted using the 'personal consultee' process as established by UK law. Demographic and disease information is reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic and disease information

	bvFTD	SD	Control	Group difference	Post-hoc
N	26	21	18	-	-
Sex (M: F)	18:8	7:14	9:9	**χ^2 = 6.05, p < 0.05**[a]	-
Age (years)	64.3 (9.1)	66.1 (7.0)	64.3 (6.9)	H(2) = 3.6, ns[b]	-
Education (years)	11.5 (1.9)	13.7 (3.0)	15.3 (3.3)	**H(2) = 14.8, p < 0.001**[b]	bvFTD < C, SD
Years since symptom onset	6.2 (3.5)	5.9 (3.4)	-	W = 272, ns[c]	-
Years since diagnosis	1.7 (1.6)	2.3 (1.8)	-	W = 219, ns[c]	-
FRS (%)	21.6 (17.0)	55.7 (25.9)	95.1 (5.9)	**H(2) = 43.9, p < 0.0001**[b]	bvFTD < SD, C; SD < C

[a]Chi-square test., [b]Kruskal-Wallis test; [c]Wilcoxon rank-sum test

Mean and standard deviations are reported for each group. Significant p-values are highlighted in bold.

bvFTD = behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia, FRS = frontotemporal dementia rating scale, SD = semantic dementia

Informant questionnaires

Cambridge Behavioural Inventory-Revised

The Cambridge Behavioural Inventory-Revised (CBI-R) measures behavioural change in neurodegenerative disorders[11,43] and includes 45 items which cover ten domains: Memory and Orientation, Everyday Skills, Self-Care, Abnormal Behaviour, Mood, Beliefs, Eating Habits, Sleep, Stereotypic and Motor Behaviours, Motivation. For each item, the informant rates the frequency of this behaviour/functional impairment over the past month on a five-point Likert scale or responds N/A if not applicable. A percentage score for each domain is calculated, where higher scores indicate increased frequency of behavioural change.

Apathy-Motivation Index-Caregiver version

The Apathy-Motivation Index-Caregiver version (AMI-CG) is an informant questionnaire designed to measure apathy in neurological patients.[44] There are 18 items covering three apathy subtypes: Behavioural Activation, Social Motivation and Emotional Sensitivity. For each item, the informant rates how appropriately the behaviour describes the thoughts and behaviours of the patient out of five response options ranging from 'completely true' to 'completely untrue'. A score is derived for each apathy domain by averaging item scores, where higher scores indicate greater levels of apathy. The caregiver version was used as cognitively impaired participants may lack the necessary insight to provide a reliable self-report (e.g. see Klar et al.[44]). All controls and a subset of the FTD cohort (bvFTD = 21, SD = 15) also completed the original self-report version of the AMI[45] to allow a direct comparison of self vs. informant ratings.

Cambridge Questionnaire for Apathy and Impulsivity Traits

The Cambridge Questionnaire for Apathy and Impulsivity Traits (CamQUAIT) is a 15-item informant questionnaire designed to measure apathy and impulsivity, developed and validated specifically in the context of syndromes associated with frontotemporal lobar degeneration.[46] Informants rate the frequency of behaviours over recent weeks, from four response options. Scores are calculated for two domains – "Motivation and Support" (CamQUAIT-M) and "Impulsivity and Challenging Behaviours" (CamQUAIT-C) where higher scores indicate increased frequency of behaviour change.

Neuropsychology

Participants completed a battery of neuropsychological tests.[36] Tasks assessed comprehension of multiple types of social concepts, including famous people,[47,48] abstract social concepts,[24,32,40,49-51] emotions,[52,53] social norms understanding and sarcasm detection.[54] Where possible, 'non-social' comparator tasks were included, matched for lexical frequency, specificity and imageability.[55] General semantic memory was assessed using the modified picture version of the Camel and Cactus test (CCT) and naming tasks from the Cambridge Semantic Memory Test Battery,[56-59] a synonym judgement task[58,60] and the 30-item Boston Naming Test.[61,62] Global cognition was assessed using the Addenbrooke's Cognitive

Examination-Revised (ACE-R), a dementia screening tool with five subscales: Attention and Orientation, Memory, Language, Fluency and Visuospatial Function[63]. The Brixton Spatial Anticipation Test[64] and Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices Set B[65] were included as tests of executive function.

Structural MRI

A subset of the FTD cohort (bvFTD = 15, SD = 18) and 35 age-matched healthy controls had a T1-weighted 3T structural MRI scan on a Siemens PRISMA, University of Cambridge using an MPRAGE sequence. Of these, 29 participants (bvFTD = 1, SD = 12, control = 16) were scanned at the MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit (TR = 2000ms, TE = 2.85ms, TI = 850ms), and 39 (bvFTD = 14, SD = 6, control = 19) were scanned at the Wolfson Brain Imaging Centre (TR = 2000ms, TE = 2.93ms, TI = 850ms).

Raw data were converted to the Brain Imaging Dataset format[66] and preprocessed using the Computational Anatomy Toolbox version 12 in SPM 12.[67] Images were segmented into grey matter, white matter and CSF, modulated and normalised to MNI space using geodesic shooting.[68] Normalised grey matter images were spatially smoothed using a 10mm FWHM Gaussian kernel.

Voxel-based morphometry (VBM) was conducted to explore grey matter volume differences between groups. Separate general linear models were fitted for each contrast, with age, intracranial volume (ICV) and scanner site as covariates, and independent t-tests conducted to compare groups. An explicit mask was used, based on a method recommended for VBM of severely atrophic brains.[69] Significant clusters were extracted using a cluster-level threshold of $Q < 0.05$, based on an initial voxel-level threshold of $P < 0.001$. Results were visualised using the xjView toolbox (https://www.alivelearn.net/xjview) and brain regions were labelled using the Automated Anatomical Labelling Atlas 3.[70]

Statistical analysis

Behavioural data were analysed using the 'rstatix' package[71] in R studio version 4.0.3[72] and IBM SPSS version 28. Normality and equality of variance were assessed by Shapiro-Wilk tests and Levene's test, respectively. If data were normally distributed then one-way ANOVAs and post-hoc Tukey's range tests were conducted if there was equality of variance across groups, whereas Welch ANOVAs and post-hoc Games Howell tests were conducted

where variances were not equal. Where data were not normally distributed, Kruskal-Wallis tests with post-hoc Dunn's tests were conducted. A $P < 0.05$ threshold was used to determine statistical significance.

Frequency of behavioural changes in frontotemporal dementia

Informant-based Likert scale ratings in neurodegenerative disorders may be influenced by symptom duration. For example, caregivers may overestimate the frequency/magnitude of behavioural features initially when these may be noticeably florid relative to a premorbid baseline. Conversely, caregivers may acclimatise to behaviours over time, and thus begin to underestimate their frequency and/or magnitude. To account for this, we explored the prevalence of individual behaviours in FTD regardless of their frequency. First, for each CBI-R domain, a patient was binarised as 'impaired' if they had a rating above 'never' or 'not impaired' otherwise. Second, each patient was binarised as 'impaired' (i.e. item frequency rated more than 'never') or 'not impaired' (i.e. item frequency rated 'never') on each CBI-R item (N = 45). Differences in the prevalence of behaviours in bvFTD vs. SD were explored using χ^2 tests.

Extracting the magnitude and dimensions of behavioural change in FTD

Raw scores for each questionnaire domain were z-scored and missing data were imputed using probabilistic principal component analysis.[73,74] This method requires the number of extracted principal components to be pre-specified and so k-fold cross-validation was conducted to determine the optimum number of components, based on the solution with the lowest root mean squared error for held out cases over 1000 permutations.[75] Two principal component analyses (PCA) were used in the analyses. In the first, PCA with varimax-rotation was conducted on the questionnaire domains to extract the underlying behavioural dimensions of variation in FTD. An initial PCA extracted four principal components which explained 78.3% of the total variance. One bvFTD participant had an extreme outlier factor score (4.05) on the 3rd principal component and so this participant was excluded and the final PCA was re-run with N = 46. Sampling adequacy and suitability of the data for the PCA was assessed using the Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Bartlett's test of sphericity. The number of principal components to extract was determined using the elbow method on the

scree plot of eigenvalues.[76] Factor scores for each participant were calculated using the regression method and groups were compared using independent t-tests.

The neuropsychological and neuroanatomical correlates of behaviour change in FTD

A second, separate varimax-rotated standard PCA was conducted on the FTD neuropsychological data. This PCA extracted three components, labelled for ease of reference and interpretation as: (1) *FTD severity*, (2) *semantic memory* and (3) *executive function* (Supplementary Fig. 1).[36] Note that such labelling is approximate and implies differential weighting rather than exclusivity of features across components. The association between neuropsychological performance and behaviour change was explored by fitting separate forced-entry linear multiple regression models with factor scores on each component extracted from the informant questionnaire PCA as the dependent variable, and the three neuropsychological (*FTD severity, semantic memory, executive function)* components as predictors. Voxel-based correlations[77] were conducted to determine the regions of grey matter intensity associated with factor scores on the informant questionnaire PCA-derived behavioural dimensions. A linear regression model was fitted with each factor score as the dependent variable, and age, ICV and scanner site as covariates.

bvFTD vs SD discrimination

Logistic regression was conducted to determine the ability of each informant questionnaire PCA-derived behavioural dimension to discriminate between bvFTD and SD. This was compared with the discriminative ability of the three neuropsychological components (described above). Discriminative ability (as a diagnostic forced two-choice classification) was expressed by receiver operator characteristic (ROC) curves with “area under the curve” as the summary metric.

Results

Grey matter volume differences between groups

The VBM results align closely with the expected distribution of frontotemporal atrophy in FTD and in each syndrome (Fig. 1 and Supplementary Table 1). The bvFTD group had reduced grey matter, which was maximal in the prefrontal cortex, and extended to the temporal lobes, insula, parietal lobe and cerebellum. The SD group had reduced grey matter volume in the bilateral ATLs, maximal at the temporal pole, with additional loss in the posterior temporal cortex, prefrontal cortex and insula. Comparisons between bvFTD and SD revealed reduced volume in the bilateral ATLs in SD, with no significant clusters emerging in the reverse contrast.



Figure 1. Voxel-based morphometry results. Rows display regions of reduced grey matter volume in each patient group compared to age-matched controls. The bottom row shows

regions of reduced grey matter volume in SD compared to bvFTD. Groups were compared using independent t-tests, with age, intracranial volume and scanner site included as covariates. Images are thresholded using a cluster-level threshold of $Q < 0.05$ (after an initial voxel-level threshold of $P < 0.001$). Significant clusters are overlaid on the MNI avg152 T1 template. Co-ordinates are reported in Montreal Neurological Institute space.

Frequency of behavioural changes in FTD

Table 2 and Fig. 2A display group scores on each questionnaire domain. As expected, the bvFTD group had significantly higher scores (i.e., more common behaviour change) than controls across every domain. These main effects were not driven solely by the bvFTD sample, however - the SD group also had significantly higher scores than controls on every domain apart from CBI-R Self-Care ($P = 0.15$), CBI-R Beliefs ($P = 0.09$), AMI-CG Emotional Sensitivity ($P = 0.18$) and CamQUAIT-C ($P = 0.30$).

Post-hoc pairwise comparisons between the two FTD subtypes revealed that the bvFTD group had significantly higher scores on the following CBI-R domains: Everyday Skills ($P = 0.005$), Self-Care ($P = 0.0003$), Abnormal Behaviours ($P = 0.0006$), Eating Habits ($P = 0.007$), Sleep ($P = 0.04$) and Motivation ($P = 0.002$). The bvFTD group also had increased ratings of apathy, with higher scores on the Behavioural Activation ($P = 0.002$) and Emotional Sensitivity ($P = 0.0002$) AMI-CG domains, and both CamQUAIT subscales (CamQUAIT-M, $P = 0.002$; CamQUAIT-C, $P = 0.0002$). There were no differences on the AMI-CG Social Motivation domain ($P = 0.07$) or on the following CBI-R domains: Memory and Orientation ($P = 0.74$), Mood ($P = 0.12$), Beliefs ($P = 0.09$) and Stereotypic and Motor Behaviours ($P = 0.26$). These results demonstrate that people with FTD are impaired across a wide range of behaviours, and this is not selective to bvFTD but is true in SD too (although milder on average).

Table 2. Scores on each Informant Questionnaire Domain

Questionnaire domain	bvFTD	SD	Control	Group effect	Post-hoc	χ^2 test
CBI-R Memory and Orientation (%)	59.7 (22.9)	56.1 (24.8)	5.2 (5.7)	**H(2) = 36.7, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD > C	-
CBI-R Everyday Skills (%)	58.7 (27.7)	29.0 (31.8)	0.3 (1.2)	**H(2) = 36.3, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD > C	**χ^2 = 5.61, P = 0.02**
CBI-R Self-Care (%)	33.9 (30.5)	9.5 (21.5)	0.0 (0.0)	**H(2) = 29.2, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD > C	**χ^2 = 15.25, P < 0.0001**
CBI-R Abnormal Behaviour (%)	55.4 (25.7)	21.2 (22.1)	4.2 (6.2)	**H(2) = 36.3, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD > C	**χ^2 = 6.93, P = 0.008**
CBI-R Mood (%)	33.4 (23.4)	21.7 (19.0)	6.9 (6.7)	**H(2) = 18.4, P < 0.001**	bvFTD, SD > C	χ^2 = 0.05, P = 0.82
CBI-R Beliefs (%)	14.5 (22.4)	4.4 (8.2)	0.0 (0.0)	**H(2) = 16.0, P < 0.001**	bvFTD > C	χ^2 = 2.77, P = 0.1
CBI-R Eating Habits (%)	60.6 (27.4)	31.3 (24.0)	0.7 (2.0)	**H(2) = 39.3, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD > C	χ^2 = 1.63, P = 0.20
CBI-R Sleep (%)	50.0 (25.7)	30.4 (28.9)	11.8 (10.9)	**H(2) = 19.8, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD > C	χ^2 = 1.35, P = 0.25
CBI-R Stereotypic and Motor Behaviours (%)	60.3 (30.3)	47.3 (34.7)	6.9 (8.3)	**H(2) = 25.5, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD >C	χ^2 = 0.05, P = 0.82
CBI-R Motivation (%)	71.5 (25.6)	32.1 (25.7)	2.2 (4.9)	**H(2) = 44.0, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD > C	χ^2 = 2.59, P = 0.11
AMI-CG Behavioural Activation (4)	3.0 (0.9)	1.5 (1.0)	0.5 (0.5)	**H(2) = 37.0, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD > C	-
AMI-CG Social Motivation (4)	2.6 (0.8)	2.1 (0.8)	1.1 (0.8)	**F(2,61) = 21.0, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD > C	-
AMI-CG Emotional Sensitivity (4)	3.0 (0.9)	1.6 (1.0)	1.1 (0.6)	**H(2) = 29.0, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD > C	-
CamQUAIT-M (27)	20.5 (5.7)	12.8 (6.0)	4.7 (3.1)	**H(2) = 38.8, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD, SD >C	-
CamQUAIT-C (18)	8.4 (3.9)	4.2 (3.3)	2.7 (1.9)	**F(2,61) = 17.9, P < 0.0001**	bvFTD > C	-

Mean and standard deviations are reported for each group. Significant p-values are highlighted in bold.

AMI-CG = Apathy-Motivation Index, Care-Giver version, bvFTD = behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia, CamQUAIT = Cambridge Questionnaire for Apathy and Impulsivity Traits, CBI-R = Cambridge Behavioural Inventory Revised, C = control, SD = semantic dementia

For each of the ten CBI-R domains, the percentage of 'impaired' bvFTD patients was above 50% (Fig. 2B). This was also true in SD, except for the Self-Care (23.8%) and Beliefs (33.3%) domains. There was a significantly higher proportion of bvFTD patients impaired on the Everyday Skills (χ^2 = 5.61, P = 0.02), Self-Care (χ^2 = 15.25, P < 0.0001) and Abnormal Behaviours (χ^2 = 6.93, P = 0.008) domains. There were no significant differences on the remaining CBI-R domains (Table 2).

The percentage of participants impaired on each individual CBI-R item is reported in Supplementary Table 2. For each item (N = 45), χ^2 tests were conducted to explore whether particular behaviours were more prevalent in one FTD subtype than the other. Twenty-three out of 45 (51.1%) χ^2 tests were significant, and in every single situation, this was due to a significantly higher proportion of impaired bvFTD participants. There were no instances where the opposite was true, i.e., impaired behaviours significantly more frequent in SD. In other words, we detected no "behavioural double dissociations".



Figure 2. Scores across each CBI-R domain. **(A)** Average scores across each CBI-R domain for bvFTD, SD and controls. **(B)** The percentage of bvFTD and SD participants impaired on each CBI-R domain.

Association between self- and caregiver-ratings of apathy

Despite large differences in AMI-CG ratings between FTD and controls, there were no differences between groups on the self-rated version of the AMI for Behavioural Activation ($H(2) = 2.1$, $P = 0.36$), Social Motivation ($F(2,51) = 0.76$, $P = 0.48$) or Emotional Sensitivity ($F(2,51) = 0.03$, $P = 0.97$). The correlation between AMI-CG and AMI scores for each group is displayed in Fig. 3. Self- and informant-ratings of apathy were positively correlated in controls (Behavioural Activation; $r = 0.71$, $P = 0.001$, Social Motivation; $r = 0.58$, $P = 0.01$, Emotional Sensitivity; $r = 0.5$, $P = 0.04$). In contrast, there was less concordance between self- and informant ratings in the two FTD subgroups. There were no significant associations in bvFTD (Behavioural Activation; $r = 0.17$, $P = 0.47$, Social Motivation; $r = 0.25$, $P = 0.28$, Emotional Sensitivity; $r = 0.23$, $P = 0.32$). There were significant correlations between SD patients and informant ratings for Social Motivation ($r = 0.53$, $P = 0.04$) and Emotional Sensitivity (r = 0.6, P = 0.02) but not for Behavioural Activation ($r = 0.23$, $P = 0.41$). These findings highlight the discrepancy between the perspective of the patient and the caregiver in FTD, particularly in bvFTD[44] (and thus why it is important to collect informant reports in the clinic; see Discussion).



Figure 3. Association between self and caregiver ratings of apathy. Data points represent scores on the self-rated AMI plotted against scores on the AMI-CG for each AMI domain.

Extracting the dimensions of behavioural change in FTD

The PCA conducted on the informant questionnaire data had a KMO statistic of 0.75, indicating meritorious sampling adequacy[78] and Bartlett's test for sphericity was significant ($P < 0.0001$) indicating presence of at least some common factors in the covariance matrix. Visual inspection of the scree plot indicated three principal components, which explained 77.7% of the total variance. Factor loadings for each questionnaire domain and factor scores for each participant are displayed in Fig. 4. For the full details of the neuropsychology PCA, see Rouse et al. (2024).[36]



Figure 4. PCA loadings and factor scores. (A) Factor loadings for each informant questionnaire domain. Red dashed lines indicate the factor loading cut-offs (>|0.5|). **(B)** PC1 (Apathy) plotted against PC2 (Challenging behaviours). **(C)** PC2 (Challenging behaviours) plotted against PC3 (ADLs). **(D)** PC3 (ADLs) plotted against PC1 (Apathy). The black dashed lines indicate the factor score of a hypothetical participant scoring 1.96 standard deviations below the control average on each task, and the shaded grey regions indicate the regions of preserved performance.

The first principal component had an eigenvalue of 6.96 and explained 46.42% of the total variance. The Motivation, Self-Care and Everyday Skills CBI-R domains, CamQUAIT-M and the three AMI-CG domains loaded positively on this component. Accordingly, this component was labelled *apathy.* The bvFTD group had significantly higher factor scores than SD on this component (t = 3.70, P = 0.0006). The second principal component had an eigenvalue of 2.38 and explained 15.8% of the total variance. The Mood, Beliefs, Abnormal Behaviours, Eating Habits and Stereotypic and Motor Behaviours CBI-R domains, and the CamQUAIT-C loaded positively on this component. This component was labelled *challenging behaviours*. Again, bvFTD patients had significantly higher factor scores than SD on this component (W = 354, P = 0.04). The third principal component had an eigenvalue of 1.27 and explained 8.44% of the total variance. The Abnormal Behaviours, Eating Habits, Memory and Orientation and Everyday Skills CBI-R domains loaded positively on this component, and thus the component was labelled *Activities of Daily Living (ADLs).* There were no differences in factor scores between bvFTD and SD (t = 1.20, P = 0.24).

bvFTD versus SD discrimination

Receiver operating characteristic curves showing the bvFTD versus SD discriminative ability of each behavioural and neuropsychological component are shown in Fig. 5. *Semantic memory* had the highest predictive accuracy (AUC = 84.1%) followed by *executive function* (AUC = 78.8%), *apathy* (AUC = 78.5%). There was poor discriminative accuracy from *challenging behaviours* (AUC = 67.4%), *FTD severity* (AUC = 55.5%) and *ADLs* (AUC = 61.1%). When combined, *semantic memory* and *executive function* had excellent predictive

accuracy (AUC = 95.1%) while *apathy, challenging behaviours* and *ADLs* combined had good predictive accuracy (AUC = 83.1%).



Figure 5. Receiver Operating Characteristic curves distinguishing between bvFTD and SD using neuropsychological and behavioural components

The neuropsychological and neuroanatomical correlates of behaviour change in FTD

A linear multiple regression model with the three neuropsychology components as predictors (*FTD severity*, *semantic memory*, *executive function*) was significant for *apathy* factor scores ($F(3, 42) = 5.25$, $P = 0.004$) with *executive function* the only significant individual predictor (t = -3.51, P = 0.001, standardized beta = -0.46). The negative beta value indicates that higher levels of apathy were associated with poorer status of executive function. To investigate which specific aspects of executive function were most related to apathy, partial correlations were calculated between each of the three tasks that loaded on the *executive function* factor and *apathy* factor scores, whilst controlling for the other two tasks. *Apathy* factor scores were significantly correlated with performance on the Brixton Spatial Anticipation Test ($r = -0.56$, $P = 0.001$) but not with the Ravens ($r = -0.03$, $P = 0.90$) or TASIT ($r = 0.06$, $P = 0.76$). The

model was significant for *ADLs* factor scores ($F(3, 42) = 5.04$, $P = 0.0001$), where *FTD severity* was only significant individual predictor ($t = -3.18$, $P = 0.003$, standardized beta = -0.42). The negative beta value indicates that increased impairments in ADLs were associated with increased levels of FTD severity. The model was not significant for the *Challenging Behaviours* component ($F(3, 42) = 1.85$, $P = 0.15$).

VBCM analysis detected no regions of grey matter that associated with factor scores on the *apathy* or *challenging behaviours* component. However, when a measure of global atrophy was added as a covariate, then significant clusters emerged for *apathy* in the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (Brodmann area 24), supplementary motor area and precuneus. Higher factor scores on the *ADLs* component were negatively associated with grey matter volume in the medial prefrontal cortex, precentral gyri and left insula (Fig. 6 and Supplementary Table 3). A similar set of brain regions was associated with total atrophy and indeed, when total atrophy was included as a covariate in the VBCM analysis, then no regions remained for *ADLs*.



Figure 6. Regions of grey matter volume associated with factor scores. Multiple linear regression models were fitted with each factor as the main effect and age, intracranial volume and scanner site included as covariates. Images are thresholded using a cluster-level threshold

of $Q < 0.05$ (after an initial voxel-level threshold of $P < 0.05$). Significant clusters are overlaid on the MNI avg152 T1 template. Co-ordinates are reported in Montreal Neurological Institute Space.

Discussion

Behavioural changes are a common manifestation of FTD; they are a defining feature of bvFTD but are also common in SD.[8,9,11,79] This study confirmed the frequency and dimensionality of abnormal behaviours in FTD, with quantitative rather than qualitative behavioural differences between bvFTD and SD. The transdiagnostic approach, including intermediate cases, reveals the underlying dimensions of behavioural change, and it is the individual expression of these dimensions that was used to study neuroanatomical correlates of FTD behaviour and neuropsychology rather than a traditional binary group comparison. Apathy was a major dimension in FTD, and apathy severity was associated with impaired executive function and anterior cingulate atrophy in both bvFTD and SD. There was a large discrepancy between patients' self-ratings of apathy *vs.* informant ratings, highlighting the importance of the caregiver's perspective when measuring behavioural change in FTD and for effective evaluation in diagnostic clinics. For group discrimination of bvFTD from SD, neuropsychological measures of semantic memory and executive function were more successful than behavioural change. In the following sections, we discuss these findings and their implications.

Behavioural profiles in bvFTD and SD differ quantitatively not qualitatively

People with bvFTD displayed the expected wide range of behavioural and social disturbances.[5,80] Behavioural change was common in SD too. Indeed, across CBI-R domains, a high percentage of FTD patients displayed a degree of impairment, in contrast to age-matched controls who were at floor-level. Taken together, these results highlight the sensitivity of informant questionnaires for detecting behaviour changes in FTD and reinforce that both bvFTD and SD patients are abnormal across every behavioural domain.

The behavioural overlap mirrored the radiological overlap - there was a degree of bilateral ATL volume loss in bvFTD and a degree of prefrontal volume loss in SD, in line with

previous neuroimaging comparisons.[41,81] This confirms the absence of an absolute neuroanatomical division between bvFTD and SD. Instead, each patient has correlated atrophy in multiple regions and occupies a different point in a frontotemporal multidimensional atrophy space. Patients (beyond their initial presentation) often display "mixed" intermediate phenotypes and express diagnostic criteria for more than one syndrome.[82] This clinical overlap adds systematic, graded variations to categorical comparisons, potentially diluting any behavioural differences, and the correlated atrophy makes categorical comparisons suboptimal for disentangling the precise functions of the ATL and prefrontal regions. To accommodate for this, we used a transdiagnostic approach to FTD and applied multivariate analytics sensitive to the heterogeneity in FTD to model graded behavioural variation and the cognitive and neuroanatomical underpinnings of these variations.

Group-level diagnostic-based comparisons revealed higher levels of apathy, abnormal behaviour, changed eating habits, impaired everyday skills and self-care in bvFTD compared to SD. In contrast, there were no differences regarding stereotypic behaviours, mood or abnormal beliefs. Although there were many individual behaviours more common to bvFTD, there were no specific behaviours more common in SD. This finding contrasts with some previous studies that have identified distinct behavioural profiles in bvFTD and SD.[8,12] For example, Snowden et al. reported that, although obsessive behaviours were common in both FTD subtypes, there was a more 'compulsive' quality to these behaviours in SD (e.g. clock watching). Here we found that although compulsive behaviours were indeed highly prevalent in SD, they were even more common in bvFTD. Taken together, the lack of any behavioural double dissociations coupled with the broad group-level differences suggests that the behavioural signatures of bvFTD and SD (at least those captured by the questionnaires used) do not differ *qualitatively*, but rather *quantitatively* and *unidirectionally* (bvFTD > SD).

Neuropsychological measures have higher discriminative ability than behavioural measures

An important clinical implication of contrastive behavioural signatures in bvFTD and SD is improved diagnostic classification. This is particularly salient for disease modifying treatments as bvFTD and SD are associated with different underlying neuropathologies (TDP-43 type C in SD[83] and heterogenerous pathology in bvFTD).[84] Consequently, accurate

diagnosis is vital for clinical trial stratification, to ensure that any participant in a trial actually has the proteinopathy a drug is targeting. We found that, although apathy was a good discriminator between bvFTD and SD, behavioural measures had poorer discriminative ability than two neuropsychological measures; *semantic memory* (SD < bvFTD) and *executive function* (bvFTD < SD) and was most powerful when the two neuropsychological components were combined (AUC = 0.95). Previous studies have shown that bvFTD and SD can be clearly distinguished using neuropsychology, with a double dissociation between semantic memory (impaired in SD) and executive function (impaired in bvFTD).[85,86] This finding implies that, rather than chasing subtle behavioural differences (which appear to be primarily quantitative rather than qualitative in nature), neuropsychological assessments of semantic memory and executive function should be considered the discriminative 'gold standard' at least in terms of bedside testing or when neuroimaging is not available.

The cognitive and neuroanatomical underpinnings of behavioural change in FTD

The informant questionnaire PCA extracted three behavioural components: *apathy*, *challenging behaviours* and *activities of daily living*. Apathy is a core feature of FTD; it is a diagnostic criterion for bvFTD[5] and is also common in SD.[87] Apathy is considered a multidimensional construct and distinct subtypes have been proposed, each associated with different neural circuitry.[88,89] In the current study, behavioural, social and emotional apathy domains were highly correlated and co-loaded onto the same component, indicating that all three domains are concurrently affected by FTD.[90] Direct comparisons between FTD subtypes revealed increased severity of apathy in bvFTD, in keeping with this feature as a core diagnostic criterion.[5] There was evidence for increased apathy in SD too – indeed the majority of patients (61.9%) had apathy factor scores outside of the control-defined normality cut-off (See Fig. 4). These findings highlight the prevalence of apathy in FTD and its occurrence across the FTD spectrum. Apathy can be difficult to distinguish from depression as they both include features such as loss of interest and anhedonia.[91] However, in our study the mood domain of the CBI-R did not co-load with the apathy measures but loaded onto a statistically orthogonal component (challenging behaviours). This suggests that the

motivational changes found in this study were not due to affective changes, in keeping with other studies which have found apathy and depression to be dissociable in FTD.[92]

Increased apathy was associated with lower levels of executive function, a finding which replicates previous FTD studies,[93,94] and which can emerge years before conversion from presymptomatic to symptomatic states in genetic FTDs.[95] When the executively-loading tasks were analysed separately, performance on the Brixton Spatial Anticipation Test was the only task that significantly correlated with apathy, potentially indicating a more specific relationship between apathy and certain aspects of executive function (e.g., the ability to adapt flexibly to rule changes and inhibit previous response strategies). It was not possible from our study to determine the causal relationship between apathy and executive function, however a previous study reported that apathy predicts executive cognitive decline in presymptomatic genetic bvFTD.[95]

Voxel-based correlation analyses revealed that apathy severity in FTD was negatively correlated with grey matter volume in the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC). This was true not only of the bvFTD sample (classically associated with ACC atrophy) but in SD too, indicating that (a) the increased levels of apathy in bvFTD > SD reflects the predominance of prefrontal atrophy in the former condition and (b) the apathy in SD is a consequence of pathology spreading into medial prefrontal areas (rather than a distinct neurocognitive process associated with ATL atrophy, for example). Atrophy or hypometabolism in the ACC has been strongly linked with apathy in FTD[96-99] as well as in other neurodegenerative disorders such as Alzheimer's disease[100,101] and Parkinson's disease.[102] Moreover, ACC lesions cause severe apathy and abulia.[103] The apathy in FTD can be explained by a predictive coding framework as a 'failure of active inference' due to reduced precision of prior expectations, leading to failures in correctly adapting actions to the environment and thus diminished goal-directed behaviour.[38,104] In support of this hypothesis, apathy is associated with reduced prior precision in both healthy participants and people with Parkinson's disease.[105,106] The ACC may be the anatomical substrate of goal priors, or potentially underpin a hub for the integration of prior expectations with sensory inputs.

No association was found between impaired social-semantic knowledge and behavioural change in FTD. How does this fit with the predictions of the CS-SC framework?[38] First, our social-semantic battery already contains tasks which provide direct measures of social abilities (e.g., emotion recognition, person recognition, sarcasm detection) and the SD patients were impaired on these and more so than the bvFTD subgroup.[36] Thus these direct assessments do detect social changes, and we have formally shown that they are very highly correlated with both general (non-social) semantic impairments and atrophy in the ATL bilaterally.[36] Second, unlike some of these direct measures, it seems possible that questionnaires such as the CBI-R may miss these more "semantically driven" aspects of behavioural change, and instead are more sensitive to deficits in prefrontal-based "social control" processes such as apathy or disinhibition. If correct, then the development of better-targeted informant questions, sensitive to these aspects of behaviour change, including formal assessment of behavioural change associated with SD in earlier studies[8,9,107] is an important avenue for future research.

Limitations and future directions

People with FTD often lack insight into their changed behaviours[14,18,108-110] and may have cognitive deficits that cause unreliable response strategies,[111] and violations of the assumptions underlying questionnaires and self-report forms (e.g. of consistent and meaningful responding).[111] Indeed, this was highlighted by the discrepancy between patient and caregiver reports of apathy in the current study. Informant ratings/interviews are therefore a common and important method for assessing behavioural changes in both clinical and research settings. However, there are multiple possible factors to consider when interpreting informant ratings. For example, there is evidence that informant ratings are influenced by caregiver burden.[112] Additionally, there may be an interaction between informant ratings of behaviour and the time since the behaviour's onset, such that in the early stages of the disease the obvious change from premorbid baseline 'magnifies' any behavioural changes and leads to disproportionately high ratings. Indeed, this possibility motivated the parallel analyses of CBI-R behaviour severity/frequency vs. behaviour presence in the current study (see above).

The PCA-based approach in this study may have obscured some more specific relationships between social-semantic impairments and particular aspects of behaviour change, such as socially inappropriate behaviour or "disinhibition". However, without inclusion of more

specific tests of social executive functions, it remains difficult to differentiate between prefrontal vs. temporal contributions to inappropriate social behaviour. Future studies could relate informant ratings of behavioural changes with performance on social executive tasks used in previous FTD studies, which assess the ability to resolve social dilemmas[113] and social decision making.[114]

Data availability

Due to the limits of the ethics approval for these patient studies, the raw data cannot be openly shared. Requests for anonymised data can be addressed to the senior author and may require a data transfer agreement.

Acknowledgements

We thank the patients and their families or caregivers for giving up the time to take part in the study. We also thank Dr. Thomas Cope, Dr. Sian Thompson and Dr. Sofia Toniolo for their help with recruitment.

Funding

M.A.R is supported by the Medical Research Council (SUAG/096 G116768). J.B.R is supported by the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00030/14; MR/T033371,1), Wellcome Trust (220258), and the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203312). M.A.L.R is supported by a Medical Research Council programme grant (MR/R023883/1) and intramural funding (MC_UU_00005/18). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Competing interests

The authors report no competing interests.

References

1. de Vugt ME, Riedijk SR, Aalten P, Tibben A, van Swieten JC, Verhey FR. Impact of behavioural problems on spousal caregivers: a comparison between Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal dementia. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord*. 2006;22(1):35-41.

2. Koyama A, Hashimoto M, Fukuhara R, et al. Caregiver Burden in Semantic Dementia with Right- and Left-Sided Predominant Cerebral Atrophy and in Behavioral-Variant Frontotemporal Dementia. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Dis Extra*. 2018;8(1):128-137.

3. Murley AG, Rouse MA, Coyle-Gilchrist ITS, et al. Predicting loss of independence and mortality in frontotemporal lobar degeneration syndromes. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2021;92(7):737-744.

4. Ibanez A, Manes F. Contextual social cognition and the behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Neurology*. 2012;78(17):1354-62.

5. Rascovsky K, Hodges JR, Knopman D, et al. Sensitivity of revised diagnostic criteria for the behavioural variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2011;134(Pt 9):2456-77.

6. Seeley WW, Zhou J, Kim E-J. Frontotemporal dementia: what can the behavioral variant teach us about human brain organization? *The Neuroscientist*. 2012;18(4):373-385.

7. Viskontas IV, Possin KL, Miller BL. Symptoms of frontotemporal dementia provide insights into orbitofrontal cortex function and social behavior. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2007;1121:528-45.

8. Snowden JS, Bathgate D, Varma A, Blackshaw A, Gibbons ZC, Neary D. Distinct behavioural profiles in frontotemporal dementia and semantic dementia. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2001;70(3):323-32.

9. Rosen HJ, Allison SC, Ogar JM, et al. Behavioral features in semantic dementia vs other forms of progressive aphasias. *Neurology*. 2006;67(10):1752-6.

10. Banks SJ, Weintraub S. Neuropsychiatric symptoms in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia and primary progressive aphasia. *J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol*. 2008;21(2):133-41.

11. Bozeat S, Gregory CA, Ralph MA, Hodges JR. Which neuropsychiatric and behavioural features distinguish frontal and temporal variants of frontotemporal dementia from Alzheimer's disease? *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2000;69(2):178-86.

12. Rankin KP, Santos-Modesitt W, Kramer JH, Pavlic D, Beckman V, Miller BL. Spontaneous social behaviors discriminate “behavioral dementias” from psychiatric disorders and other dementias. *The Journal of clinical psychiatry*. 2008;69(1):60.

13. Gorno-Tempini ML, Hillis AE, Weintraub S, et al. Classification of primary progressive aphasia and its variants. *Neurology*. 2011;76(11):1006-14.

14. Neary D, Snowden JS, Gustafson L, et al. Frontotemporal lobar degeneration: a consensus on clinical diagnostic criteria. *Neurology*. 1998;51(6):1546-54.

15. Kamminga J, Kumfor F, Burrell JR, Piguet O, Hodges JR, Irish M. Differentiating between right-lateralised semantic dementia and behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia: an examination of clinical characteristics and emotion processing. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2015;86(10):1082-8.

16. Murley AG, Coyle-Gilchrist I, Rouse MA, et al. Redefining the multidimensional clinical phenotypes of frontotemporal lobar degeneration syndromes. *Brain*. 2020;143(5):1555-1571.

17. Mendez MF, Fong SS, Shapira JS, et al. Observation of social behavior in frontotemporal dementia. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen*. 2014;29(3):215-21.

18. Lansdall CJ, Coyle-Gilchrist ITS, Jones PS, et al. Apathy and impulsivity in frontotemporal lobar degeneration syndromes. *Brain*. 2017;140(6):1792-1807.

19. Hornberger M, Geng J, Hodges JR. Convergent grey and white matter evidence of orbitofrontal cortex changes related to disinhibition in behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2011;134(Pt 9):2502-12.

20. Murley AG, Rouse MA, Jones PS, et al. GABA and glutamate deficits from frontotemporal lobar degeneration are associated with disinhibition. *Brain*. 2020;143(11):3449-3462.

21. Peters F, Perani D, Herholz K, et al. Orbitofrontal dysfunction related to both apathy and disinhibition in frontotemporal dementia. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord*. 2006;21(5-6):373-9.

22. Perry DC, Sturm VE, Seeley WW, Miller BL, Kramer JH, Rosen HJ. Anatomical correlates of reward-seeking behaviours in behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2014;137(Pt 6):1621-6.

23. Bocchetta M, Malpetti M, Todd EG, Rowe JB, Rohrer JD. Looking beneath the surface: the importance of subcortical structures in frontotemporal dementia. *Brain Commun*. 2021;3(3):fcab158.

24. Zahn R, Green S, Beaumont H, et al. Frontotemporal lobar degeneration and social behaviour: Dissociation between the knowledge of its consequences and its conceptual meaning. *Cortex*. 2017;93:107-118.

25. Ramanan S, El-Omar H, Roquet D, et al. Mapping behavioural, cognitive and affective transdiagnostic dimensions in frontotemporal dementia. *Brain Commun*. 2023;5(1):fcac344.

26. Ikeda M, Brown J, Holland AJ, Fukuhara R, Hodges JR. Changes in appetite, food preference, and eating habits in frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2002;73(4):371-6.

27. Klüver H, Bucy PC. Preliminary analysis of functions of the temporal lobes in monkeys. *Arch Neurol Psychiatry*. 1939;42(6):979-1000.

28. Terzian H, Ore GD. Syndrome of Kluver and Bucy; reproduced in man by bilateral removal of the temporal lobes. *Neurology*. 1955;5(6):373-80.

29. Chan D, Anderson V, Pijnenburg Y, et al. The clinical profile of right temporal lobe atrophy. *Brain*. 2009;132(Pt 5):1287-98.

30. Thompson SA, Graham KS, Williams G, Patterson K, Kapur N, Hodges JR. Dissociating person-specific from general semantic knowledge: roles of the left and right temporal lobes. *Neuropsychologia*. 2004;42(3):359-70.

31. Younes K, Borghesani V, Montembeault M, et al. Right temporal degeneration and socioemotional semantics: semantic behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2022;145(11):4080-4096.

32. Zahn R, Moll J, Krueger F, Huey ED, Garrido G, Grafman J. Social concepts are represented in the superior anterior temporal cortex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2007;104(15):6430-5.

33. Ulugut Erkoyun H, Groot C, Heilbron R, et al. A clinical-radiological framework of the right temporal variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2020;143(9):2831-2843.

34. Kumfor F, Landin-Romero R, Devenney E, et al. On the right side? A longitudinal study of left- versus right-lateralized semantic dementia. *Brain*. 2016;139(Pt 3):986-98.

35. Binney RJ, Henry ML, Babiak M, et al. Reading words and other people: A comparison of exception word, familiar face and affect processing in the left and right temporal variants of primary progressive aphasia. *Cortex*. 2016;82:147-163.

36. Rouse MA, Halai A, Ramanan S, et al. Social-semantic knowledge in frontotemporal dementia and after anterior temporal lobe resection. *medRxiv*. 2024;

37. Rijpma MG, Montembeault M, Shdo S, Kramer JH, Miller BL, Rankin KP. Semantic knowledge of social interactions is mediated by the hedonic evaluation system in the brain. *Cortex*. 2023;161:26-37.

38. Rouse MA, Binney RJ, Patterson K, Rowe JB, Lambon Ralph MA. A neuroanatomical and cognitive model of impaired social behaviour in frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2024;147(6):1953-1966.

39. Binney RJ, Ramsey R. Social Semantics: The role of conceptual knowledge and cognitive control in a neurobiological model of the social brain. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2020;112:28-38.

40. Zahn R, Moll J, Iyengar V, et al. Social conceptual impairments in frontotemporal lobar degeneration with right anterior temporal hypometabolism. *Brain*. 2009;132(Pt 3):604-16.

41. Ding J, Chen K, Liu H, et al. A unified neurocognitive model of semantics language social behaviour and face recognition in semantic dementia. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11(1):2595.

42. Davenport F, Gallacher J, Kourtzi Z, et al. Neurodegenerative disease of the brain: a survey of interdisciplinary approaches. *J R Soc Interface*. 2023;20(198):20220406.

43. Wear HJ, Wedderburn CJ, Mioshi E, et al. The Cambridge Behavioural Inventory revised. *Dement Neuropsychol*. 2008;2(2):102-107.

44. Klar VS, Ang YS, Lockwood P, et al. Assessment of apathy in neurological patients using the Apathy Motivation Index caregiver version. *J Neuropsychol*. 2022;16(1):236-258.

45. Ang YS, Lockwood P, Apps MA, Muhammed K, Husain M. Distinct Subtypes of Apathy Revealed by the Apathy Motivation Index. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(1):e0169938.

46. Lansdall CJ, Williams RS, Coyle-Gilchrist I, et al. The Cambridge Questionnaire for Apathy and Impulsivity Traits (CamQUAIT): a novel assessment tool for frontotemporal lobar degeneration-related syndromes. *medRxiv*. 2024:2024.07. 01.24309762.

47. Volfart A, Yan X, Maillard L, et al. Intracerebral electrical stimulation of the right anterior fusiform gyrus impairs human face identity recognition. *Neuroimage*. 2022;250:118932.

48. Rouse MA, Ramanan S, Halai AD, et al. The impact of bilateral versus unilateral anterior temporal lobe damage on face recognition, person knowledge and semantic memory. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2024;34(8)

49. Binney RJ, Hoffman P, Lambon Ralph MA. Mapping the Multiple Graded Contributions of the Anterior Temporal Lobe Representational Hub to Abstract and Social Concepts: Evidence from Distortion-corrected fMRI. *Cereb Cortex*. 2016;26(11):4227-4241.

50. Pobric G, Lambon Ralph MA, Zahn R. Hemispheric Specialization within the Superior Anterior Temporal Cortex for Social and Nonsocial Concepts. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2016;28(3):351-60.

51. Rice GE, Hoffman P, Binney RJ, Lambon Ralph MA. Concrete versus abstract forms of social concept: an fMRI comparison of knowledge about people versus social terms. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2018;373(1752)

52. Golan O, Sinai-Gavrilov Y, Baron-Cohen S. The Cambridge Mindreading Face-Voice Battery for Children (CAM-C): complex emotion recognition in children with and without autism spectrum conditions. *Mol Autism*. 2015;6:22.

53. Wallhoff F, Schuller B, Hawellek M, Rigoll G. Efficient recognition of authentic dynamic facial expressions on the feedtum database. presented at: 2006 IEEE international conference on multimedia and expo; 2006;

54. McDonald S, Flanagan S, Rollins J, Kinch J. TASIT: A new clinical tool for assessing social perception after traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 2003;18(3):219-38.

55. Rogers TT, Patterson K, Jefferies E, Ralph MA. Disorders of representation and control in semantic cognition: Effects of familiarity, typicality, and specificity. *Neuropsychologia*. 2015;76:220-39.

56. Adlam AL, Patterson K, Bozeat S, Hodges JR. The Cambridge Semantic Memory Test Battery: detection of semantic deficits in semantic dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *Neurocase*. 2010;16(3):193-207.

57. Bozeat S, Lambon Ralph MA, Patterson K, Garrard P, Hodges JR. Non-verbal semantic impairment in semantic dementia. *Neuropsychologia*. 2000;38(9):1207-15.

58. Halai AD, De Dios Perez B, Stefaniak JD, Lambon Ralph MA. Efficient and effective assessment of deficits and their neural bases in stroke aphasia. *Cortex*. 2022;155:333-346.

59. Moore K, Convery R, Bocchetta M, et al. A modified Camel and Cactus Test detects presymptomatic semantic impairment in genetic frontotemporal dementia within the GENFI cohort. *Appl Neuropsychol Adult*. 2022;29(1):112-119.

60. Jefferies E, Patterson K, Jones RW, Lambon Ralph MA. Comprehension of concrete and abstract words in semantic dementia. *Neuropsychology*. 2009;23(4):492-9.

61. Goodglass H, Kaplan E, Weintraub S. *Boston naming test*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger; 1983.

62. Mack WJ, Freed DM, Williams BW, Henderson VW. Boston Naming Test: shortened versions for use in Alzheimer's disease. *J Gerontol*. 1992;47(3):P154-8.

63. Mioshi E, Dawson K, Mitchell J, Arnold R, Hodges JR. The Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination Revised (ACE-R): a brief cognitive test battery for dementia screening. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2006;21(11):1078-85.

64. Burgess PW, Shallice T. *The hayling and brixton tests*. Thames Valley Test Company; 1997.

65. Raven JC. *Coloured Progressive Matrices, Sets A, A_B, B*. HK Lewis; 1962.

66. Gorgolewski KJ, Auer T, Calhoun VD, et al. The brain imaging data structure, a format for organizing and describing outputs of neuroimaging experiments. *Sci Data*. 2016;3(1):160044.

67. Gaser C, Dahnke R, Thompson PM, Kurth F, Luders E. CAT-a computational anatomy toolbox for the analysis of structural MRI data. *BioRxiv*. 2022;

68. Ashburner J, Friston KJ. Diffeomorphic registration using geodesic shooting and Gauss-Newton optimisation. *Neuroimage*. 2011;55(3):954-67.

69. Ridgway GR, Omar R, Ourselin S, Hill DL, Warren JD, Fox NC. Issues with threshold masking in voxel-based morphometry of atrophied brains. *Neuroimage*. 2009;44(1):99-111.

70. Rolls ET, Huang CC, Lin CP, Feng J, Joliot M. Automated anatomical labelling atlas 3. *Neuroimage*. 2020;206:116189.

71. Kassambara A. Rstatix: pipe-friendly framework for basic statistical tests. 2021. 2022.

72. R Core Team R. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2013;

73. Ilin A, Raiko T. Practical Approaches to Principal Component Analysis in the Presence of Missing Values. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. 2010;11:1957-2000.

74. Tipping ME, Bishop CM. Probabilistic Principal Component Analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*. 1999;61(3):611-622.

75. Ballabio D. A MATLAB toolbox for Principal Component Analysis and unsupervised exploration of data structure. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*. 2015;149:1-9.

76. Cattell RB. The Scree Test For The Number Of Factors. *Multivariate Behav Res*. 1966;1(2):245-76.

77. Tyler LK, Marslen-Wilson W, Stamatakis EA. Dissociating neuro-cognitive component processes: voxel-based correlational methodology. *Neuropsychologia*. 2005;43(5):771-8.

78. Kaiser HF, Rice J. Little jiffy, mark IV. *Educational and psychological measurement*. 1974;34(1):111-117.

79. Liu W, Miller BL, Kramer JH, et al. Behavioral disorders in the frontal and temporal variants of frontotemporal dementia. *Neurology*. 2004;62(5):742-8.

80. Piguet O, Hodges JR. Behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia: an update. *Dement Neuropsychol*. 2013;7(1):10-18.

81. Rosen HJ, Gorno-Tempini ML, Goldman WP, et al. Patterns of brain atrophy in frontotemporal dementia and semantic dementia. *Neurology*. 2002;58(2):198-208.

82. Kertesz A, McMonagle P, Blair M, Davidson W, Munoz DG. The evolution and pathology of frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2005;128(Pt 9):1996-2005.

83. Rohrer JD, Lashley T, Schott JM, et al. Clinical and neuroanatomical signatures of tissue pathology in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Brain*. 2011;134(Pt 9):2565-81.

84. Perry DC, Brown JA, Possin KL, et al. Clinicopathological correlations in behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2017;140(12):3329-3345.

85. Perry RJ, Hodges JR. Differentiating frontal and temporal variant frontotemporal dementia from Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology*. 2000;54(12):2277-84.

86. Hodges JR, Patterson K, Ward R, et al. The differentiation of semantic dementia and frontal lobe dementia (temporal and frontal variants of frontotemporal dementia) from early Alzheimer's disease: a comparative neuropsychological study. *Neuropsychology*. 1999;13(1):31.

87. Quang H, Wong S, Husain M, et al. Beyond language impairment: Profiles of apathy in primary progressive aphasia. *Cortex*. 2021;139:73-85.

88. Levy R, Dubois B. Apathy and the functional anatomy of the prefrontal cortex-basal ganglia circuits. *Cereb Cortex*. 2006;16(7):916-28.

89. Marin RS, Biedrzycki RC, Firinciogullari S. Reliability and validity of the Apathy Evaluation Scale. *Psychiatry Res*. 1991;38(2):143-62.

90. Chow TW, Binns MA, Cummings JL, et al. Apathy symptom profile and behavioral associations in frontotemporal dementia vs dementia of Alzheimer type. *Arch Neurol*. 2009;66(7):888-93.

91. Lanctot KL, Ismail Z, Bawa KK, et al. Distinguishing apathy from depression: A review differentiating the behavioral, neuroanatomic, and treatment-related aspects of apathy from depression in neurocognitive disorders. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2023;38(2):e5882.

92. Basavaraju R, Feng X, France J, Huey ED, Provenzano FA. Depression is associated with preserved cortical thickness relative to apathy in frontotemporal dementia. *Journal of geriatric psychiatry and neurology*. 2022;35(1):78-88.

93. Eslinger PJ, Moore P, Antani S, Anderson C, Grossman M. Apathy in frontotemporal dementia: behavioral and neuroimaging correlates. *Behav Neurol*. 2012;25(2):127-36.

94. Eggins P, Wong S, Wei G, et al. A shared cognitive and neural basis underpinning cognitive apathy and planning in behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *Cortex*. 2022;154:241-253.

95. Malpetti M, Jones PS, Tsvetanov KA, et al. Apathy in presymptomatic genetic frontotemporal dementia predicts cognitive decline and is driven by structural brain changes. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2021;17(6):969-983.

96. Kos C, van Tol MJ, Marsman JB, Knegtering H, Aleman A. Neural correlates of apathy in patients with neurodegenerative disorders, acquired brain injury, and psychiatric disorders. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2016;69:381-401.

97. Le Heron C, Apps MAJ, Husain M. The anatomy of apathy: A neurocognitive framework for amotivated behaviour. *Neuropsychologia*. 2018;118(Pt B):54-67.

98. Massimo L, Powers C, Moore P, et al. Neuroanatomy of apathy and disinhibition in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord*. 2009;27(1):96-104.

99. Zamboni G, Huey ED, Krueger F, Nichelli PF, Grafman J. Apathy and disinhibition in frontotemporal dementia: Insights into their neural correlates. *Neurology*. 2008;71(10):736-42.

100. Migneco O, Benoit M, Koulibaly PM, et al. Perfusion brain SPECT and statistical parametric mapping analysis indicate that apathy is a cingulate syndrome: a study in Alzheimer's disease and nondemented patients. *Neuroimage*. 2001;13(5):896-902.

101. Tunnard C, Whitehead D, Hurt C, et al. Apathy and cortical atrophy in Alzheimer's disease. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2011;26(7):741-8.

102. Huang C, Ravdin LD, Nirenberg MJ, et al. Neuroimaging markers of motor and nonmotor features of Parkinson's disease: an 18f fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission computed tomography study. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord*. 2013;35(3-4):183-96.

103. Kumral E, Bayulkem G, Evyapan D, Yunten N. Spectrum of anterior cerebral artery territory infarction: clinical and MRI findings. *Eur J Neurol*. 2002;9(6):615-24.

104. Kocagoncu E, Klimovich-Gray A, Hughes LE, Rowe JB. Evidence and implications of abnormal predictive coding in dementia. *Brain*. 2021;144(11):3311-3321.

105. Hezemans FH, Wolpe N, Rowe JB. Apathy is associated with reduced precision of prior beliefs about action outcomes. *J Exp Psychol Gen*. 2020;149(9):1767-1777.

106. Hezemans FH, Wolpe N, O'Callaghan C, et al. Noradrenergic deficits contribute to apathy in Parkinson's disease through the precision of expected outcomes. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2022;18(5):e1010079.

107. Rankin KP, Kramer JH, Mychack P, Miller BL. Double dissociation of social functioning in frontotemporal dementia. *Neurology*. 2003;60(2):266-71.

108. Diehl J, Kurz A. Frontotemporal dementia: patient characteristics, cognition, and behaviour. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2002;17(10):914-8.

109. Massimo L, Libon DJ, Chandrasekaran K, et al. Self-appraisal in behavioural variant frontotemporal degeneration. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2013;84(2):148-53.

110. Rankin KP, Baldwin E, Pace-Savitsky C, Kramer JH, Miller BL. Self awareness and personality change in dementia. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2005;76(5):632-9.

111. Williams RS, Adams NE, Hughes LE, et al. Syndromes associated with frontotemporal lobar degeneration change response patterns on visual analogue scales. *Sci Rep*. 2023;13(1):8939.

112. Schulz R, Cook TB, Beach SR, et al. Magnitude and causes of bias among family caregivers rating Alzheimer disease patients. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*. 2013;21(1):14-25.

113. Eslinger PJ, Moore P, Troiani V, et al. Oops! Resolving social dilemmas in frontotemporal dementia. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2007;78(5):457-60.

114. Grossman M, Eslinger PJ, Troiani V, et al. The role of ventral medial prefrontal cortex in social decisions: converging evidence from fMRI and frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Neuropsychologia*. 2010;48(12):3505-12.