Real-world datasets for the International Registry for Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementias (InRAD) and other registries: an international consensus

Robert Perneczky[1,2,3,4,5]*, David Darby[6], Giovanni B. Frisoni[7], Robert Hyde[8], Takeshi Iwatsubo[9], Catherine J. Mummery[10], Kee Hyung Park[11], Johan van Beek [8], Wiesje M. van der Flier [12], Frank Jessen[13,14]

1. Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, LMU Hospital, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, Germany
2. German Centre for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE) Munich, Munich, Germany
3. Munich Cluster for Systems Neurology (SyNergy), Munich, Germany
4. Ageing Epidemiology Research Unit (AGE), School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK
5. Division of Neuroscience, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
6. Department of Neurology, School of Translational Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
7. Memory Center, Department of Rehabilitation and Geriatrics, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland
8. TW1 Healthcare Consulting Ltd., London, UK
9. Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
10. Dementia Research Centre, Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK
11. Department of Neurology, College of Medicine, Gachon University Gil Medical Centre, Incheon, Republic of Korea

12. Alzheimer Centre Amsterdam, University Medical Centers, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

13. Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

14. German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE) Cologne, Cologne, Germany

***Corresponding author**

Prof. Dr. Robert Perneczky

Email: robert.perneczky@med.uni-muenchen.de

Full postal address: Division of Mental Health in Older Adults, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, LMU Hospital, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Nussbaumstr. 7, 80336 Munich, Germany

Running title: Alzheimer's disease real-world data registry

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Many dementia and Alzheimer's disease (AD) registries operate at local or national levels without standardization or comprehensive real-world data (RWD) collection. This initiative sought to achieve consensus among experts on priority outcomes and measures for clinical practice in caring for patients with symptomatic AD, particularly in the mild cognitive impairment and mild to moderate dementia stages.

OBJECTIVE: The primary aim was to define a minimum dataset (MDS) and extended dataset (EDS) to collect RWD in the new International Registry for AD and Other Dementias (InRAD) and other AD registries. The MDS and EDS focus on informing routine clinical practice, covering relevant comorbidities and safety, and are designed to be easily integrated into existing data capture systems.

METHODS AND RESULTS: An international steering committee (ISC) of AD clinician experts lead the initiative. The first drafts of the MDS and EDS were developed based on a previous global inter-societal Delphi consensus on outcome measures for AD. Based on the ISC discussions, a survey was devised and sent to a wider stakeholder group. The ISC discussed the survey results, resulting in a consensus MDS and EDS covering: patient profile and demographics; lifestyle and anthropometrics; co-morbidities and diagnostics; imaging; treatment; clinical characterization; safety; discontinuation; laboratory tests; patient and care partner outcomes; and interface functionality.

CONCLUSION: By learning from successful examples in other clinical areas, addressing current limitations, and proactively enhancing data quality and analytical rigor, the InRAD registry will be a foundation to contribute to improving patient care and outcomes in neurodegenerative diseases.

Keywords

Real-world evidence; Alzheimer's disease care; international expert consensus; standardized datasets; clinical practice improvement; international large-data collaborations.

Introduction

The global landscape of dementia and Alzheimer's disease (AD) registries is fragmented, with many operating at local or national levels without standardization or longitudinal comprehensive real-world data (RWD) collection. This fragmentation limits advances in research and patient care. The Alzheimer Association's ALZ-NET registry in the USA is a notable example of progress, collecting data on AD patients treated with novel FDA-approved therapies [1], highlighting the need for similar international efforts. By collecting comprehensive, harmonized data globally, an international registry would provide valuable insights into disease progression, treatment effectiveness and patient outcomes [2]. The registry would foster sustainable collaboration, promote knowledge sharing, facilitate patient recruitment for clinical trials, and help collect RWD for regulatory purposes [3]. Real-world evidence (RWE) complements randomized controlled trials by confirming their external validity in less-selected populations drawn from routine clinical practice [1-3]. Regulatory authorities increasingly mandate registry studies and RWD collection as part of risk management plans and other post-approval requirements [4-6] including, for example, biologics for chronic inflammatory diseases and monoclonal antibodies targeting amyloid-β [7, 8].

A RWD registry would provide evidence of treatment efficacy and safety outside of research settings, filling gaps left by controlled clinical trials [9]. An international registry would also help identify patients most likely to respond to specific treatments, including demographic measures, disease progression markers and genetic factors, enabling a more personalized approach to care [10]. Without a RWD registry, the necessary data are unlikely to be available from routine medical records as these also lack data collection standards and completeness. By tracking long-term patient outcomes in larger numbers and more diverse groups than is possible with clinical trials, registries can provide valuable insights into

optimal care strategies, such as the best time to start or stop treatment, dosage adjustments, and managing side effects. Long-term tracking of patient outcomes will provide insights into optimal treatment strategies, and standardized biomarker assessments will facilitate early detection of AD, allowing for earlier intervention and more effective treatment [11].

Recent advances in interventions for early AD, particularly monoclonal antibodies targeting amyloid-β, have shown some efficacy and are being approved in different parts of the world [11]. These disease-modifying treatments (DMTs) slow disease progression and show positive results on different clinical and biomarker endpoints, including effective removal of amyloid-β from the brain as measured by positron-emission-tomography (PET). As these drugs become more widely used, it will be crucial to explore how their efficacy in clinical trials translates to meaningful benefits for the patients and their safety profiles in real-world situations. Many questions on drug effectiveness and safety cannot be answered through controlled trials alone, and setting up registries for individual therapies is undesirable, underscoring the need for a global initiative to collect RWD from patients with and without different types and brands of treatment, ensuring that post-marketing monitoring of safety and effectiveness can effectively be performed in actual clinical care. A global registry will help to set standards to improve the quality of care, facilitate the sharing of best practices, encourage the regular use of biomarkers in clinical practice, and help to avoid unnecessary treatments in patients unlikely to benefit.

The primary aim of this initiative was to define a minimum dataset (MDS) and extended dataset (EDS) to collect RWD in the new International Registry for AD and Other Dementias (InRAD) and across other AD registries globally. This effort sought to achieve consensus among experts on priority outcomes and measures for clinical practice in caring for patients with symptomatic AD, particularly in the mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and mild to moderate dementia stages. The MDS and EDS focus on informing routine clinical

practice, covering relevant comorbidities and safety, and are designed to be easily integrated into existing data capture systems. The MDS and EDS document clinical characteristics and allow tracking of both existing and upcoming AD treatments, offering flexibility to include new outcome measures and novel therapies entering healthcare.

Methods

Definitions

In this paper, MDS refers to domains completed by every user in the context of diagnosis and management of AD, such as demographics, disease history, current conditions, and effectiveness and safety outcomes. EDS refers to data collected where practice permits, when additional instruments are used (eg those mandated by local authorities or that are part of local clinical practice).

Organization of the consensus group

An international steering committee (ISC) of AD clinician experts was convened to lead the consensus initiative. This ISC comprised Robert Perneczky, Frank Jessen, David Darby, Giovanni Frisoni, Robert Hyde, Takeshi Iwatsubo, Catherine Mummery, Kee Hyung Park, Johan van Beek and Wiesje van der Flier. The overall aims and scope of the consensus were defined by this group and the process was managed by TW1 Healthcare Consulting Limited, London. The first drafts of the MDS and EDS were developed based on a previous global inter-societal Delphi consensus on outcome measures for AD [12] and additional data set established for the ALZ-NET project (www.alz-net.org/).

As a first step, a panel of participants was assembled (Table 1), representing key stakeholders who responded to a survey about the MDS and EDS. Stakeholders included clinical academics (N=72 out of 143 contacted individuals, response rate 50.4%), industry experts (N=4 companies) and patient representatives (N=4 organizations; one patient group provided two responses, and the weighting was adjusted to provide one response). Stakeholders from different geographical regions of the world were invited to respond to the survey to ensure that the consensus was relevant globally, including: 52 from Europe and Israel; 17 from Asia-Pacific Countries; and 3 from North America (Table 2). The academic

group covered a range of diverse backgrounds, including: 51 neurologists; 7 geriatricians; 4 psychiatrists; 4 imaging specialists; 4 neuropsychologists; as well as a genetics specialist and an electronic data capture expert.

Members of the ISC and contributors to the stakeholder discussion and survey were not compensated for their work on the project. Eli Lilly and Company funded the involvement of TW1 Healthcare Consulting Limited, but did not have any influence over the consensus process outside of their inclusion in the stakeholder involvement.

Consensus process

A meeting of the Steering Committee on 9 January 2024 discussed the first draft of the dataset. Based on these discussions, a survey was developed and sent to stakeholders between 9 and 26 February 2024. Survey respondents could designate each domain as MDS, EDS or 'not applicable' and comment on the frequency and/or measure used. Respondents could suggest additional domains and/ or outcomes for consideration by the ISC.

The survey results were discussed at ISC meetings held during the ADPD Conference in Lisbon on 5 March 2024 and on-line on 23 and 24 April 2024. Members who were unable to attend received copies of the minutes that they could comment upon. These comments were given the same weight as those from face-to-face and virtual attendees. The ISC discussed the safety and co-morbidity domains in detail during a series of virtual meetings between January and September 2024 and approved the final MDS and EDS in October 2024.

Consensus on each item was defined as at least 75% of participants agreeing that a domain should be in the MDS. Domains where 50% or fewer survey participants agreed were included in the EDS. The ISC discussed domains with 51% to 74% participants agreeing and decided whether the domain should be in the MDS or EDS. The survey included a 'not

relevant' option, although this was not selected for any domain by any participant. The ISC also considered and discussed suggestions provided in open fields related to data elements, regional accessibility to scales, outcomes or markers, and considered the responses from participating pharmaceutical companies and other organizations.

Discordances that arose between pharmaceutical companies and patient representatives and the academic and clinician survey participants were used to direct the discussion where there was no concordance and to contextualize the discussion regarding the needs of the different stakeholder groups and how this data element should be included. This was especially relevant when the academic consensus was less than 75% but greater than 50%.

Results

Informed consent will be mandatory and the availability of care partners and their willingness to be informants (assuming the patient agrees) will be ascertained. The ISC and consultation process resulted in a consensus MDS (Table 3) and EDS (Supplemental table 1). The domains are classified into several groups.

Domain one: patient profile and demographics

The MDS includes eight subsections from this domain. Each patient will receive a unique ID. The EDS allows the user to include other patient identifiers most of which would be used in the local data set and defined as Personal Identifiable Information (PII). This data would be used at the local center and not uploaded to the registry database.

The MDS also includes basic demographics: sex assigned at birth; date/year of birth; race/ethnicity; country of residence; and education (assessed using the International Standard Classification of Education [13]). All eight sub-domains will be entered at entry (when permitted by local guidelines). The availability of care partners and their willingness to be informants may be updated at each visit however continuity is highly recommended. The EDS includes further domains that may be of practical value or facilitate deeper characterizations [14] including martial and work status, linguistic ability (eg bilingual) [15, 16] and dominant hand [17, 18].

Domain two: lifestyle and anthropometrics

The MDS includes height (entry only) and weight (documented at entry and each clinic visit), which indicate body mass index [19]. The EDS includes further lifestyle domains: smoking, alcohol consumption, cannabis and recreational drug use, physical activity, active driving and sleep patterns [19-22].

Domain three: Co-morbidities and diagnostics

The ISC acknowledged the impracticality of collecting every co-morbidity. Therefore, the ISC agreed on a list of relevant concomitant medical conditions to be recorded in the MDS that influence AD risk or modify the course of cognitive impairment or activities of daily living, such as cerebrovascular and other vascular or cardiac disorders, [23] psychiatric conditions [24], other neurological/neurodegenerative conditions (including traumatic brain injury) as well as other significant other historic or on-going conditions including metabolic conditions (eg diabetes, obesity), malignancies, blood or lymphatic diseases, immune or autoimmune conditions, or history of severe or recurrent infections [25]. The ISC agreed to capture medicines for concomitant diseases that potentially modify dementia outcomes (eg metformin) [26] as well as antithrombotic and antiplatelet medications, which have implications for current antibody therapies for AD [27] and which manage certain co-morbidities [28].

The patient's history of these co-morbidities will be documented at entry to the registry. Current relevant co-morbidities will be updated at each clinic visit if ongoing. Whether there is a history of dementia in a first-degree relative, the date of the patient's symptom onset, date of diagnosis, the syndromic presentation and etiological diagnosis (AD and co-morbidities), and the predominant clinical syndrome during the first two years will be recorded if known. In a case where the subject presents as asymptomatic or other syndromic presentation the changes in diagnosis can be added over time. In addition, the MDS will include as biomarker information the amyloid-β and tau-status, and whether there is evidence of neurodegeneration on imaging (see also domain group 4), with a 'not performed' option in the case where access to tests or imaging is limited.

The EDS includes further domains including details of the referral pathway, the specialty of the diagnosing physician and whether patients are or have been enrolled on a

clinical trial. The EDS allows users to input the results of plasma neurofilament light chain measurements, and new biomarkers will be added as they become available.

Domain four: Imaging

The MDS will include whether structural brain imaging was performed. These details will be input at entry and each clinic visit. The EDS contains detailed imaging-related domains including the scanner and magnet field strength, where relevant, information on atrophy, vascular lesion, and microbleeds, results of PET quantification and information on dopamine transporter imaging. A cloud-based repository and analysis platform for the images is in development.

Domain five: treatment

The MDS includes treatments prescribed for AD focusing on DMTs and symptomatic and other treatments of interest, including acetylcholinesterase inhibitors, memantine and nutritional supplements. The three MDS domains in this group will be collected at entry and updated at each visit. Moreover, the MDS includes the details (eg dose, route and frequency), and start, change and stop dates. Approved therapies will be presented as a drop-down list with international non-proprietary name (INN) and brand names. Other medicines will be entered as the INN rather than brand name. The list will be updated as new therapies become available.

Domain six: clinical characterization

The MDS includes four subsections from this domain - global, cognitive, functional, milestones - all of which will be collected at entry and updated at each visit (table 3). Global clinical staging will use the 2024 Alzheimer's Association Workgroup revised criteria for

diagnosis and staging of AD [29] based on clinical judgement to assign patients to one of six stages [29]:

- Stage 0: Asymptomatic, deterministic gene
- Stage 1: Asymptomatic, biomarker evidence only
- Stage 2: Transitional decline – mild detectable change, but minimal impact on daily function
- Stage 3: Cognitive impairment with early functional impact
- Stage 4: Dementia with mild functional impairment
- Stage 5: Dementia with moderate functional impairment
- Stage 6: Dementia with severe functional impairment

The ISC recommended that measures of cognitive function, such as the Mini-Mental Status Examination (MMSE) [12, 30, 31] and /or the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) [12, 32, 33] should be part of the MDS. The clinician will determine whether the patient has attained a functional milestone. Given that activities of daily living scales are not part of the clinical routine assessment in most settings, the ISC does not recommend a specific instrument but rather agreed to monitor changes in three specific milestones (work status, driving status and living status) that impact on the life of the person with AD and their family.

Other assessments used in clinical practice can be entered into the EDS. In addition, as part of post-approval commitments, regulators may mandate completion of specific measures, such as the Clinical Dementia Rating Sum of Boxes (CDR-SB) [34, 35]. Therefore, CDR-SB is part of the EDS alongside other functional instruments such as the Neuropsychiatric Inventory Questionnaire (NPI-Q) [36] and the Utilization in Dementia-Lite (RUD-Lite) score [37, 38].

Domain seven: safety

The MDS includes four subsections from this domain, all of which will be collected at each visit. The ISC acknowledged the impracticality of collecting every adverse event in clinical practice as the common events are known and documented in the label. The characterization of adverse events as related to a single therapeutic agent has also proved problematic in the real-world setting, and was raised in the survey, as subjects may be on or off therapy; hence the adoption of a universal term “Medical Events” has been recommended and is used in other disease registries. Medical events of special interest (MESI; table 3) are collected, which segregate into two main groups: (1) MESI related to AD therapy (eg ARIA and infusion/injection reactions, including hypersensitivity) and (2) emergent MESIs that may have a direct or immediate impact on the patient’s functional status including serious malignancy, other neurological conditions, or fulfilling the criteria for a serious adverse event (SAE). A SAE results in death, is life-threatening, requires hospitalization or prolongation of existing hospitalization, results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity, or is a birth defect [39].

All ARIA [40] are included in the MDS, as required in registries on antibodies targeting amyloid-β [7] with management strategy (eg drug discontinuation, treatment resumption and outcome). In addition, the MDS includes infusion and injection reactions; and other adverse events that the ISC agreed were of interest. Additional events (eg hospitalization, out-patient, rehabilitation, treatment regimen modification) can be entered into the EDS.

Domain eight: discontinuation

At the final visit at which the patient leaves the registry, the clinician will record the reason for discontinuation, such as death or withdrawal of consent [41].

Domain nine: laboratory tests

The laboratory test information for the EDS includes the biomarkers amyloid-β, tau, ptau and additional biomarkers as well as genetic information (*APOE* genotype) plus whether any material was biobanked and the assay used. In addition, standard blood chemistry and haematology fields will be available if needed.

Domain ten: patient and care partner outcomes

The following measures of patient and care partner assessments are included in the EDS: the Quality of Life in AD scale (QoL-AD) [42, 43], Euro-QoL 5 dimensions 5 levels (EQ-5D-5L) [44, 45], the Dependence Scale [46], the Zarit Burden Interview [47, 48], the Amsterdam Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Questionnaire (A-IADL-Q) [49-51], and the AD Cooperative Study - Activities of Daily Living Scale for use in MCI (ADSC_ADL-MCI) [52].

Interface functionality

The ISC agreed that the interface capturing the MDS and EDS will use a combination of drop-down menus, yes/no boxes and open-text fields. Figure 1 shows an example of the data-tree structure. As an example, living status (eg caregiver involvement) is entered at first visit. The healthcare professional checks whether there has been a change at each visit using yes/no boxes. If yes, the change is noted using a standard drop-down list and an open-text field that allows the inclusion of additional information. The data set includes a drop-down menu of ethnicity, with an open-text field for additional information.

The ICS recommended that a prompt should remind users to complete specific items at each visit to ensure rapid and complete follow up with a time stamped denominator in all subjects over time. Each event occurrence should be described using standardized coding (eg

Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities; MedDRA). The ISC also advocated prompts for treatment changes and co-morbidities, including documenting no change, which is considered as important as a change when using the registry to assess risk and disease progression.

Discussion

RWD registries aim to bridge the gap between clinical trials and everyday clinical practice, providing comprehensive datasets reflecting the diverse patient populations and treatment scenarios encountered in real-world settings. We propose a registry-agnostic, internationally agreed MDS and EDS to collect practice-based RWD in AD of data arising in routine care, including patient history, clinical and biomarker outcomes, and safety profiles of drugs.

These datasets were composed by a consensus process including a diverse group of key stakeholders, aiming to create a common base while being sensitive to local, national and international variations in access to technology (eg neuroimaging [53, 54] and other biomarkers), measures in practice, such as the preferred cognitive assessment, clinician time constraints and existing or upcoming registries. This process resulted in a unified and internationally acceptable standard for RWD collection to support the evolution of AD care and to improve the study of the natural disease course and intervention effects.

The definition of the MDS and EDS was coordinated by InRAD (www.inradnetwork.org), a new interactive, dynamic, multinational effort to collect, organize, and provide feedback based on data collected in routine clinical practice. InRAD will use the datasets to capture and report longitudinal individual and aggregated data, with the launch in 2025 of a cloud-based, secure platform for data storage, sharing and analysis. The registry will be managed by a non-profit organization (InRAD Foundation) with an independent scientific leadership group, allowing partner sites to retain full ownership and control over their data. InRAD will be free to use and provide the participating clinicians with useful information about their patients at the point-of-care to facilitate patient counselling and education, and track and present changes in outcomes.

InRAD is distinguished from other large prospective AD data collections, such as ALZ-NET [55], and the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) [56], through its

unique focus on integrating RWD from diverse clinical settings. While ALZ-NET is specifically designed to collect RWE on the effectiveness and side effects of new FDA-approved AD treatments, and NACC provides a comprehensive dataset from multiple AD Research Centers across the US, InRAD emphasizes a broader, more inclusive approach, capturing data from a wide array of healthcare environments. This inclusivity allows InRAD to provide a representative picture of AD management in everyday clinical practice, leading to generalizable findings for application to improving patient care.

The utility of RWD has been well-documented in other medical fields, particularly in oncology, cardiology, diabetes, and rheumatology. In oncology, RWD plays an important role in drug development, present across all development stages. For instance, a review of cancer drugs authorized by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) in 2018-2019 indicated that RWD was used 100% in discovery, 37.5% in early development, 58.3% in clinical development, 62.5% in registration decision and 100% in post-authorization lifecycle management [57]. In cardiology, registries like the American College of Cardiology's National Cardiovascular Data Registry (NCDR) [58] have significantly contributed to improving cardiovascular care. These registries collect data on various cardiovascular conditions and procedures, helping to identify best practices and improve patient outcomes [59].

In the field of diabetes, RWD have been pivotal in improving the prevention and management of diabetes-related outcomes. The PIONEER REAL Switzerland study [60], for example, provided valuable insights into the effectiveness of oral semaglutide in routine clinical practice, showing significant reductions in glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) and body weight among participants, supporting the drug's use in real-world settings. RWD is also the foundation of studying the effectiveness of semaglutide in AD [61, 62]. RWD are also widely collected in MS. InRAD is based on well-established secure, two-system platform used in

MS (MSBase). Sub-studies using MSBase helped investigate diverse, but clinically important issues, such as: disease activity in pregnant and postpartum women receiving DMTs [63]; DMT prescribing patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic [64]; and routine CSF parameters as predictors of disease course [65].

Despite the promising potential of RWD, some limitations must be acknowledged. One major challenge is the variability in data quality and completeness. RWD are often collected from diverse sources, including electronic health records, insurance claims, and patient registries, which can lead to inconsistencies and gaps in the data. Additionally, the observational nature of RWD studies can introduce biases that are not present in randomized controlled trials. These biases can affect the validity of the findings and limit the generalizability of the results. Another limitation is the lack of standardization in data collection and reporting. Different healthcare systems and institutions may use varying methods to capture and record data, making it difficult to aggregate and compare data across different settings. Furthermore, the use of RWD requires sophisticated analytical techniques to account for confounding factors and ensure robust and reliable results. The consensus MDS and EDS proposed here will mitigate some of these limitations by helping participating clinics to collect standardized data. Furthermore, InRAD will provide an umbrella governance structure, including central statistical support to reduce bias by using advanced methods such as propensity score methods, instrumental variable analysis, and machine learning algorithms to control for confounding variables and improve the robustness of the results.

Conclusions

The primary aim was to define a MDS and EDS to collect RWD in InRAD and other AD registries. The MDS and EDS focus on informing routine clinical practice, covering relevant comorbidities and safety, and are designed to be easily integrated into existing data capture systems. The consensus MDS and EDS covers: patient profile and demographics; lifestyle and anthropometrics; co-morbidities and diagnostics; imaging; treatment; clinical characterization; safety; discontinuation; laboratory tests; patient and care partner outcomes; and interface functionality. The InRAD registry is being developed with the aim of advancing the field of AD care and research using RWD. By learning from successful examples in oncology, cardiology, diabetes, rheumatology and neuroinflammatory conditions like MS, addressing current limitations, and taking proactive steps to enhance data quality and analytical rigor, the registry will significantly contribute to improving patient care and outcomes in neurodegenerative diseases like AD.

Disclosures

RP has received research grants from Roche, Astra Zeneca, Bayer, Takeda and GE. He has received speaker and consultancy honoraria from Roche, Eisai, Biogen, Janssen-Cilag, Lilly, GE, AstraZeneca, Grifols, Novo Nordisk, Abbvie and GSK. RP is a the founding chairman of the board of InRAD Foundation, which is supported by Lilly, Biogen, Novo Nordisk and GSK. FJ received a research grant from Roche and honoraria for presentations and consultancy services from Abbvie, AC immune, Biogen, Eli Lilly, Eisai, GE Healthcare, Grifols, Janssen-Cliag and Roche. FJ is a founding member of the board of InRAD Foundation. DD has received honoraria as a clinical lecturer and funding received support for investigator-initiated studies (or clinical meetings) from Biogen, Merck, Novartis, Lilly and Nutricia. He is a founder of Cogstate Ltd but retains no commercial or stock interest in this company. He is an independent software developer of medical applications with CereScape P/L. CJM has served on advisory boards or consulted for Biogen, Roche, WAVE, IONIS, Prevail, Eli Lilly, Novartis, Neuroimmune, AviadoBio, GSK, MSD and Eisai. She received an investigator grant from Biogen for the development of ultrafast MRI. She has received honoraria for lectures at sponsored symposia for Biogen, Roche, EISAI, IONIS, Lilly. She is supported by the UCLH Biomedical Research Centre. RH, JVB, GF, TI, KHP and WMF have no disclosures.

Acknowledgements

Mark Greener, on behalf of TW1 Healthcare Consulting Limited, provided medical writing support. TW1 Healthcare Consulting Limited provided project management support. TW1 receives consulting fees from InRAD. RP is supported by the German Center for Neurodegenerative Disorders (Deutsches Zentrum für Neurodegenerative Erkrankungen, DZNE), the Hirnliga e.V. (Manfred-Strohscheer Stiftung) and the Deutsche

Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, 1007 German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy within the framework of 1008 the Munich Cluster for Systems Neurology (EXC 2145 SyNergy – ID 390857198), the Davos Alzheimer's Collaborative, the VERUM Foundation, the Robert-Vogel-Foundation, the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Sheffield Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203321), the University of Cambridge – Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich Strategic Partnership within the framework of the German Excellence Initiative and Excellence Strategy and the European Commission under the Innovative Health Initiative program (project 101132356).

The authors would like to thank the following for their contributions to the discussions regarding the MDS and EDS:

Carlos Acosta, Biogen

Jane Alty, University of Tasmania, Australia

Luisa Alves, Centro Clínico Académico de Lisboa-Nova Medical School, Portugal

Rhoda Au, Boston University, USA

Wing Chi Lisa Au, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, UK

Joanne Bell, Eisai

Başar Bilgiç, Istanbul University, Turkey

Vanessa Raymont, University of Oxford

Daniel J Blackburn, University of Sheffield, UK

Casper de Boer, Amsterdam UMC, the Netherlands

Riad Bournane, Eisai

Noa Bregman, Tel Aviv Medical Center, and Tel Aviv University, Israel

Amy Brodtmann, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Maja Katharina Grav Christensen, Eastern Health, Victoria, Australia

Sharon Cohen, Toronto Memory Program, Canada

Ana Sofia Costa, University Hospital RWTH, Aachen, Germany;

Elizabeth Coulthard, University of Bristol, UK

Virginie Dauphinot, Lyon University Hospital, France

Firuze Delen, Başakşehir Çam and Sakura City Hospital, Istanbul, Turkey

Sebastiaan Engelborghs, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Universtair Ziekenhuis Brussels, Belgium

Nesrin Ergin, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey

Maria Eriksdotter, Karolinska Institutet and Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden

Michael Ewers, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Germany

Ansgar Felbecker, Kantonsspital St Gallen, Switzerland

Tormod Fladby, Akershus University Hospital, University of Oslo, Norway

Kristian Steen Frederiksen, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

Antoine Garnier-Crussard, Charpennes Hospital and Hospices Civils de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France

Hasmet Hanagasi, Istanbul Faculty Of Medicine, Turkey

Masud Husain, University of Oxford, UK

Pervin Işeri, Yeni Yüzyıl University, Istanbul, Turkey

Jung Lung Hsu, New Taipei Municipal TuCheng Hospital, Taiwan

Ignacio Illán-Gala, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Barcelona, Spain

Matthew Jones, Salford Royal Hospital, UK

Sean P Kennelly, Tallaght University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland

Chi-Hun Kim, Hallym University Sacred Heart Hospital, Pyeongchang, South Korea

Eun-Joo Kim, Pusan National University School of Medicine and Medical Research Institute, Busan, South Korea

Sean Knox, Biogen

Seong-Ho Koh, Hanyang University Guri Hospital, Guri-si, South Korea

Natasha Krishnadas, Florey Institute of Neurosciences & Mental Health, Victoria, Australia

Inês Laranjinha, Unidade Local de Saúde de Santo António, Porto, Portugal

Charlene Lee, Peninsula Health, Victoria, Australia

Teresa Leon, Novo Nordisk

Iracema Leroi, Trinity College and Global Brain Health Institute Dublin, Ireland

Johannes Levin, LMU Munich, Germany

Jae-Sung Lim, Asan Medical Center, Seoul, South Korea

Marco Lyons, Roche Products Ltd

Francesca Mangialasche, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

Rafael Meyer, Psychiatrische Dienste Aargau AG, Windisch, Switzerland

Maas Christoph Mollenhauer, Wellington Hospital, New Zealand

Andreas U Monsch, University of Basel, Switzerland

So Young Moon, Ajou University School of Medicine, Suwon, South Korea

Diego Novick, Eli Lilly & Company

Sean O'Dowd, Tallaght University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland

Tiago Gil Oliveira, University of Minho, Portugal

Pierre Jean Ousset, Toulouse University Hospital, France

Alessandro Padovani, University of Brescia, Italy

Ming-Chyi Pai, Medical College and Hospital, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

Richard J Perry, Imperial College and Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London UK

Boris-Stephan Rauchmann, University Hospital LMU, Munich, Germany

Pascual Sánchez-Juan, Reina Sofia-CIEN Foundation-ISCIII, Madrid, Spain

Maria Isabel Jacinto Santana, Centro Hospitalar e Universit rio de Coimbra, Portugal

Nikolaos Scarmeas, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece and Columbia University, New York, USA

Jörg B. Schulz, RWTH Aachen University, Germany

Geir Selbaek, Vestfold Hositpal Trust, Tønsberg, Norway

Tamara Shiner, Tel Aviv University, Isreal

Cathy Short, Central Adelaide Local Health Network, Australia

Jón Snædal, Landspitali University Hospital, Reykjavík, Iceland

Eino Solje, University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio and Kuopio University Hospital Finland

Marc Sollberger, Die Universitäre Altersmedizin Felix Platter, Basel, Switzerland

Luiza Spiru, Ana Aslan International Foundation, Bucharest, Romania

Sofia Toniolo, University of Oxford, UK

Gorkem Tutal Gursoy, Ankara Bilkent City Hospital, Turkey

Sven J van der Lee, Amsterdam UMC, the Netherlands

Jo Vandercappellen, Eisai

Alberto Villarejo-Galende, Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre and Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Huali Wang, Peking University Institute of Mental Health, China

Wendy Weidner, Alzheimer's Disease International

Yuval Zabar, Biogen

References

1. Liu, F. and D. Panagiotakos, *Real-world data: a brief review of the methods, applications, challenges and opportunities*. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2022. **22**(1): p. 287.

2. Sheldrick, R.C., *Randomized trials vs real-world evidence: how can both inform decision-making?* JAMA, 2023. **329**(16): p. 1352-1353.

3. Blonde, L., et al., *Interpretation and impact of real-world clinical data for the practicing clinician*. Adv Ther, 2018. **35**(11): p. 1763-1774.

4. European Medicines Agency, *Reflection paper on use of real-world data in non-interventional studies to generate real-world evidence. Available at https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/reflection-paper-use-real-world-data-non-interventional-studies-generate-real-world-evidence-scientific-guideline. Accessed November 2024*. p. .

5. Food and Drug Administration, *Real-world data: assessing registries to support regulatory decision-making for drug and biological products. Available at https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/real-world-data-assessing-registries-support-regulatory-decision-making-drug-and-biological-products. Accessed August 2024.*

6. Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health, *Real-world evidence for decision-making. Available at https://www.cadth.ca/real-world-evidence-decision-making. Accessed November 2024.*

7. Socal, M.P., I.C. Odouard, and H. Kharrazi, *Ownership and interoperability challenges of Alzheimer monoclonal antibody registries*. JAMA Neurol, 2024. **81**(2): p. 109-110.

8. Kroes, J.A., et al., *Blueprint for harmonising unstandardised disease registries to allow federated data analysis: prepare for the future.* ERJ Open Res, 2022. **8**(4).

9. Kennedy, M., et al., *Science Club's Secret Sauce.* ASTC Dimens, 2017. **2017**: p. 16-17.

10. Chen, X., et al., *Contact Guidance Drives Upward Cellular Migration at the Mesoscopic Scale.* Cell Mol Bioeng, 2023. **16**(3): p. 205-218.

11. Perneczky, R., et al., *Anti-amyloid antibody therapies in Alzheimer's disease.* Brain, 2023. **146**(3): p. 842-849.

12. Ellison, T.S., et al., *Outcome measures for Alzheimer's disease: a global inter-societal Delphi consensus.* Alzheimers Dement, 2023. **19**(6): p. 2707-2729.

13. United Nations Educational, S.a.C.O.I.f.S., *International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011; available at https://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf. Accessed November 2024.*

14. Delude, C.M., *Deep phenotyping: The details of disease.* Nature, 2015. **527**(7576): p. S14-5.

15. Paulavicius, A.M., et al., *Bilingualism for delaying the onset of Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. Eur Geriatr Med, 2020. **11**(4): p. 651-658.

16. Liu, H. and L. Wu, *Lifelong bilingualism functions as an alternative intervention for cognitive reserve against Alzheimer's disease*. Front Psychiatry, 2021. **12**: p. 696015.

17. Abuduaini, Y., W. Chen, and X.-Z. Kong, *Handedness in Alzheimer's disease: A systematic review.* Brain Res, 2024. **1840**: p. 149131.

18. Ryan, J.J., D.S. Kreiner, and A.M. Paolo, *Handedness of healthy elderly and patients with Alzheimer's disease.* Int J Neurosci, 2020. **130**(9): p. 875-883.

19. Livingston, G., et al., *Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2024 report of the Lancet standing Commission.* Lancet, 2024. **404**(10452): p. 572-628.

20. Irwin, M.R. and M.V. Vitiello, *Implications of sleep disturbance and inflammation for Alzheimer's disease dementia.* Lancet Neurol, 2019. **18**(3): p. 296-306.

21. Li, S., et al., *Impact of the cannabinoid system in Alzheimer's Disease.* Curr Neuropharmacol, 2023. **21**(3): p. 715-726.

22. Pilozzi, A., et al., *A brief review on the potential of psychedelics for treating Alzheimer's Disease and related depression.* Int J Mol Sci, 2023. **24**(15).

23. Takeda, S., H. Rakugi, and R. Morishita, *Roles of vascular risk factors in the pathogenesis of dementia.* Hypertens Res, 2020. **43**(3): p. 162-167.

24. Botto, R., et al., *Anxiety and depression in Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review of pathogenetic mechanisms and relation to cognitive decline.* Neurol Sci, 2022. **43**(7): p. 4107-4124.

25. Patel, V. and P. Edison, *Cardiometabolic risk factors and neurodegeneration: a review of the mechanisms underlying diabetes, obesity and hypertension in Alzheimer's disease*. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry, 2024. **95**(6): p. 581-589.

26. Aderinto, N., et al., *Metformin mitigates dementia risk among individuals with type 2 diabetes*. Clin Diabetes Endocrinol, 2024. **10**(1): p. 10.

27. Honig, L.S., et al., *Updated safety results from phase 3 lecanemab study in early Alzheimer's disease*. Alzheimers Res Ther, 2024. **16**(1): p. 105.

28. Ali Babar, B., et al., *Prevalence of oral anticoagulant use among people with and without Alzheimer's disease.* BMC Geriatrics, 2022. **22**(1): p. 464.

29. Jack, C.R., Jr., et al., *Revised criteria for diagnosis and staging of Alzheimer's disease: Alzheimer's Association Workgroup*. Alzheimers Dement, 2024. **20**(8): p. 5143-5169.

30. Cullen, B., et al., *Screening for dementia in an Irish community sample using MMSE: a comparison of norm-adjusted versus fixed cut-points.* Int J Geriatr Psychiatry, 2005. **20**(4): p. 371-6.

31. Huppert, F.A., S.T. Cabelli, and F.E. Matthews, *Brief cognitive assessment in a UK population sample - distributional properties and the relationship between the MMSE and an extended mental state examination.* BMC Geriatr, 2005. **5**: p. 7.

32. Freitas, S., et al., *Construct validity of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA).* J Int Neuropsychol Soc, 2012. **18**(2): p. 242-50.

33. Freitas, S., et al., *Montreal cognitive assessment: validation study for mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer disease.* Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord, 2013. **27**(1): p. 37-43.

34. Muralidharan, K.K., et al., *Characterization of exposure-Clinical Dementia Rating-Sum of Boxes relationship in subjects with early Alzheimer's disease from the aducanumab Phase 3 trials.* J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn, 2023. **50**(1): p. 45-62.

35. McDougall, F., et al., *Psychometric properties of the Clinical Dementia Rating - Sum of Boxes and other cognitive and functional outcomes in a prodromal alzheimer's disease population.* J Prev Alzheimers Dis, 2021. **8**(2): p. 151-160.

36. Kaufer, D.I., et al., *Validation of the NPI-Q, a brief clinical form of the Neuropsychiatric Inventory.* J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci, 2000. **12**(2): p. 233-9.

37. Wimo, A., et al., *Application of Resource Utilization in Dementia (RUD) instrument in a global setting.* Alzheimers Dement, 2013. **9**(4): p. 429-435.e17.

38. Wimo, A. and B. Winblad, *Resource Utilization in Dementia: RUD Lite.* Brain Aging, 2003. **3**(1): p. 48-59.

39. European Medicines Agency, *Serious adverse reaction. Available at https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/glossary/serious-adverse-reaction. Accessed November 2024*.

40. Thambisetty, M. and R. Howard, *Conveying risks of harm in Alzheimer disease by amyloid lowering.* JAMA, 2024.

41. Happich, M., et al., *Excess costs associated with possible misdiagnosis of Alzheimer's disease among patients with vascular dementia in a UK CPRD population.* J Alzheimers Dis, 2016. **53**(1): p. 171-83.

42. Logsdon, R.G., et al., *Assessing quality of life in older adults with cognitive impairment.* Psychosom Med, 2002. **64**(3): p. 510-9.

43. Torisson, G., et al., *Reliability, validity and clinical correlates of the Quality of Life in Alzheimer's disease (QoL-AD) scale in medical inpatients.* Health Qual Life Outcomes, 2016. **14**: p. 90.

44. EuroQol Group, *EuroQol -a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life.* Health Policy, 1990. **16**(3): p. 199-208.

45. Easton, T., et al., *An empirical comparison of the measurement properties of the EQ-5D-5L, DEMQOL-U and DEMQOL-Proxy-U for older people in residential care.* Qual Life Res, 2018. **27**(5): p. 1283-1294.

46. Zhu, C.W., B.G. Bruinsma, and Y. Stern, *Utility of the Dependence Scale in dementia: validity, meaningfulness, and health economic considerations.* Alz Res Ther, 2018. **10**(1): p. 78.

47. Zarit, S.H., K.E. Reever, and J. Bach-Peterson, *Relatives of the impaired elderly: correlates of feelings of burden.* Gerontologist, 1980. **20**(6): p. 649-55.

48. Zarit, S.H., P.A. Todd, and J.M. Zarit, *Subjective burden of husbands and wives as caregivers: a longitudinal study.* Gerontologist, 1986. **26**(3): p. 260-6.

49. Koster, N., et al., *The sensitivity to change over time of the Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire.* Alzheimers Dement, 2015. **11**(10): p. 1231-40.

50. Sikkes, S.A., et al., *Validation of the Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire©, a new tool to measure instrumental activities of daily living in dementia.* Neuroepidemiology, 2013. **41**(1): p. 35-41.

51. Sikkes, S.A., et al., *Assessment of instrumental activities of daily living in dementia: diagnostic value of the Amsterdam Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Questionnaire.* J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol, 2013. **26**(4): p. 244-50.

52. Potashman, M., et al., *Psychometric properties of the Alzheimer's Disease Cooperative Study – Activities of Daily Living for Mild Cognitive Impairment (ADCS-MCI-ADL) scale: a post hoc analysis of the ADCS ADC-008 trial.* BMC Geriatrics, 2023. **23**(1): p. 124.

53. Frija, G., et al., *How to improve access to medical imaging in low- and middle-income countries ?* eClin Med, 2021. **38**.

54. Jalloul, M., et al., *MRI scarcity in low- and middle-income countries*. NMR Biomed, 2023. **36**(12): p. e5022.

55. *Alzheimer's Association launches ALZ-NET: A long-term data collection and sharing network for new treatments.* Alzheimers Dement, 2022. **18**(9): p. 1694-1695.

56. Besser, L., et al., *Version 3 of the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center's Uniform Data Set*. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord, 2018. **32**(4): p. 351-358.

57. Eskola, S.M., et al., *The role of Real-World Data and evidence in oncology medicines approved in EU in 2018-2019.* J Cancer Policy, 2023. **36**: p. 100424.

58. Malenka, D.J., et al., *The National Cardiovascular Data Registry Data Quality Program 2020: JACC State-of-the-Art Review.* J Am Coll Cardiol, 2022. **79**(17): p. 1704-1712.

59. Ryan, T.J., et al., *ACC/AHA guidelines for the management of patients with acute myocardial infarction: executive summary. A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee on Management of Acute Myocardial Infarction).* Circulation, 1996. **94**(9): p. 2341-50.

60. Kick, A., et al., *Real-World Use of Oral Semaglutide in Adults with Type 2 Diabetes: The PIONEER REAL Switzerland Multicentre, Prospective, Observational Study.* Diabetes Ther, 2024. **15**(3): p. 623-637.

61. Norgaard, C.H., et al., *Treatment with glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists and incidence of dementia: Data from pooled double-blind randomized controlled trials and nationwide disease and prescription registers.* Alzheimers Dement (N Y), 2022. **8**(1): p. e12268.

62. Wang, W., et al., *Associations of semaglutide with first-time diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease in patients with type 2 diabetes: Target trial emulation using nationwide real-world data in the US.* Alzheimers Dement, 2024.

63. Yeh, W.Z., et al., *Disease activity in pregnant and postpartum women with multiple sclerosis receiving ocrelizumab or other disease-modifying therapies.* Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm, 2024. **11**(6): p. e200328.

64. Lal, A.P., et al., *A multi-centre longitudinal study analysing multiple sclerosis disease-modifying therapy prescribing patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic.* J Neurol, 2024. **271**(9): p. 5813-5824.

65. Dekeyser, C., et al., *Routine CSF parameters as predictors of disease course in multiple sclerosis: an MSBase cohort study.* J Neurol, Neurosurg Psychiatry, 2024. **95**(11): p. 1021-1031.

Table 1. Clinical, academic, patient representative and pharmaceutical company responses to the survey of the draft MDS and EDS

Clinical and academic specialty	**Number of responses (n=72)**
Neurologist	51
Geriatrician	7
Psychiatrist	4
Imaging	4
Neuropsychology	4
Genetics	1
Remote and electronic data capture expert	1
Patient representatives	**Number of responses (n=5)**
Alzheimer's Association	1
Alzheimer's Disease International	2*
Alzheimer Europe	1
Gates Ventures	1
Pharmaceutical company representatives	**Number of responses (n=4)**
Biogen	1
Eli Lilly & Company	1
Eisai	1
Roche Products	1

* Weighting adjusted to provide one response

Table 2. Clinical and academic responses to the survey by country

Country	Number of responses (n=72)
Australia	6
Belgium	1
Canada	1
China	1
Denmark	1
Germany	5
Finland	1
France	3
Greece	1
Hong Kong	1
Iceland	2
Ireland	2
Israel	2
Italy	1
Netherlands	4
New Zealand	1
Norway	3
Portugal	4
Republic of Korea	6
Romania	1
Spain	3
Sweden	2
Switzerland	4
Taiwan	2
Turkey	6
United Kingdom	6
United States of America	2

Table 3. Domains identified by the International Steering Committee and items identified for the minimum dataset

Domain	Minimum dataset items
Patient profile	Consent; care partner; sex; birth year; ethnicity; country of birth/residence; education; living status;
Lifestyle/anthropometrics	Height/weight
Diagnostic work-up	Family history; date of onset; amyloid-β status; tau status; neurodegeneration status (imaging and non-imaging); non-AD pathology (imaging and non-imaging); medical history
Imaging	Imaging performed; type of scan; reason
Laboratory tests	None included in minimum dataset
Treatment	AD specific; cognitive enhancers
Clinical outcome measures	Global staging; cognitive screening test (MMSE or MoCA); ADL test completed; milestone events
Safety	SAE; ARIA; infusion reaction; other event of interest
Patient- and care partner-oriented	None included in minimum dataset
Discontinuation	Reason

AD: Alzheimer's disease; SAE: serious adverse event; ARIA: amyloid-related imaging abnormality.

Figure 1: Example of data tree structure



ARIA: amyloid-related imaging abnormalities; E: extravasation of fluid causing central oedema;
H: cerebral microhaemorrhages; MedDRA: Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities.