Title: Neighborhood deprivation moderates prognosis in behavioral-variant frontotemporal degeneration.

Authors:

Rory Boyle[1], Nadia Dehghani[1], Sheina Emrani[1], Anil R. Wadhwani[1], Melanie Matyi[1], Katheryn A.Q. Cousins[1], Emma Rhodes[1], Brian Nelson[1], Shana D. Stites[2], Sharon X. Xie[3], Laynie Dratch[1], Vivianna M. Van Deerlin[4], Allison Snyder[1], David Irwin[1], Corey T. McMillan[1], Lauren Massimo[1*]

Affiliations:

1. Penn Frontotemporal Degeneration Center, Department of Neurology, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, 3400 Spruce St, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
2. Department of Psychiatry, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, 3400 Spruce St, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
3. Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, 423 Guardian Drive, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
4. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Pennsylvania; 3400 Spruce St, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

*Corresponding author:

Lauren Massimo, Penn Frontotemporal Degeneration Center – University of Pennsylvania, B601, Richards Building, 3700 Hamilton Walk, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19104, USA.

Email: Lauren.Massimo@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

Abstract

INTRODUCTION: Neighborhood deprivation has been associated with shorter survival, cognitive impairment and neurodegeneration in aging and Alzheimer's disease. However, the association of neighborhood deprivation with disease progression in behavioral-variant frontotemporal degeneration (bvFTD) is unknown.

METHODS: We examined associations between tertiles of neighborhood deprivation, using the Area Deprivation Index (ADI), and survival in 311 individuals clinically diagnosed with bvFTD from the Penn Frontotemporal Degeneration (FTD) Center. In a subset of participants with complete baseline data across measures of global cognition, executive function, and language (n=163), we examined the association of ADI with longitudinal change.

RESULTS: Higher neighborhood deprivation was associated with shorter survival after symptom onset and faster decline in global cognition, executive and language functions, independent of genetic risk.

DISCUSSION: Living in more deprived neighborhoods (i.e. above the 50th percentile nationally) was associated with an accelerated disease course in bvFTD, highlighting an important socioeconomic disparity in disease prognosis.

Clinical Trial Registration Information: N/A

1. Introduction

Frontotemporal degeneration (FTD) is a common cause of early-onset dementia with no known cure. It is an understudied neurodegenerative disease that affects the frontal and temporal lobes of the brain and results in progressive deterioration in executive function, language and social comportment. This disease ultimately leads to death but there is considerable variability in survival across pathological subtypes of frontotemporal lobar degeneration (FTLD) [1]. Behavioral variant frontotemporal degeneration (bvFTD) is the most common FTD syndrome [2,3]. There is substantial heterogeneity in the progression of bvFTD across individuals [4] with a median survival from symptom onset of ~10 years reported in clinical cohorts [5], although a lower median survival of ~6 years is reported in autopsy-confirmed frontotemporal lobar degeneration (FTLD) cases [6]. This heterogeneity presents a major barrier to successful therapeutic interventions given that clinical trial endpoints are challenging to meet without the knowledge of factors that contribute to variable prognosis.

Genetics account for a portion of the heterogeneity in survival and cognitive decline in bvFTD. The presence of a pathogenic (disease-causing) variant in any of the three most common genes associated with autosomal dominant FTD (*MAPT, GRN, C9orf72*) is associated with reduced survival [7]. More rapid cognitive decline is also associated with the presence of a *C9orf72* expansion [8]. Moreover, several common genetic variants including single nucleotide polymorphisms have been associated with reduced survival[9] and more rapid cognitive decline[10,11].

Beyond genetics and distinct pathological subgroups of bvFTD, individual-level socioeconomic and lifestyle factors also explain variability in disease progression in

bvFTD [6,12,13] and are therefore thought to contribute to resilience, i.e. better-than-expected cognitive or clinical outcomes given the degree of neurodegenerative disease [14,15]. Better-than-expected outcomes given the degree of genetic risk for neurodegenerative disease also provides evidence for resilience, as seen in Alzheimer's disease (AD), where slower cognitive decline in apoliprotein-E(*APOE*)-ε4 carriers is associated with higher education and literacy levels [16]. Although resilience is somewhat understudied in FTD compared to AD, there is evidence for protective effects of education, occupation, and leisure activities in FTD [17]. For instance, higher educational and occupational attainment have been associated with better cognitive performance [12] and longer survival in FTD [6].

An additional, under-explored source of heterogeneity in bvFTD is neighborhood socioeconomic deprivation, which has been linked to variability in cognitive aging and neurodegenerative disease [18]. Living in socioeconomically deprived neighborhoods can impair access to quality food, education, and healthcare, and is associated with increased exposure to harmful environmental factors [19], increased stress and worse health outcomes [20,21], including earlier mortality [22]. The relative deprivation of a neighborhood can be quantified using composite indices, such as the Area Deprivation Index (ADI), which summarizes neighborhood-level information on education, employment, housing, and poverty, collected from the American Community Survey [20,23]. A systematic review of 15 studies reported that higher neighborhood deprivation was associated with worse cognitive function in older adults [24], which has been further confirmed in several large international cohorts [25–28]. Moreover, neighborhood deprivation is associated with an increased risk of dementia [29,30], worse late-life

cognitive function [31], shorter survival following dementia diagnosis [32], faster cognitive decline [33], and faster cortical thinning in AD-relevant regions, including the entorhinal, precuneus, and middle temporal regions [33]. Recently, we demonstrated that higher neighborhood deprivation, measured with the ADI, is associated with worse late-life cognitive function, independent of the effects of various neurodegenerative proteinopathies [31]. This suggests that neighborhood deprivation contributes to the heterogeneity in neurodegenerative disease outcomes. While growing evidence suggests that neighborhood deprivation is detrimental for cognitive function and dementia-related outcomes, the association of neighborhood deprivation with disease severity and progression in bvFTD has not yet been studied.

Here, we aim to characterize the association of neighborhood deprivation with disease progression in bvFTD. Specifically, we evaluate the hypothesis that greater neighborhood deprivation, measured by the ADI, is associated with an accelerated disease course, characterized by shorter survival and faster cognitive decline.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

311 individuals from the Penn FTD Center (mean age at symptom onset = 59.75 years [SD = 8.89 years], 128 female participants/183 male participants) who met published clinical criteria for probable bvFTD [34] confirmed by a multidisciplinary consensus committee and had available Area Deprivation Index (ADI) data (see Table 1) were included in this study. We define age at symptom onset as an individual's age in which their symptoms were first noted (by themselves or their caregivers). These 311 individuals formed the group used in the survival analysis (hereafter referred to as the Survival group).

A subset of the Survival group had complete baseline data across all three selected measures of cognitive function (n = 161, mean age at symptom onset = 60.62 years [SD = 8.34 years], mean age at cognitive test baseline = 64.84 years [SD = 8.40 years], 61 female participants/100 male participants). This subset formed the group used for cognitive analyses (see Table 1, hereafter referred to as the Cognitive group) and their demographics did not differ from the Survival group (all p>.05, see Supplement e-Table 1). For the Cognitive group, we define disease duration as the time from symptom onset to their baseline cognitive test and the mean disease duration at baseline was 4.22 years [SD = 2.74 years].

25% of the Survival group and 26% of the Cognitive group had confirmed genetic etiology (the presence of an FTD-causing pathogenic variant, see Section 2.4 Genetic screening). 13% of the Survival group and 15% of the Cognitive group had co-diagnoses of FTLD-associated motor syndromes. All subjects or their proxies completed a written

informed consent procedure in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Pennsylvania.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of groups used in the survival and cognitive analyses.

	Survival group				Cognitive group			
Characteristic	**Lowest Deprivation (n = 129)**	**Intermediate Deprivation (n = 130)**	**Highest Deprivation (n = 52)**	**p**	**Lowest Deprivation (n = 72)**	**Intermediate Deprivation (n = 64)**	**Highest Deprivation (n = 25)**	**p**
Age at symptom onset (y)	60.31 (8.20)	59.50 (9.43)	58.98 (9.20)	0.359	61.19 (8.03)	60.20 (8.50)	60.04 (9.06)	0.757
Symptom onset to initial visit years	3.61 (2.84)	2.91 (2.33)	3.38 (2.67)	0.064	3.61 (2.49)	2.98 (2.04)	4.00 (2.96)	0.219
Sex *(Female)*	55 (43%)	55 (42%)	18 (35%)	0.575	28 (39%)	28 (44%)	5 (20%)	0.113
Race				0.961				0.882
Asian	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)		1 (1.4%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	
Black or African American	2 (1.6%)	4 (3.1%)	2 (3.8%)		1 (1.4%)	2 (3.1%)	0 (0%)	
White	120 (93%)	122 (94%)	49 (94%)		68 (94%)	60 (94%)	24 (96%)	
More than One Race	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)		1 (1.4%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	
Unknown/Not Reported	3 (2.3%)	2 (1.5%)	1 (1.9%)		1 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.0%)	
Ethnicity *(Not Hispanic or Latino)*	127 (98%)	130 (100%)	52 (100%)	0.478	72 (100%)	64 (100%)	25 (100%)	-
Years of education	16.40 (2.62)	15.12 (2.96)	14.42 (2.69)	**<0.001**	16.49 (2.54)	15.63 (2.79)	14.84 (2.72)	**0.019**
Confirmed genetic etiology	28 (22%)	34 (26%)	15 (29%)	0.536	17 (24%)	15 (23%)	10 (40%)	0.226
Gene with pathogenic variant				0.709				0.319
C9orf72	13 (46%)	20 (59%)	9 (60%)		8 (47%)	10 (67%)	6 (60%)	
GRN	9 (32%)	4 (12%)	3 (20%)		5 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	
MAPT	5 (18%)	6 (18%)	3 (20%)		3 (18%)	2 (13%)	3 (30%)	
TARDBP	1 (3.6%)	1 (2.9%)	0 (0%)		1 (5.9%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	
TBK1	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	
VCP	0 (0%)	1 (2.9%)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	
Co-occurring motor syndrome *(Present)*	16 (12%)	12 (9.2%)	11(21%)	0.09	11 (15%)	8 (13%)	5 (20%)	0.664
Co-occurring motor syndrome type				0.088				0.184
ALS	10 (63%)	8 (67%)	9 (82%)		5 (45%)	5 (63%)	3 (60%)	
CBS	1 (6.3%)	4 (33%)	1 (9.1%)		1 (9.1%)	3 (38%)	1 (20%)	
PSP	5 (31%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.1%)		5 (45%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	
Age at test baseline	-	-	-	-	65.64 (8.58)	63.97 (8.20)	64.76 (8.53)	0.634
Disease duration at test baseline	-	-	-	-	4.44 (2.87)	3.77 (2.40)	4.72 (3.12)	0.326
Baseline MMSE Total	-	-	-	-	24.8 (4.3)	23.0 (5.5)	22.6 (5.8)	0.084
Baseline Digit Span Backwards	-	-	-	-	4.31 (1.45)	3.59 (1.66)	3.48 (1.66)	**0.011**
Baseline BNT	-	-	-	-	19 (9)	20 (9)	19 (8)	0.692

Note: ADI tertiles were compared using Kruskal-Wallis rank-sum tests for continuous variables and Pearson's Chi-squared test for categorical variables. Bold text denotes statistical significance at $p < 0.05$. See e-Figure 1 for post-hoc comparisons of baseline cognitive assessments. C9orf72 = C9orf72 hexanucleotide repeat expansion, GRN = Progranulin, MAPT = Microtubule-associated protein tau, TARDBP = Transactive response DNA-binding protein 43, TBK1 = TANK-binding kinase 1, VCP = Valosin-containing protein, ALS = Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, CBS = Corticobasal syndrome, PSP = Progressive supranuclear palsy. MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination, BNT = Boston Naming Test.

2.2 Area deprivation index

We assessed neighborhood deprivation using the ADI, which is a summary index of variables reflecting area-level income, education, employment, and housing quality characteristics[20]. Using 12-digit Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) codes from participants' first clinical visit, we obtained ADI values using the Neighborhood Atlas® website (https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu/). We used the 2020 ADI (version 4) as this variable had the most non-missing data in our cohort. The 2020 ADI was created using 2016-2020 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Data. The ADI provides a national percentile ranking of neighborhoods, at the level of the Census block group, where 1 represents the lowest level of disadvantage within the nation and 100 represents the highest level of disadvantage. As the negative effects of neighborhood deprivation are most evident at higher levels of relative deprivation [33], following previously published methods [31,35], we categorized the ADI national percentile rank values into tertiles based on the distribution of the ADI across the wider Penn Integrated Neurodegenerative Disease Database [36] (INDD, n = 20,569) to obtain broadly representative tertiles. The tertiles were as follows: Lowest Deprivation (Median ADI = 11, range = 1-23); Intermediate Deprivation (Median ADI = 35, range = 24-49); and Highest Deprivation (Median ADI = 62, range = 50-92).

2.3 Cognitive assessments

While participants in ongoing research in the Penn FTD Center complete an array of cognitive tests, to maximize our sample size and reduce multiple comparisons, we limited our analyses to three tests, collected consistently over a follow-up period spanning 9

years in some individuals, in cognitive domains that are often impaired in bvFTD (global cognition, executive function, and language function).

The Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) is a screening tool for cognitive impairment [37] and, although known to be more sensitive to amnestic syndromes, we use it here as a measure of global cognitive performance. MMSE total scores have a possible range of 0 to 30, with higher scores reflecting better global cognitive performance. We had 517 MMSE observations in the Cognitive group, with a minimum interval of 3 months between observations (see Supplement e-Fig. 2 for spaghetti plots of cognitive test scores over time and frequency of observations on each test over time).

We also evaluated two domain-specific cognitive measures. Digit Span Backwards is a working-memory based measure of executive function [38]. Participants are presented with a series of numbers and asked to repeat the series backwards, with increasing span lengths. We used the maximal backwards span, with a possible range of 0 to 8, here as the Digit Span Backwards score. We had available data for 364 Digit Span Backwards observations in the Cognitive group, with a minimum interval of 3 months between observations. The Boston Naming Test (BNT) assesses language function, specifically visual naming ability [39]. In this task patients are asked to name stimuli, one-at-time, shown in a picture. We used a 30-item version of the BNT with a possible range of 0 to 30, with 30 representing each stimuli being correctly named. To maximize our number of observations with data on language function over time, and because the BNT is suboptimal for assessing naming ability in non-native English speakers [40], we also included data collected using the Multilingual Naming test (MINT) [40]. The 32-item MINT is scored with a possible range of 0-32, with 32 representing maximal performance. MINT

scores were converted to BNT scores in line with the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) Crosswalk Study [41]. After conversion, we had available data for 374 BNT observations (145 observations collected using the BNT and 229 collected using the MINT) in the Cognitive group, with a minimum interval of 3 months between observations.

2.4 Genetic screening

We determined whether participants had identifiable pathogenic variants in the genes most commonly implicated in hereditary FTD: *C9orf72*, *GRN*, *MAPT*, *TARDBP, TBK1,* and *VCP* [7]. Briefly, DNA was extracted from peripheral blood or frozen brain tissue. *GRN*, *MAPT*, *TARDBP*, *TBK1* and *VCP* mutations were assessed using a custom-targeted next-generation sequencing panel (MiND-Seq) or Exome Sequencing as previously described [42]. *C9orf72* hexanucleotide repeat expansions were assessed using repeat-primed PCR as previously described[43]. In the Survival group, 77 (25%) participants were identified to have a genetic etiology (16 *GRN*, 14 *MAPT*, 2 *TARDBP*, 2 *TBK1*, 1 *VCP*, and 42 *C9orf72*). In the Cognitive group 42 (26%) participants were identified to have a genetic etiology (6 *GRN*, 8 *MAPT*, 2 *TARDBP*, 1 *TBK1*, 1 *VCP*, and 24 *C9orf72*). All other participants were considered to have an unknown genetic status.

2.5 Statistical analyses

2.5.1 Survival analysis

Survival time was calculated as the time from symptom onset to death. We included individuals who were still alive at study close (n = 94, 30% of Survival group) and censored these individuals at their last clinical visit. We additionally adjusted for left truncation in our survival models, which acknowledges the possibility that some individuals with very short survival from symptom onset may not have lived long enough to have entered the study [7]. We accounted for this by considering our data to be left-truncated at the date of initial visit. We evaluated the difference in survival time from symptom onset across ADI tertiles in a Kaplan-Meier analysis. We conducted the Kaplan-Meier analysis and obtained survival curves with risk tables using the *coxph* and *survfit* functions from the

survival package in R (version 4.3.2). We then performed Cox regression to examine the association between ADI (reference group = Lowest Deprivation) and survival time (time from symptom onset to death), adjusting for age at symptom onset, sex (reference group = females), years of education, and genetic status (binary variable reflecting the presence of a pathogenic variant, reference group = no known genetic etiology identified). In a sensitivity analysis to account for the shorter survival due to motor symptoms [44], and in line with previous work [45], we excluded 39 individuals with a co-occurring diagnosis of either amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS, n = 27), corticobasal syndrome (CBS, n = 6), or progressive supranuclear palsy (PSP, n = 6).

2.5.2 Longitudinal analyses

In separate linear mixed effects models for each cognitive outcome, we examined the association between ADI (reference group = lowest deprivation tertile) and change in cognitive performance over time, adjusting for age at baseline test, sex (reference group = female participants), years of education, baseline test score, disease duration at baseline, and genetic status (reference group = no known genetic etiology identified). Individual was included as a random intercept term in each model. Our effect of interest in each linear mixed effects model was the time from baseline x Highest Deprivation tertile interaction term. We conducted the linear mixed effect models using the *lme* function from the *nlme* package in R.

3. Results

3.1 Higher neighborhood deprivation is associated with shorter survival in bvFTD

A Kaplan-Meier analysis indicated that higher ADI was associated with shorter survival (see Fig. 1). This association of ADI with survival was confirmed in a Cox proportional hazards model (n = 311, events = 217, censored = 94) adjusting for age at symptom onset, sex, years of education, and genetic status, where, compared to the lowest ADI tertile as a reference group, the highest ADI tertile showed shorter survival (hazard ratio = 1.63, 95% CI = 1.09 – 2.45, p = 0.018, see Table 2). The intermediate ADI tertile also showed shorter survival compared to the lowest ADI tertile, but this association was not statistically significant (hazard ratio = 1.36, 95% CI = 0.99 – 1.88, p = 0.057). Older age at symptom onset and having a confirmed genetic etiology were also associated with shorter survival. Sex and years of education were not associated with shorter survival. The highest ADI tertile did not significantly differ, compared to the lowest ADI tertile, in time between symptom onset and initial visit (see Table 1), suggesting that these findings are not attributable to a diagnostic delay.

Sex-specific median survival was estimated for those with and without confirmed genetic etiology based on the mean age at symptom onset (59.75 years old) and mean years of education (15.53 years) across the whole sample and decreased in a dose-response type manner with shorter median survival in each increasing tertile of ADI (see Table 3). The Cox proportional hazards model satisfied the assumption of proportional hazards (global χ^2 = 8.99, p = 0.17).

In sensitivity analyses, the association of higher ADI with reduced survival remained statistically significant (HR = 1.64, 95% CI = 1.03 – 2.60, p = 0.036) even after

removing individuals with co-occurring motor syndromes (n=39, see Table 1) and adjusting for age at onset, sex, education, and genetic status in this subsample (see Supplement e-Fig. 3 and e-Table 2).

We conducted exploratory sex-stratified analyses where we repeated the survival analyses in male participants (n = 183, events = 130) and female participants (n = 128, events = 87) with bvFTD. The association with shorter survival in the highest ADI tertile (HR = 1.78, 95% CI = 1.05 – 3.02, p = 0.033) was confirmed in the male subsample (see e-Fig. 4 and e-Table 3). The association with reduced survival was in the same direction in female participants in the highest ADI tertile, but was not statistically significant (HR = 1.74, 95% CI = 0.87 – 3.29, p = 0.124, see e-Fig. 5, and e-Table 4). While the assumption of proportional hazards was satisfied in the male participant-only Cox model (global χ^2 = 9.95, p = 0.077), this assumption was violated in the female participant-only Cox model (global χ^2 = 13.55, p = 0.019). Furthermore, age at onset, an established prognostic factor, was not statistically significant in the female participant-only model (HR = 1.01, 95% CI = 0.98 – 1.04, p = 0.843). As such, we refrain from making inferences based on the sex-stratified models.



Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier curves with log-rank p-value showing survival from symptom onset across ADI tertiles. *Note: Because of delayed entry due to left-truncation in the Cox model, the risk set size increases after time 0 (i.e. 0 months from symptom onset).*

Table 2. Results of Cox proportional hazards models for survival across ADI tertiles adjusted for age at onset, sex, education, and genetic status.

Characteristic	Hazard Ratio	95% CI	p
ADI (Intermediate Deprivation (T2))	1.36	0.99 – 1.88	0.057
ADI (Highest Deprivation (T3))	1.63	1.09 – 2.45	**0.018**
Age at onset	1.03	1.01 – 1.04	**0.002**
Sex (Male)	0.85	0.64 – 1.13	0.264
Education	0.99	0.94 – 1.04	0.638
Genetic status (Confirmed genetic etiology)	1.74	1.29 – 2.35	**<0.001**

Note: Bold text denotes statistical significance at $p < 0.05$. The reference groups for the categorical variables ADI, sex, genetic status, and ADI were lowest deprivation tertile, female participants, and no known genetic etiology, respectively.

Table 3. Sex-specific median survival time for those with and without known genetic etiology across ADI tertiles.

ADI	Female: No known genetic etiology *Months (95% CI)*	Female: Confirmed genetic etiology *Months (95% CI)*	Male: No known genetic etiology *Months (95% CI)*	Male: Confirmed genetic etiology *Months (95% CI)*
Lowest Deprivation (T1)	107 (92, 134)	80 (63, 100)	122 (99, 144)	87 (72, 113)
Intermediate Deprivation (T2)	90 (76, 112)	65 (52, 88)	97 (87, 122)	73 (61, 90)
Highest Deprivation (T3)	84 (65, 110)	61 (47, 85)	89 (74, 116)	64 (50, 89)

3.2 Higher neighborhood deprivation is associated with faster cognitive decline in bvFTD

Separate linear mixed effects models, adjusting for sex, education, age at baseline, baseline test performance, disease duration at baseline, and genetic status, revealed that, compared to the lowest ADI tertile, the highest ADI tertile showed faster decline in performance over time (see Figure 2 and Table 4) on the MMSE ($p = 0.011$), Digit Span Backwards ($p = 0.002$) and BNT ($p = 0.029$). Compared to the lowest ADI tertile, there was no statistically significant difference in decline in performance over time in the intermediate ADI tertile on the MMSE ($p = 0.148$), Digit Span Backwards ($p = 0.127$) or the BNT ($p = 0.563$).



Figure 2. Associations of ADI with change over time in cognitive performance. A) MMSE, B) Digit Span Backwards, C) BNT. *Note: Marginal effects of the ADI tertile x time interaction are plotted here when continuous variables are equal to their mean values, and factor variables equal their reference values (sex = female, genetic status = no known genetic etiology). The effects are estimated from models fit using the full follow-up timeframe but are plotted for the first 3 years of follow-up to improve interpretability as this timeframe had the densest data coverage across deprivation tertiles.*

Table 4. Results of linear mixed effects models examining the association of ADI with cognitive change over time.

	MMSE			***Digit Span Backwards***			***BNT***		
	N = 161, Observations = 517			***N = 161, Observations = 364***			***N = 161, Observations = 374***		
Predictors	***B***	***CI***	***p***	***B***	***CI***	***p***	***B***	***CI***	***p***
Intercept	-2.06	-8.19 – 4.07	0.515	-0.85	-2.10 – 0.40	0.190	-0.40	-5.19 – 4.38	0.871
Time (from baseline)	-1.37	-1.72 – -1.02	**<0.001**	-0.22	-0.33 – -0.11	**<0.001**	-0.91	-1.28 – -0.54	**<0.001**
ADI (Intermediate Deprivation)	0.11	-1.24 – 1.46	0.875	0.09	-0.22 – 0.41	0.568	-0.56	-1.72 – 0.61	0.356
ADI (Highest Deprivation)	0.69	-1.35 – 2.73	0.511	-0.01	-0.49 – 0.46	0.951	0.10	-1.61 – 1.81	0.908
Sex (Male)	0.83	-0.39 – 2.05	0.185	-0.01	-0.29 – 0.27	0.941	1.02	-0.08 – 2.12	0.073
Education	-0.10	-0.33 – 0.12	0.362	0.01	-0.04 – 0.06	0.709	-0.07	-0.26 – 0.13	0.509
Age	0.00	-0.07 – 0.07	0.977	0.02	0.00 – 0.03	**0.041**	-0.01	-0.07 – 0.05	0.849
Baseline score	1.06	0.93 – 1.18	**<0.001**	0.90	0.81 – 0.99	**<0.001**	1.01	0.96 – 1.07	**<0.001**
Disease duration	0.24	0.03 – 0.45	**0.024**	-0.03	-0.07 – 0.02	0.238	0.15	-0.03 – 0.33	0.102
Genetic status (Confirmed genetic etiology)	0.09	-1.22 – 1.39	0.894	0.08	-0.22 – 0.38	0.605	-0.13	-1.26 – 1.00	0.822
ADI (Intermediate Deprivation) x Time	0.36	-0.12 – 0.85	0.148	0.11	-0.03 – 0.25	0.127	-0.14	-0.62 – 0.34	0.563
ADI (Highest Deprivation) x Time	-2.38	-4.20 – -0.56	**0.011**	-0.61	-0.99 – -0.23	**0.002**	-1.44	-2.71 – -0.17	**0.029**

Note: Age and disease duration refer to age and disease duration at test baseline. All models included a random intercepts term. The reference groups for the categorical variables ADI, sex, genetic status were lowest deprivation tertile, female participants, and no known genetic etiology, respectively. Bold text denotes statistical significance at $p < 0.05$.

4. Discussion

In a clinical cohort, we observed that individuals with bvFTD living in neighborhoods with higher levels of deprivation (i.e. above the 50th percentile nationally) had an accelerated disease course. Specifically, higher deprivation was associated with shorter survival and subsequently faster decline in global cognition, executive function, and language function. These findings indicate that the neighborhood environment may contribute to the substantial variability seen in bvFTD progression.

Our finding that higher neighborhood deprivation was associated with reduced survival from symptom onset in bvFTD is in line with associations of higher deprivation with reduced survival in other dementias, including Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease [32], and broadly in other diseases such as cancer [46] or stroke [47], and with earlier all-cause mortality [48]. We observed a substantial association, as individuals living in the highest tertile of neighborhood deprivation had between 19 (in females with confirmed genetic etiology) to 33 months (in males without known genetic etiology) shorter median survival compared to individuals in the lowest tertile. Moreover, this association was independent of the effects of age at onset, sex, years of education, genetic status as well as the presence of co-occurring motor syndromes [5,44,49]. This novel and robust association suggests that neighborhood deprivation may contribute to an accelerated disease course in bvFTD.

We found that individuals with bvFTD living in the highest tertile of neighborhood deprivation showed more rapid decline in global cognitive performance, executive function and language function than individuals in the least deprived tertile. Specifically, individuals in the highest deprivation tertile, compared to those in the lowest tertile, displayed a 2.38 point faster annual decline in MMSE scores (equating to a 7.9% greater reduction in total score per year), a 0.61 point faster annual decline on the Digit Span Backwards test (7.6% greater reduction in digit span per year), and 1.44 point faster annual decline on the Boston Naming Test (4.8% greater reduction in overall items named per year). These effects are notable, as the observed effect size for the MMSE is large enough to be considered a clinically meaningful change in AD clinical trials [50]. Our results extend previous findings of similar associations with global cognitive decline in a large epidemiologic cohort [51], with executive function and memory decline in a cohort with dementia [52], and with executive function decline in a cohort of adults who were cognitively unimpaired at baseline [33]. In the latter cohort, the association between deprivation and executive function decline was partially mediated by cortical thinning in AD-signature regions (i.e. the inferior parietal, inferior temporal, middle temporal, entorhinal, fusiform, and precuneus) [33]. Future work will allow us to understand if the similar association observed in bvFTD is mediated by frontotemporal lobe atrophy.

It is well-established that socioeconomic deprivation is a fundamental cause of negative health-related outcomes [21] (e.g. multi-morbidity [53] and earlier all-cause mortality [48]) and reflects access to resources (e.g. money, knowledge, power, social connections) that allow individuals to avoid disease risk factors, engage with protective factors, and minimize the consequences of disease [21]. The fundamental cause of

deprivation may underlie and/or exacerbate the other mechanisms, which are not necessarily independent. Beyond this broad negative impact of deprivation on general health outcomes, the contribution of neighborhood deprivation to an accelerated disease course in bvFTD may be explained via several mechanisms.

First, individuals in more deprived neighborhoods have a higher risk of overexposure to heat, pollutants, and lack of vegetation or greenspace [19]. These exposures are associated with increased risk of dementia [54,55] and dementia-related mortality [56], accelerated epigenetic aging [57], and shorter survival in other neurodegenerative diseases, such as ALS [58]. Higher exposure to lead and environmental hazards in occupational settings are also associated with shorter survival and more severe cognitive impairment in ALS [59,60] and similar effects would presumably be observed if these exposures were measured in the neighborhood context. As such, greater neighborhood deprivation may give rise to an accelerated disease course in bvFTD due to biological pathways associated with harmful exposures. The influence of specific exposures on the disease course in bvFTD warrants further investigation.

Second, neighborhood deprivation may also influence outcomes in bvFTD via epigenetic and psychosocial pathways. Data from the Baltimore Memory Study [61] demonstrated a novel gene-by-environment interaction in AD whereby perceived neighborhood stressors were associated with worse executive function performance but only in *APOE* e4 carriers. We have previously demonstrated, in data from the Health and Retirement Study, that disparities in “epigenetic age acceleration” are explained in part by neighborhood deprivation and physical environment exposures [57] and increased

epigenetic age acceleration is associated with more rapid decline in general cognition and functional outcomes [62]. The increased psychosocial stress arising from living in a more deprived neighborhood may further alter inflammatory and immune responses in neurodegenerative disease. In an autopsy cohort, higher neighborhood deprivation was related to differential DNA methylation at a CpG site, cg26514961, located within the *PLXNC1* gene that may be involved in the immune response [63].

Third, individuals living in deprived neighborhoods may have had fewer opportunities to engage in cognitively stimulating activities that strengthen cognitive resilience [64]. Individuals in more deprived neighborhoods may also have been more likely to attend lower quality schools, which may reduce cognitive resilience given that lower educational quality is associated with increased dementia risk, independently of educational attainment, which we covaried for in our analyses [65]. Consequently, individuals living in deprived areas may be less able to compensate in the face of neurodegenerative disease and pathological processes. In the present study, we observed associations of higher deprivation with reduced survival and faster cognitive decline, independent of the effect of genetic contribution to bvFTD. In other words, we observed worse-than-expected clinical and cognitive outcomes, given genetic risk, in individuals living in more deprived neighborhoods. This suggests that neighborhood deprivation is associated with reduced cognitive resilience to neurodegenerative disease, and is line with post-mortem data showing that greater neighborhood deprivation is associated with worse late-life cognitive function, independent of the effect of various dementia-related neuropathologies [31].

Our findings suggest that population-level structural interventions are necessary [66] to reduce socioeconomic inequality and its consequences for neurodegenerative disease outcomes. Such interventions could also strive to ensure greater access to resources that provide opportunities for cognitive stimulation and enrichment (e.g. libraries, community centers, Men's Sheds [67], Women's Sheds [68]) and more equitable provision of high-quality education in more deprived neighborhoods [18]. Healthcare systems should also allocate additional resources to individuals with bvFTD who live in areas of high deprivation as these individuals are at increased risk for worse outcomes. This could include devising strategies to improve affordability and accessibility of care for symptom management, by providing access to nurses and social workers within these high deprivation areas or by providing transport to and from healthcare clinics.

There are some limitations to our findings to consider. The ADI may be largely weighted towards house values and can therefore underestimate deprivation in some urban areas [69]. This is evident in a discordance between the ADI and other deprivation indices in several US cities [70]. However, higher ADI values have been linked to worse cognitive impairment [31] and other negative health outcomes in the Philadelphia area [71,72]. Future work could attempt to replicate findings with other deprivation indices, e.g. the neighborhood disadvantage index from the National Neighborhood Data Archive (NaNDA) [73]. NaNDA also provides publicly available data of various neighborhood factors that we can study in future work to identify specific factors driving the association with worse outcomes in bvFTD. Importantly, we measured ADI at a single point in the individual's life course which neglects their residential history. Future work using emerging tools that can reconstruct residential histories [74] may allow us to identify critical periods

for the influence of neighborhood deprivation on outcomes in bvFTD. Importantly, given the known pathological contributions to prognosis in bvFTD, our findings are limited by the lack of antemortem tau and TDP-43 specific biomarkers that would allow for testing within individual pathological subgroups. Future work using tau and TDP-43 specific biomarkers will enable such studies. In the present study, however, we accounted for biological factors including known pathogenic variants as well as co-occurring motor syndromes. Moreover, incorporating epigenetics and plasma and neuroimaging biomarkers will allow us to identify potential biological mechanisms through which neighborhood deprivation may affect progression. Finally, given the prominent behavioral impairments in bvFTD, future work should also evaluate the influence of deprivation on longitudinal behavioral change.

In conclusion, in a longitudinal clinical cohort of individuals with bvFTD, in analyses that adjusted for several potential confounds, we observed robust and novel associations of neighborhood deprivation with an accelerated disease course in bvFTD, characterized by reduced survival and faster cognitive decline.

References

[1] Giannini LAA, Peterson C, Ohm D, Xie SX, McMillan CT, Raskovsky K, et al. Frontotemporal lobar degeneration proteinopathies have disparate microscopic patterns of white and grey matter pathology. Acta Neuropathol Commun 2021;9:30. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40478-021-01129-2.

[2] Irwin DJ, Cairns NJ, Grossman M, McMillan CT, Lee EB, Van Deerlin VM, et al. Frontotemporal lobar degeneration: defining phenotypic diversity through personalized medicine. Acta Neuropathol 2015;129:469–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-014-1380-1.

[3] Perry DC, Brown JA, Possin KL, Datta S, Trujillo A, Radke A, et al. Clinicopathological correlations in behavioural variant frontotemporal dementia. Brain 2017;140:3329–45. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awx254.

[4] Devenney E, Bartley L, Hoon C, O'Callaghan C, Kumfor F, Hornberger M, et al. Progression in Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia: A Longitudinal Study. JAMA Neurol 2015;72:1501–9. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2015.2061.

[5] Kansal K, Mareddy M, Sloane KL, Minc AA, Rabins PV, McGready JB, et al. Survival in Frontotemporal Dementia Phenotypes: A Meta-Analysis. Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders 2016;41:109–22. https://doi.org/10.1159/000443205.

[6] Massimo L, Zee J, Xie SX, McMillan CT, Rascovsky K, Irwin DJ, et al. Occupational attainment influences survival in autopsy-confirmed frontotemporal degeneration. Neurology 2015;84:2070–5. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000001595.

[7] Caswell C, McMillan CT, Xie SX, Van Deerlin VM, Suh E, Lee EB, et al. Genetic predictors of survival in behavioral variant frontotemporal degeneration. Neurology 2019;93:e1707–14. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000008387.

[8] Irwin DJ, McMillan CT, Brettschneider J, Libon DJ, Powers J, Rascovsky K, et al. Cognitive decline and reduced survival in C9orf72 expansion frontotemporal degeneration and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2013;84:163–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2012-303507.

[9] Irwin DJ, McMillan CT, Suh E, Powers J, Rascovsky K, Wood EM, et al. Myelin oligodendrocyte basic protein and prognosis in behavioral-variant frontotemporal dementia. Neurology 2014;83:502–9. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000000668.

[10] Massimo L, Rennert L, Xie SX, Olm C, Bove J, Van Deerlin V, et al. Common genetic variation is associated with longitudinal decline and network features in behavioral variant frontotemporal degeneration. Neurobiol Aging 2021;108:16–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2021.07.018.

[11] Tropea TF, Mak J, Guo MH, Xie SX, Suh E, Rick J, et al. TMEM106B Effect on cognition in Parkinson disease and frontotemporal dementia. Ann Neurol 2019;85:801–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.25486.

[12] Placek K, Massimo L, Olm C, Ternes K, Firn K, Van Deerlin V, et al. Cognitive reserve in frontotemporal degeneration. Neurology 2016;87:1813–9. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000003250.

[13] Kinney NG, Bove J, Phillips JS, Cousins KAQ, Olm CA, Wakeman DG, et al. Social and leisure activity are associated with attenuated cortical loss in behavioral variant

frontotemporal degeneration. Neuroimage Clin 2021;30:102629. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2021.102629.
[14] Stern Y, Albert M, Barnes CA, Cabeza R, Pascual-Leone A, Rapp PR. A framework for concepts of reserve and resilience in aging. Neurobiol Aging 2023;124:100–3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2022.10.015.
[15] Arenaza-Urquijo EM, Vemuri P. Improving the resistance and resilience framework for aging and dementia studies. Alzheimer's Research & Therapy 2020;12:41. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-020-00609-2.
[16] Pettigrew C, Nazarovs J, Soldan A, Singh V, Wang J, Hohman T, et al. Alzheimer's disease genetic risk and cognitive reserve in relationship to long-term cognitive trajectories among cognitively normal individuals. Alzheimer's Research & Therapy 2023;15:66. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-023-01206-9.
[17] Grebe LA, Vonk JMJ, Galletta EE, Goral M. Cognitive reserve in individuals with frontotemporal dementia: a systematic review. Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology n.d.;0:1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803395.2024.2410207.
[18] Vassilaki M, Petersen RC, Vemuri P. Area Deprivation Index as a Surrogate of Resilience in Aging and Dementia. Front Psychol 2022;13:930415. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.930415.
[19] Adélaïde L, Hough I, Seyve E, Kloog I, Fifre G, Launoy G, et al. Environmental and social inequities in continental France: an analysis of exposure to heat, air pollution, and lack of vegetation. J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol 2024:1–11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-024-00641-6.
[20] Kind AJH, Buckingham WR. Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible — The Neighborhood Atlas. N Engl J Med 2018;378:2456–8. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1802313.
[21] Link BG, Phelan J. Social Conditions As Fundamental Causes of Disease. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 1995:80–94. https://doi.org/10.2307/2626958.
[22] Nakaya T, Honjo K, Hanibuchi T, Ikeda A, Iso H, Inoue M, et al. Associations of All-Cause Mortality with Census-Based Neighbourhood Deprivation and Population Density in Japan: A Multilevel Survival Analysis. PLOS ONE 2014;9:e97802. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0097802.
[23] Zuelsdorff M, Larson JL, Hunt JFV, Kim AJ, Koscik RL, Buckingham WR, et al. The Area Deprivation Index: A novel tool for harmonizable risk assessment in Alzheimer's disease research. Alzheimer's & Dementia: Translational Research & Clinical Interventions 2020;6:e12039. https://doi.org/10.1002/trc2.12039.
[24] Wu Y-T, Prina AM, Brayne C. The association between community environment and cognitive function: a systematic review. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol 2015;50:351–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-014-0945-6.
[25] McCann A, McNulty H, Rigby J, Hughes CF, Hoey L, Molloy AM, et al. Effect of Area-Level Socioeconomic Deprivation on Risk of Cognitive Dysfunction in Older Adults. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 2018;66:1269–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.15258.
[26] Kumar H, Arokiasamy P, Selvamani Y. Socioeconomic Disadvantage, Chronic Diseases and their Association with Cognitive Functioning of Adults in India: A Multilevel Analysis. Population Ageing 2020;13:285–303. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12062-019-09243-9.

[27] Liu Y, Liu Z, Liang R, Luo Y. The association between community-level socioeconomic status and cognitive function among Chinese middle-aged and older adults: a study based on the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS). BMC Geriatrics 2022;22:239. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-022-02946-3.
[28] Pase MP, Rowsthorn E, Cavuoto MG, Lavale A, Yassi N, Maruff P, et al. Association of Neighborhood-Level Socioeconomic Measures With Cognition and Dementia Risk in Australian Adults. JAMA Network Open 2022;5:e224071. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.4071.
[29] Dintica CS, Bahorik A, Xia F, Kind A, Yaffe K. Dementia Risk and Disadvantaged Neighborhoods. JAMA Neurology 2023;80:903–9. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2023.2120.
[30] Vassilaki M, Aakre JA, Castillo A, Chamberlain AM, Wilson PM, Kremers WK, et al. Association of neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and cognitive impairment. Alzheimer's & Dementia 2023;19:761–70. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.12702.
[31] Kim B, Yannatos I, Blam K, Wiebe D, Xie SX, McMillan CT, et al. Neighborhood disadvantage reduces cognitive reserve independent of neuropathologic change. Alzheimer's & Dementia 2024;20:2707–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.13736.
[32] McMichael AJ, Zafeiridi E, Passmore P, Cunningham EL, McGuinness B. Factors Associated with Mortality Including Nursing Home Transitions: A Retrospective Analysis of 25,418 People Prescribed Anti-Dementia Drugs in Northern Ireland. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease 2020;73:1233–42. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-190751.
[33] Hunt JFV, Vogt NM, Jonaitis EM, Buckingham WR, Koscik RL, Zuelsdorff M, et al. Association of Neighborhood Context, Cognitive Decline, and Cortical Change in an Unimpaired Cohort. Neurology 2021;96:e2500–12. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000011918.
[34] Rascovsky K, Hodges JR, Knopman D, Mendez MF, Kramer JH, Neuhaus J, et al. Sensitivity of revised diagnostic criteria for the behavioural variant of frontotemporal dementia. Brain 2011;134:2456–77. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr179.
[35] Boyle R, Townsend DL, Klinger HM, Scanlon CE, Yuan Z, Coughlan GT, et al. Identifying longitudinal cognitive resilience from cross-sectional amyloid, tau, and neurodegeneration. Alz Res Therapy 2024;16:148. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-024-01510-y.
[36] Toledo JB, Van Deerlin VM, Lee EB, Suh E, Baek Y, Robinson JL, et al. A platform for discovery: The University of Pennsylvania Integrated Neurodegenerative Disease Biobank. Alzheimers Dement 2014;10:477-484.e1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2013.06.003.
[37] Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. Journal of Psychiatric Research 1975;12:189–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6.
[38] Wechsler D. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV). San Antonio, Texas: Pearson; 2008.
[39] Kaplan E, Goodglass H, Weintraub S. The Boston Naming Test. Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger; 1983.

[40] Ivanova I, Salmon DP, Gollan TH. The Multilingual Naming Test in Alzheimer's Disease: Clues to the Origin of Naming Impairments. J Int Neuropsychol Soc 2013;19:272–83. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617712001282.
[41] Monsell SE, Dodge HH, Zhou X-H, Bu Y, Besser LM, Mock C, et al. Results from the NACC Uniform Data Set neuropsychological battery Crosswalk Study Running head: Neuropsychological Battery Crosswalk Study Results. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2016;30:134–9. https://doi.org/10.1097/WAD.0000000000000111.
[42] Lee EB, Porta S, Michael Baer G, Xu Y, Suh E, Kwong LK, et al. Expansion of the classification of FTLD-TDP: distinct pathology associated with rapidly progressive frontotemporal degeneration. Acta Neuropathol 2017;134:65–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-017-1679-9.
[43] Suh E, Lee EB, Neal D, Wood EM, Toledo JB, Rennert L, et al. Semi-automated quantification of C9orf72 expansion size reveals inverse correlation between hexanucleotide repeat number and disease duration in frontotemporal degeneration. Acta Neuropathol 2015;130:363–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-015-1445-9.
[44] Murley AG, Rouse MA, Coyle-Gilchrist ITS, Jones PS, Li W, Wiggins J, et al. Predicting loss of independence and mortality in frontotemporal lobar degeneration syndromes. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2021;92:737–44. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2020-324903.
[45] Massimo L, Xie SX, Rennert L, Fick DM, Halpin A, Placek K, et al. Occupational attainment influences longitudinal decline in behavioral variant frontotemporal degeneration. Brain Imaging and Behavior 2019;13:293–301. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-018-9852-x.
[46] Kennedy K, Jusue-Torres I, Buller ID, Rossi E, Mallisetty A, Rodgers K, et al. Neighborhood-level deprivation and survival in lung cancer. BMC Cancer 2024;24:959. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-024-12720-w.
[47] Grimaud O, Leray E, Lalloué B, Aghzaf R, Durier J, Giroud M, et al. Mortality following stroke during and after acute care according to neighbourhood deprivation: a disease registry study. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2014;85:1313–8. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2013-307283.
[48] Lawrence WR, Kucharska-Newton AM, Magnani JW, Brewer LC, Shiels MS, George KM, et al. Neighborhood Socioeconomic Disadvantage Across the Life Course and Premature Mortality. JAMA Network Open 2024;7:e2426243. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.26243.
[49] Steenland K, MacNeil J, Seals R, Levey A. Factors Affecting Survival of Patients with Neurodegenerative Disease. Neuroepidemiology 2010;35:28–35. https://doi.org/10.1159/000306055.
[50] Andrews JS, Desai U, Kirson NY, Zichlin ML, Ball DE, Matthews BR. Disease severity and minimal clinically important differences in clinical outcome assessments for Alzheimer's disease clinical trials. Alzheimers Dement (N Y) 2019;5:354–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trci.2019.06.005.
[51] Sheffield KM, Peek MK. Neighborhood context and cognitive decline in older Mexican Americans: results from the Hispanic Established Populations for Epidemiologic Studies of the Elderly. Am J Epidemiol 2009;169:1092–101. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwp005.

[52] Meyer OL, Mungas D, King J, Hinton L, Farias S, Reed B, et al. Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Cognitive Trajectories in a Diverse Longitudinal Cohort. Clinical Gerontologist 2018;41:82–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/07317115.2017.1282911.
[53] Chamberlain AM, Finney Rutten LJ, Wilson PM, Fan C, Boyd CM, Jacobson DJ, et al. Neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage is associated with multimorbidity in a geographically-defined community. BMC Public Health 2020;20:13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8123-0.
[54] Frndak S, Deng Z, Ward-Caviness CK, Gorski-Steiner I, Thorpe RJ, Dickerson AS. Risk of dementia due to Co-exposure to air pollution and neighborhood disadvantage. Environmental Research 2024;251:118709. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2024.118709.
[55] Slawsky ED, Hajat A, Rhew IC, Russette H, Semmens EO, Kaufman JD, et al. Neighborhood greenspace exposure as a protective factor in dementia risk among U.S. adults 75 years or older: a cohort study. Environmental Health 2022;21:14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12940-022-00830-6.
[56] Gao Y, Lin L, Yin P, Kan H, Chen R, Zhou M. Heat Exposure and Dementia-Related Mortality in China. JAMA Network Open 2024;7:e2419250. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.19250.
[57] Yannatos I, Stites S, Brown RT, McMillan CT. Contributions of neighborhood social environment and air pollution exposure to Black-White disparities in epigenetic aging. PLoS One 2023;18:e0287112. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287112.
[58] Goutman SA, Boss J, Jang D-G, Mukherjee B, Richardson RJ, Batterman S, et al. Environmental risk scores of persistent organic pollutants associate with higher ALS risk and shorter survival in a new Michigan case/control cohort. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2024;95:241–8. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2023-332121.
[59] Rhodes E, Alfa S, Jin HA, Massimo L, Elman L, Amado D, et al. Cognitive reserve in ALS: the role of occupational skills and requirements. Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration 2024;0:1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/21678421.2024.2336113.
[60] Wang T-W, Wuu J, Cooley A, Yeh T-S, Benatar M, Weisskopf M. Occupational lead exposure and survival with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration 2023;24:100–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/21678421.2022.2059379.
[61] Lee BK, Glass TA, James BD, Bandeen-Roche K, Schwartz BS. Neighborhood Psychosocial Environment, Apolipoprotein E Genotype, and Cognitive Function in Older Adults. Archives of General Psychiatry 2011;68:314–21. https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.6.
[62] Yannatos I, Stites SD, Boen C, Xie SX, Brown RT, McMillan CT. Epigenetic age and socioeconomic status contribute to racial disparities in cognitive and functional aging between Black and White older Americans. medRxiv 2023:2023.09.29.23296351. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.29.23296351.
[63] Pett L, Li Z, Abrishamcar S, Hodge K, Everson T, Christensen G, et al. The association between neighborhood deprivation and DNA methylation in an autopsy cohort. Aging (Albany NY) 2024;16:6694. https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.205764.

[64] Clarke PJ, Ailshire JA, House JS, Morenoff JD, King K, Melendez R, et al. Cognitive function in the community setting: the neighbourhood as a source of “cognitive reserve”? J Epidemiol Community Health 2012;66:730–6. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2010.128116.
[65] Soh Y, Whitmer RA, Mayeda ER, Glymour MM, Peterson RL, Eng CW, et al. State-Level Indicators of Childhood Educational Quality and Incident Dementia in Older Black and White Adults. JAMA Neurology 2023;80:352–9. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2022.5337.
[66] Walsh S, Govia I, Wallace L, Richard E, Peters R, Anstey KJ, et al. A whole-population approach is required for dementia risk reduction. The Lancet Healthy Longevity 2022;3:e6–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568(21)00301-9.
[67] McGrath A, Murphy N, Egan T, Richardson N. Sheds for life: health and wellbeing outcomes of a tailored community-based health promotion initiative for men’s sheds in Ireland. BMC Public Health 2022;22:1590. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13964-6.
[68] Golding B, Carragher L, Foley A. The Women’s Shed movement: Scoping the field internationally. Australian Journal of Adult Learning 2021;61:150–74. https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.074377153699052.
[69] Hannan EL, Wu Y, Cozzens K, Anderson B. The Neighborhood Atlas Area Deprivation Index For Measuring Socioeconomic Status: An Overemphasis On Home Value. Health Affairs 2023;42:702–9. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2022.01406.
[70] Rollings KA, Noppert GA, Griggs JJ, Melendez RA, Clarke PJ. Comparison of two area-level socioeconomic deprivation indices: Implications for public health research, practice, and policy. PLOS ONE 2023;18:e0292281. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0292281.
[71] Faden DF, Xie L, Stone C, Lopes Almeida Gomes L, Le T, Ezeh N, et al. Area Deprivation and Disease Severity in Adult Patients With Discoid Lupus Erythematosus. JAMA Dermatol 2024:e242355. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamadermatol.2024.2355.
[72] Banwell E, Collaco JM, Oates GR, Rice JL, Juarez LD, Young LR, et al. Area deprivation and respiratory morbidities in children with bronchopulmonary dysplasia. Pediatric Pulmonology 2022;57:2053–9. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppul.25969.
[73] Zahodne LB, Sol K, Scambray K, Lee JH, Palms JD, Morris EP, et al. Neighborhood racial income inequality and cognitive health. Alzheimer’s & Dementia 2024;20:5338. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.13911.
[74] Xu W, Agnew M, Kamis C, Schultz A, Salas S, Malecki K, et al. Constructing Residential Histories in a General Population-Based Representative Sample. American Journal of Epidemiology 2024;193:348–59. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwad188.

Acknowledgements

We thank our participants as well as their caregivers and families for the time and effort that they have generously contributed to this research. We would also like to gratefully acknowledge the valuable work and dedication of our colleagues in the Penn FTD Center in collecting this data and for their thoughtful feedback on this work.

Disclosures

L.D. has received consulting fees from Passage Bio, Biogen, and Sano Genetics.

Funding Sources

Research reported in this publication was supported by the Penn Institute on Aging, and the National Institute on Aging of the National Institutes of Health under award numbers P01AG066597, P30AG072979, P30AG012836 (Penn Population Aging Research Center), P30AG073105 (PennAITech) and R01AG076832. The content is solely the responsibility of the author(s) and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Key Words

Frontotemporal Degeneration, Behavioral-Variant Frontotemporal Degeneration, Cognitive Decline, Executive Function, Social and structural determinants of health, Brain Health Equity, Socioeconomic Status, Neighborhood deprivation, Area Deprivation Index, Reserve, Resilience