1

4

Brain functional network integrity sustains cognitive function despite atrophy in presymptomatic genetic frontotemporal dementia.

5	Kamen A. Tsvetanov, ^{*,1,2} Stefano Gazzina, ^{*,1,3} Simon P. Jones, ¹ John van Swieten, ³ Barbara Borroni, ⁴ Raquel Sanchez-						
6	Valle, ⁵ Fermin Moreno, ^{6, 7} Robert Laforce Jr, ⁸ Caroline Graff, ⁹ Matthis Synofzik, ^{10,11} Daniela Galimberti, ^{12,13} Mario						
7	Masellis, ¹⁴ Maria Carmela Tartaglia, ¹⁵ Elizabeth Finger, ¹⁶ Rik Vandenberghe, ^{17,18} Alexandre de Mendonça, ¹⁹ Fabrizio						
8	Tagliavini, ²⁰ Isabel Santana, ^{21,22,23} Simon Ducharme, ^{24,25} Chris Butler, ²⁶ Alex Gerhard, ²⁷ Adrian Danek, ²⁸ Johannes						
9	Levin, ²⁸ Markus Otto, ²⁹ Giovanni Frisoni, ^{30,31} Roberta Ghidoni, ³² Sandro Sorbi, ^{33,34} Jonathan D. Rohrer, ³⁵ and James B						
10	Rowe, ^{1,2,36} on behalf of the Genetic FTD Initiative, GENFI. [#]						
11 12	*Joint first authorship						
13	1 Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK						
14 15	2 Cambridge Centre for Ageing and Neuroscience (Cam-CAN), University of Cambridge and MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, UK						
16	3 Department of Neurology, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands						
17 18	4 Centre for Neurodegenerative Disorders, Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Brescia, Italy						
19 20	5 Alzheimer's disease and Other Cognitive Disorders Unit, Neurology Service, Hospital Clínic, Institut d'Investigacións Biomèdiques August Pi I Sunyer, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain						
21	6 Cognitive Disorders Unit, Department of Neurology, Hospital Universitario Donostia, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain						
22	7 Neuroscience Area, Biodonostia Health Research Insitute, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain						
23 24	8 Clinique Interdisciplinaire de Mémoire, Département des Sciences Neurologiques, CHU de Québec, and Faculté de Médecine, Université Laval, Québec, Canada						
25	9 Karolinska Institutet, Department NVS, Center for Alzheimer Research, Division of Neurogenetics, Stockholm, Sweden						
26 27	10 Department of Neurodegenerative Diseases, Hertie-Institute for Clinical Brain Research & Center of Neurology, University of Tübingen, Germany						
28	11 German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Tübingen, Germany						

29	12 University of Milan, Centro Dino Ferrari, Milan, Italy					
30	13 Fondazione IRCSS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Neurodegenerative Diseases Unit, Milan, Italy					
31	14 LC Campbell Cognitive Neurology Research Unit, Sunnybrook Research Institute, Toronto, Ontario, Canada					
32	15 Toronto Western Hospital, Tanz Centre for Research in Neurodegenerative Disease, Toronto, Ontario, Canada					
33	16 Department of Clinical Neurological Sciences, University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada					
34	17 Laboratory for Cognitive Neurology, Department of Neurosciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium					
35	18 Neurology Service, University Hospitals Leuven, Belgium, Laboratory for Neurobiology, VIB-KU					
36 37	19 Laboratory of Neurosciences, Institute of Molecular Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon, Portugal					
38	20 Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, Milan, Italy					
39	21 Neurology Department, Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal					
40	22 Faculty of Medicine, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal					
41	23 Centre of Neurosciences and Cell biology, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal					
42	24 Department of Psychiatry, McGill University Health Centre, McGill University, Montreal, Canada					
43	25 McConnell Brain Imaging Centre, Montreal Neurological Institute, McGill University, Montreal, Canada					
44	26 Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Medical Sciences Division, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK					
45 46	27 Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences, Institute of Brain, Behaviour and Mental Health, The University of Manchester, Withington, Manchester, UK					
47 48	28 Neurologische Klinik und Poliklinik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich, German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Munich, Germany					
49	29 Department of Neurology, University Hospital Ulm, Ulm, Germany					
50 51	30 Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico (IRCCS) Istituto Centro San Giovanni di Dio Fatebenefratelli, Brescia, Italy					
52 53	31 Memory Clinic and LANVIE-Laboratory of Neuroimaging of Aging, University Hospitals and University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland					
54	32 Molecular Markers Laboratory, IRCCS Istituto Centro San Giovanni di Dio Fatebenefratelli, Brescia, Italy					

55	33 Department of Neuroscience, Psychology, Drug Research and Child Health, University of Florence, Florence, Italy					
56	34 Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico (IRCCS) "Don Gnocchi", Florence, Italy					
57 58	35 Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen Square ondon, UK					
59	36 Medical Research Council Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, UK					
60						
61	# See Appendix for a list of GENFI consortium members.					
62						
63	Correspondence to:					
64	Kamen A. Tsvetanov					
65	e-mail: kat35@cam.ac.uk					
66						
	Keywords (up to five): frontotemporal dementia (FTD), presymptomatic, functional magnetic resonance imaging					

Keywords (up to five): frontotemporal dementia (FTD), presymptomatic, functional magnetic resonance imaging (*f*MRI), network connectivity.

67 Abstract

- 68 INTRODUCTION: The presymptomatic phase of neurodegenerative disease can last many years, with
- 69 sustained cognitive function despite progressive atrophy. We investigate this phenomenon in familial
- 70 Frontotemporal dementia (FTD).
- 71 METHODS: We studied 121 presymptomatic FTD mutation carriers and 134 family members without
- 72 mutations, using multivariate data-driven approach to link cognitive performance with both structural and
- 73 functional magnetic resonance imaging. Atrophy and brain network connectivity were compared between
- 74 groups, in relation to the time from expected symptom onset.
- 75 RESULTS: There were group differences in brain structure and function, in the absence of differences in
- 76 cognitive performance. Specifically, we identified behaviourally-relevant structural and functional network
- 77 differences. Structure-function relationships were similar in both groups, but coupling between functional
- 78 connectivity and cognition was stronger for carriers than for non-carriers, and increased with proximity to
- 79 the expected onset of disease.
- B0 DISCUSSION: Our findings suggest that maintenance of functional network connectivity enables carriers to
 81 maintain cognitive performance.

82

83 1. Introduction

84 Across the adult healthy lifespan, the structural and functional properties of brain networks are coupled, and both are predictive of cognitive ability [1,2]. The connections between structure, function and 85 86 performance have been influential in developing current models of ageing and neurodegeneration [3–5]. 87 However, this work contrasts with the emerging evidence of neuropathological and structural changes 88 many years before the onset of symptoms of Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal dementia (FTD) [6– 89 8]. Genetic FTD with highly-penetrant gene mutations provides the opportunity to examine the precursors of symptomatic disease. Three main genes account for 10-20% of FTD cases: chromosome 9 open reading 90 91 frame 72 (C9orf72), granulin (GRN) and microtubule-associated protein tau (MAPT). These genes vary in 92 their phenotypic expression and in the age of onset [9]. Despite pleiotropy [10], environmental and 93 secondary genetic moderation [11,12] all three mutations cause significant structural brain changes in key 94 regions over a decade before the expected age of disease onset [7,13], confirmed by longitudinal studies 95 [14,15].

96 The divergence between early structural change and late cognitive decline begs the question: how do 97 presymptomatic gene carriers stay so well in the face of progressive atrophy? We propose that the answer 98 lies in the maintenance of network dynamics and functional organisation [16]. Across the lifespan, 99 functional brain network connectivity predicts cognitive status [17], and this connectivity-cognition 100 relationship becomes stronger with age [18,19].

101 Our overarching hypothesis is that for those at genetic risk of dementia, the maintenance of network 102 connectivity prevents the manifestation of symptoms despite progressive structural changes. A challenge 103 is that neither the anatomical and functional substrates of cognition nor the targets of neurodegenerative 104 disease are mediated by single brain regions: they are distributed across multi-level and interactive 105 networks. We therefore used a multivariate data-driven approach to identify differences in the 106 multidimensional brain-behaviour relationship between presymptomatic carriers and non-carriers of 107 mutations in FTD genes. We identified key brain networks [20] from a large independent population-based 108 age-matched dataset [21].

109 We tested three key hypotheses: (i) presymptomatic carriers differ from non-carriers in brain structure and110 brain function, but not in cognitive function, (ii) brain structure and function correlate with performance in

both groups, but functional network indices are stronger predictors of cognition in carriers, and (iii) the
 dependence on network integrity for maintaining cognitive functioning increases as carriers approach the
 onset of symptoms.

114 2. Methods

115 2.1. Participants

Thirteen research sites across Europe and Canada recruited participants as part of an international multicentre partnership, the Genetic Frontotemporal Initiative (GENFI). 313 participants had usable structural and resting state functional magnetic resonance imaging data (MRI) [7,13]. The study was approved by the institutional review boards for each site, and participants providing written informed consent. Five participants were excluded due to excessive head motion (see below), resulting in 308 datasets for further analysis.

Participants were genotyped based on whether they carried a pathogenic mutation in *MAPT, GRN* and *C9orf72*. In this study, we focus on non-carriers (NC, N=134) and presymptomatic carriers (PSC, N=121), i.e. gene carriers with normal cognitive function based on a neurocognitive assessment (see below). Participants and site investigators were blinded to the research genotyping, although a minority of participants had undergone predictive testing outwith the GENFI study. See Table 1 for demographic information of both groups. In keeping with other GENFI reports, the years to expected onset (EYO) were calculated as the difference between age at assessment and mean age at onset within the family [7].

129

130 2.2. Neurocognitive assessment

131 Each participant completed a standard clinical assessment consisting of medical history, family history, 132 functional status and physical examination, in complement with collateral history from a family member or 133 a close friend. In the current study 13 behavioural measures of cognitive function were correlated with 134 neuroimaging measures. These included the Uniform Data Set [22]: the Logical Memory subtest of the 135 Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised with Immediate and Delayed Recall scores, Digit Span forwards and 136 backwards from the Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised, a Digit Symbol Task, Parts A and B of the Trail Making 137 Test, the short version of the Boston Naming Test, and Category Fluency (animals). Additional tests included 138 three subscores of the Letter Fluency and Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence Block Design task, 139 and the Mini-Mental State Examination. Latency measures for the Trail Making Test were inverted so that 140 higher values across all tests reflect better performance.

141

142 2.3. Neuroimaging assessment

143 Figure 1 provides a schematic representation of imaging data processing pipeline and the analysis strategy 144 for linking brain-behaviour data. MRI data were acquired using 3T scanners and 1.5T where no 3T scanning 145 was available from various vendors, with optimised scanning protocols to maximise synchronisation across 146 scanners and sites [7,13]. A 3D-structural MRI was acquired on each participant using T1-weighted 147 Magnetic Prepared Rapid Gradient Echo sequence. The co-registered T1 images were segmented to extract 148 probabilistic maps of 6 tissue classes: grey matter (GM), white matter (WM), cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), 149 bone, soft tissue, and residual noise. The native-space GM and WM images were submitted to 150 diffeomorphic registration to create equally represented gene-group template images [DARTEL; 23]. The templates for all tissue types were normalised to the Montreal Neurological Institute template using a 12-151 152 parameter affine transformation. The normalised images were smoothed using an 8-mm Gaussian kernel.

153 For resting state fMRI measurements, Echo-Planar Imaging data were acquired with at least six minutes of 154 scanning. The imaging data were analysed using Automatic Analysis [AA 4.0; ,24] pipelines and modules 155 which called relevant functions from SPM12 [25]. To quantify the total motion for each participant, the root 156 mean square volume-to-volume displacement was computed using the approach of Jenkinson et al [26]. 157 Participants with 3.5 or more standard deviations above the group mean motion displacement were 158 excluded from further analysis (N = 5). To further ensure that potential group bias in head motion did not 159 affect later analysis of connectivity, we took three further steps: i) fMRI data was further postprocessed 160 using whole-brain Independent Component Analysis (ICA) of single subject time-series denoising, with 161 noise components selected and removed automatically using a priori heuristics using the ICA-based 162 algorithm [27], ii) postprocessing of network node time-series (see below) and iii) a subject-specific 163 estimate of head movement for each participant [26] included as a covariate in group-level analysis [28].

164 2.4. Network definition

The location of the key cortical regions in each network was identified by spatial-ICA in an independent dataset of 298 age-matched healthy individuals from a large population-based cohort [21]. Full details about preprocessing and node definition are described previously [29]. Four networks commonly affected by neurodegenerative diseases including FTD [20] were identified by spatially matching to pre-existing templates [30]. The node time-series were defined as the first principal component resulting from the

singular value decomposition of voxels in an 8-mm radius sphere, which was centred on the peak voxel foreach node [18]. Visual representation of the spatial distribution of the nodes is shown in Figure 2.

172 We aimed to further reduce the effects of noise confounds on functional connectivity effects of node timeseries using general linear model (GLM) [28]. This model included linear trends, expansions of realignment 173 174 parameters, as well as average signal in WM and CSF, including their derivative and quadratic regressors 175 from the time-courses of each node. The WM and CSF signals were created by using the average signal 176 across all voxels with corresponding tissue probability larger than 0.7 in associated tissue probability maps 177 available in SPM12. A band-pass filter (0.0078-0.1 Hz) was implemented by including a discrete cosine 178 transform set in the GLM. Finally, the functional connectivity (FC) between each pair of nodes was 179 computed using Pearson's correlation on postprocessed time-series.

180

181 2.5. Statistical analysis

182

2.5.1. Group differences in brain structure, function and cognition

To assess the group-differences in neuroimaging and behavioural dataset we used multiple linear 183 regression with a well-conditioned shrinkage regularization [31,32] and 10-Fold Cross–Validation [33]. In 184 185 the analysis of brain structure we used as independent variables the mean grey matter volume (GMV) of 186 246 brain nodes [34]. In the analysis of brain function, we used the functional connectivity between 15 187 nodes, which were part of the four large-scale functional networks described above. In the analysis of 188 cognitive function, the independent variables comprised the performance measures on the 13 189 neuropsychological tests performed outside of the scanner. In all three analyses the dependent variable 190 was the genetic status (PSC vs NC) including age as a covariate of no interest. In addition, in the analysis of 191 neuroimaging data we included scanner site and head motion as additional covariates of no interest.

192

2.5.2. Brain-behaviour relationships

For the brain-behaviour analysis, we adopted a two-level procedure. In the first-level analysis, we assessed the multidimensional brain-behaviour relationships using partial least squares [35]. This analysis described the linear relationships between the two multivariate datasets, namely neuroimaging (either GMV or FC) and behavioural performance, by providing pairs of latent variables (Brain-LVs and Cognition-LVs) as linear combinations of the original variables which are optimised to maximise their covariance. Namely, dataset 1 consisted of a brain feature set, which could be either grey matter volume (GMV dataset) or functional

connectivity strength between pairs of regions for each individual (FC dataset). Dataset 2 included the
 performance measures on the 13 tests (i.e. Cognition dataset), as considered in the multiple linear
 regression analysis of group differences in cognition. Covariates of no interest included head motion,
 scanner site, gender and handedness.

203 Next, we tested whether the identified behaviourally-relevant LVs of brain structure and function were differentially expressed by NC and PSC as a function of expected years to onset. To this end, we performed 204 205 a second-level analysis using multiple linear regression with robust fitting algorithm as implemented in 206 matlab's function "fitlm.m". Independent variables included subjects' brain scores from first level PLS 207 (either Structure-LV or Function-LV subject scores), group information, expected years to onset and their 208 interaction terms (e.g. brain scores x group, brain scores x years to expected onset, etc.). The dependent 209 variable was subjects' cognitive scores from the first level analysis in the corresponding PLS (Cognition-LV). 210 Covariates of no interest included gender, handedness, head movement and education (Figure 1).

211 3. Results

212 3.1. Group differences in neuroimaging and cognitive data

213 Brain structure

The multiple linear regression model testing for overall group differences in grey matter volume between PSC and NC was significant (r=.14, p=.025), reflecting expected presymptomatic differences in brain-wide atrophy. The frontal, parietal and subcortical regions had most atrophy in PSC (Figure 3). As expected, the group difference in grey matter volume of these regions increased as EYO decreased, see Supplementary Materials.

219 Brain Function

The multiple linear regression model testing for overall group differences in functional connectivity between PSC and NC was marginally significant (r=.12, p=.049). The pattern of connectivity indicated mainly increased connectivity between SN-DMN and SN-FPN in presymptomatic carriers, coupled with decreased connectivity within the networks and DMN-FPN connectivity (Figure 3).

224 Cognitive Function

We did not identify group differences in cognition and behaviour (r=.002, p=.807), confirming the impression of "healthy" status among presymptomatic carriers. However, in the next section, we consider

the relationships between structure, function and cognition that underlie this maintenance of cognitivefunction.

229 3.2. Brain-behaviour relationships

230 Structure-cognition

231 Partial least squares analysis of grey matter volume and cognition identified one significant pair of latent variables (r = .40, p = .009). This volumetric latent variable expressed negative loadings in frontal (superior 232 233 frontal gyrus, precentral gyrus, paracentral lobule), parietal (postcentral gyrus, precuneus, superior and inferior parietal lobule) and occipital (lateral and medial occipital cortex) regions and positive loadings in 234 parahippocampal and hippocampal regions (Figure 4). The Cognition-LV profile expressed positively a large 235 236 array of cognitive tests, with strongest values on delayed memory, Trail Making, Digit Symbol, Boston 237 Naming and Fluency tests. The positive correlation between volumetric and cognitive LV's confirms the 238 expected relationship across the cohort as a whole, between cortical grey matter volume and both 239 executive, language and mnemonic function (Figure 4).

240 To understand the structure-cognition relationship in each group and in relation to the expected 241 years of onset, we performed a second-level moderation analysis using a regression model: we entered 242 Cognition-LV subject scores as dependent variable, and grey matter volume LV subject scores, genetic 243 status (i.e. carrier or non-carrier), expected years to onset and their interactions as independent variables 244 in addition to covariates of no interest. The results indicated that the relationship between grey matter 245 volume and cognition could not be explained by genetic status, expected years to onset or their interactions 246 with grey matter volume LV subject scores. There was no evidence for genetic status- and onset-dependent 247 differences (over and above ageing and other covariates) in the associations between grey matter volume 248 and cognition in this analysis (Figure 4).

249 Connectivity-Cognition

PLS analysis of functional connectivity and cognition also identified one significant pair of LVs (Function-LV and Cognition-LV, r=.32, p=.020), see Figure 5. This Function-LV reflected weak between-network connectivity, coupled with strong within-network connectivity. This pattern indicates the segregation or modularity of large-scale brain networks. The Cognition-LV expressed all tests, with positive loading values indicating that higher performance on a wide range of cognitive tests is associated with stronger functional network segregation. Cognitive deficits were associated with loss of segregation, with increased betweennetwork connectivity and decreased within-network connectivity.

To further test whether the observed behaviourally-relevant pattern of connectivity is differentially expressed between genetic status groups and expected years of onset, we constructed a second-level regression model with robust error estimates by including Function-LV subject scores, genetic status, expected years of onset and their interaction terms as independent variables and Cognition-LV as dependent variable in addition to covariates of no interest (Figure 5).

We found evidence for significant interaction between expected years of onset and Function-LV (r=.21, p<.001) and between group and Function-LV (r=.15, p=.003) explaining unique variance in Cognition-LV. We used the Dawson and Richter approach [36] to test formally for differences in the relationship (i.e. simple slopes) between Function-LV and Cognition-LV for PSC and NC. The relationship between Function-LV and Cognition-LV was stronger for PSC relative to NC (r=.15, p=.003), indicating the increasing importance of functional connectivity between the large-scale networks for PSC participants to maintain performance (Figure 5).

269 For ease of interpretation and illustration, we also computed the correlation between Cognition-LV and 270 Function-LV for high and low levels of expected years to onset (EYO) within each group separately, where 271 the levels were taken to be 1 standard deviation above and below the mean values of EYO. The two EYO 272 subgroups were labelled "near" and "far", with "near" for EYO values close to zero (i.e. participant's age is "near" the age at which disease symptoms were demonstrated in the family), and "far" for EYO being a 273 274 largely negative value (i.e. participant's age is "far" from the age at which disease symptoms were 275 demonstrated in the family). The analysis indicated that as the EYO decreases (i.e. participant's age is 276 reaching the years of onset of symptoms) the relationship between functional connectivity and 277 performance becomes stronger (moderation effects; r=.14, p=.021 and r=.28, p<.001 for NC and PSC. 278 respectively). Interestingly this relationship was stronger in each EYO subgroup for PSC relative to NC (PSC-279 Near vs NC-Near: r=.28, p<.001; PSC-Far vs NC-Far: r=.22, p=.001). These findings indicate that the 280 relationship between FC and cognition is stronger in PSC relative to NC, and that this relationship increases 281 as a function of EYO.

282

283 4. Discussion

In the present study, we confirmed previous findings of group differences in brain structure and function,in the absence of differences in cognitive performance between non-carriers and presymptomatic carriers

of FTD-related genetic mutations. But, while the relationship between structure and cognition was similar
in both groups, the coupling between function and cognition was stronger for presymptomatic carriers,
and increased as they approached the expected onset of disease.

289 These results suggest that people can maintain good cognitive abilities and successful day-to-day 290 functioning despite significant neuronal loss and atrophy. This disjunction between structure and function 291 is a feature of healthy ageing, but we have shown that it also characterises presymptomatic FTD, over and 292 above the age effects in their other family members, despite widespread progressive atrophy. The 293 multivariate approach reveals two key findings: (i) presymptomatic carriers express stronger between-294 network and weaker within-network functional connectivity than age-matched non-carriers, and (ii) as 295 carriers approach their estimated age of symptom onset, and atrophy becomes evident, the maintenance 296 of good cognition is increasingly associated with sustaining balance of within- and between-network 297 integration.

298 This balance of within- and between-network connectivity is characteristic of segregated and specialized 299 network organization of brain systems. Such functional segregation varies with physiological ageing 300 [17,18,37], with cognitive function [18] and in individuals at risk for Alzheimer's disease [38]. Graph-301 theoretic quantification of network organisation confirms the relevance of modularity and efficiency to 302 function in FTD [16]. Conversely, the loss of neural systems' modularity mirrors the loss of functional 303 specialization with age [39] and dementia [38]. Here, we show the significance of the maintenance of this 304 functional network organisation, with a progressively stronger correlation with cognitive performance as 305 seemingly healthy adults approach the age of expected onset of FTD.

306 The uncoupling of brain function from brain structure indicates that there may be independent and 307 synergistic effects of multiple factors leading to cognitive preservation. This is consistent with a previous 308 work in healthy ageing where brain activity and connectivity provide independent and synergistic 309 predictions of performance across the lifespan [19]. Therefore, future studies need to consider the 310 independent and synergistic effects of many possible biomarkers, based on MRI, computed tomography, 311 positron-emission tomography, CSF, blood and brain histopathology. For example, functional network impairment may be related to tau expression and tau pathology, amyloid load, or neurotransmitter deficits 312 313 in neurodegenerative diseases, independent of atrophy [29,40–42]. Importantly, studies need to recognise the rich multivariate nature of cognition and of neuroimaging in order to improve stratification procedures, 314 315 e.g. based on integrative approaches that explain individual differences in cognitive impairment [29,43].

We also recognise the difficulty to determine a unique contribution of each factor (e.g. brain structure and brain function), given the increasing interaction between factors in advanced stages of disease [44]. This is further complicated by these alterations becoming irreversible with progression of neurodegeneration [45]. This suggests that the critical interplay between multiple factors (including brain structure and function) may be better studied in the asymptomatic and preclinical stages as well as across the healthy lifespan, which could still be modifiable and their influences are likely to be more separable.

322 Our findings agree with the model of compensation in the presymptomatic and early phases of 323 Huntington's disease, where network coupling predicted better cognitive performance [46]. In a recent 324 longitudinal study a non-linear concave-down pattern of both brain activity and behaviour was present, 325 despite a linear decline in brain volume over time, [47]. Similar effects have been observed also in healthy 326 ageing and amnestic mild cognitive impairment, where greater connectivity with the default-mode network 327 and weaker connectivity between default-mode network and dorsal-attention network was associated with 328 higher cognitive status in both groups [48]. Network integrity may also play a role in compensatory 329 mechanisms in non-cognitive symptoms, such as motor impairment in Parkinson's disease [49]. 330 Accordingly, increased network efficiency and connectivity has been shown in prodromal phases, followed 331 by decreased local connectivity in symptomatic phases, suggesting the emergence and dissipation of neural 332 compensation [50].

333 The current study has several limitations. First, despite the large sample of subjects included, we did not 334 analyse each gene separately, as it may have resulted in too small and unbalanced samples, lowering 335 statistical power and robustness. Moreover, genetic FTD is also characterised by multiple mutations within 336 these genes and pleiotropy of clinical phenotypes even for the same mutation [10]. Pleiotropy in terms of 337 clinical phenotype is avoided by the study of presymptomatic carriers, but we cannot rule out pleiotropy 338 of intermediate phenotypes expressed as say neural network diversity. Furthermore, clinical heterogeneity 339 is modified by environmental factors such as education [which may be a surrogate of cognitive reserve, 51], 340 in FTD as in other dementias [12]. Genetic modifiers such as TMEM106B [52], APOE [53], have also been identified. Further work, with larger cohorts, will be able to test the potential effect of these moderators 341 342 on the relationships between brain structure, functional networks and cognition. Future studies will benefit from using brain measures that reflect differences in neural connectivity directly from neurophysiology or 343 344 separation of neurovascular from neuronal contributors to BOLD fMRI variance [18,54], which can confound the effects of age, drug or disease [55]. 345

The current study is cross-sectional. Therefore, we cannot infer longitudinal progression within subjects as the unambiguous cause of the effects we observe in relation to expected years of onset. Accumulating evidence suggests that network integrity serves to maintain performance with either physiological ageing or pathological conditions. However, longitudinal mediation studies and pharmacological or electroceutical interventions would be needed to prove its causal role in cognitive preservation. Finally, our findings are limited to autosomal dominant FTD, which represents a minority of FTD: generalisation to sporadic forms of disease would be speculative.

In conclusion, we used a multivariate data-driven approach to demonstrate that brain functional integrity can enable presymptomatic carriers to maintain cognitive performance in the presence of progressive brain atrophy for years before the onset of symptoms. The approach and the findings have implications for the design of presymptomatic disease-modifying therapy trials and the study of unique and synergistic effects of risk factors and biomarkers in health and disease, which are otherwise increasingly interacting and irreversible with progression of neurodegeneration.

359

360

361 5. References

362

- Persson J, Nyberg L, Lind J, Larsson A, Nilsson LG, Ingvar M, et al. Structure-function correlates of
 cognitive decline in aging. CerebCortex 2006;16:907–15.
- Geerligs L, Cam-CAN, Henson RN. Functional connectivity and structural covariance between
 regions of interest can be measured more accurately using multivariate distance correlation.
 Neuroimage 2016;135:16–31. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.04.047.
- 368 [3] Cope TE, Rittman T, Borchert RJ, Jones PS, Vatansever D, Allinson K, et al. Tau burden and the
 functional connectome in Alzheimer's disease and progressive supranuclear palsy. Brain
 2018;141:550–67. doi:10.1093/brain/awx347.
- Seeley WW, Crawford RK, Zhou J, Miller BL, Greicius MD. Neurodegenerative diseases target largescale human brain networks. Neuron 2009;62:42–52. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2009.03.024.
- Raj A, Kuceyeski A, Weiner M. A network diffusion model of disease progression in dementia.
 Neuron 2012;73:1204–15. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2011.12.040.
- Kinnunen KM, Cash DM, Poole T, Frost C, Benzinger TLS, Ahsan RL, et al. Presymptomatic atrophy
 in autosomal dominant Alzheimer's disease: A serial magnetic resonance imaging study.
 Alzheimer's Dement 2018;14:43–53. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2017.06.2268.
- Rohrer JD, Nicholas JM, Cash DM, van Swieten J, Dopper E, Jiskoot L, et al. Presymptomatic
 cognitive and neuroanatomical changes in genetic frontotemporal dementia in the Genetic
 Frontotemporal dementia Initiative (GENFI) study: a cross-sectional analysis. Lancet Neurol
 2015;14:253–62. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(14)70324-2.
- Vatsavayai SC, Yoon SJ, Gardner RC, Gendron TF, Vargas JNS, Trujillo A, et al. Timing and
 significance of pathological features in *C9orf72* expansion-associated frontotemporal dementia.
 Brain 2016;139:3202–16. doi:10.1093/brain/aww250.
- 385 [9] Deleon J, Miller BL. Frontotemporal dementia, 2018, p. 409–30. doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-64076386 5.00027-2.

- [10] Snowden JS, Adams J, Harris J, Thompson JC, Rollinson S, Richardson A, et al. Distinct clinical and
 pathological phenotypes in frontotemporal dementia associated with MAPT, PGRN and C9orf72
 mutations. Amyotroph Lateral Scler Front Degener 2015;16:497–505.
 doi:10.3109/21678421.2015.1074700.
- Murphy NA, Arthur KC, Tienari PJ, Houlden H, Chiò A, Traynor BJ. Age-related penetrance of the
 C9orf72 repeat expansion. Sci Rep 2017;7:2116. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-02364-1.
- Premi E, Grassi M, Van Swieten J, Galimberti D, Graff C, Masellis M, et al. Cognitive reserve and
 TMEM106B genotype modulate brain damage in presymptomatic frontotemporal dementia: a
 GENFI study. Brain 2017;140:1784–91. doi:10.1093/brain/awx103.
- [13] Cash DM, Bocchetta M, Thomas DL, Dick KM, van Swieten JC, Borroni B, et al. Patterns of gray
 matter atrophy in genetic frontotemporal dementia: results from the GENFI study. Neurobiol Aging
 2018;62:191–6. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2017.10.008.
- 399 [14] Olm CA, McMillan CT, Irwin DJ, Van Deerlin VM, Cook PA, Gee JC, et al. Longitudinal structural gray
 400 matter and white matter MRI changes in presymptomatic progranulin mutation carriers.
 401 NeuroImage Clin 2018;19:497–506. doi:10.1016/J.NICL.2018.05.017.
- Floeter MK, Danielian LE, Braun LE, Wu T. Longitudinal diffusion imaging across the *C9orf72* clinical
 spectrum. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2018;89:53–60. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2017-316799.
- 404 [16] Rittman DT, Borchert MR, Jones MS, van Swieten J, Borroni B, Galimberti D, et al. Functional
 405 network resilience to pathology in presymptomatic genetic frontotemporal dementia. Neurobiol
 406 Aging 2019;77:169–77. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROBIOLAGING.2018.12.009.
- 407 [17] Chan MY, Park DC, Savalia NK, Petersen SE, Wig GS. Decreased segregation of brain systems across
 408 the healthy adult lifespan. Proc Natl Acad Sci 2014;111:4997–5006.
 409 doi:10.1073/pnas.1415122111.
- [18] Tsvetanov KA, Henson RNA, Tyler LK, Razi A, Geerligs L, Ham TE, et al. Extrinsic and intrinsic brain
 network connectivity maintains cognition across the lifespan despite accelerated decay of regional
 brain activation. J Neurosci 2016;36:3115–26. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2733-15.2016.
- [19] Tsvetanov KA, Ye Z, Hughes L, Samu D, Treder MS, Wolpe N, et al. Activity and connectivity
 differences underlying inhibitory control across the adult lifespan. J Neurosci 2018;38:7887–900.

415 doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2919-17.2018.

- 416 [20] Chhatwal JP, Schultz AP, Johnson KA, Hedden T, Jaimes S, Benzinger TLS, et al. Preferential
 417 degradation of cognitive networks differentiates Alzheimer's disease from ageing. Brain
 418 2018;141:1486–500. doi:10.1093/brain/awy053.
- 419 [21] Shafto MA, Tyler LK, Dixon M, Taylor JR, Rowe JB, Cusack R, et al. The Cambridge Centre for Ageing
 420 and Neuroscience (Cam-CAN) study protocol: a cross-sectional, lifespan, multidisciplinary
 421 examination of healthy cognitive ageing. BMC Neurol 2014;14:204. doi:10.1186/s12883-014-0204422 1.
- 423 [22] Morris JC, Weintraub S, Chui HC, Cummings J, DeCarli C, Ferris S, et al. The Uniform Data Set (UDS):
 424 Clinical and Cognitive Variables and Descriptive Data From Alzheimer Disease Centers. Alzheimer
 425 Dis Assoc Disord 2006;20:210–6. doi:10.1097/01.wad.0000213865.09806.92.
- 426 [23] Ashburner J. A fast diffeomorphic image registration algorithm. Neuroimage 2007;38:95–113.
 427 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.07.007.
- 428 [24] Cusack R, Vicente-Grabovetsky A, Mitchell DJ, Wild CJ, Auer T, Linke AC, et al. Automatic analysis
 429 (aa): efficient neuroimaging workflows and parallel processing using Matlab and XML. Front
 430 Neuroinform 2014;8:90. doi:10.3389/fninf.2014.00090.
- 431 [25] Friston KJ, Ashburner J, Kiebel S, Nichols T, Penny WD. Statistical parametric mapping : the analysis
 432 of functional brain images. Elsevier Academic Press; 2007.
- 433 [26] Jenkinson M, Bannister P, Brady M, Smith S. Improved optimization for the robust and accurate
 434 linear registration and motion correction of brain images. Neuroimage 2002;17:825–41.
- 435 [27] Pruim RHR, Mennes M, Buitelaar JK, Beckmann CF. Evaluation of ICA-AROMA and alternative
 436 strategies for motion artifact removal in resting state fMRI. Neuroimage 2015;112:278–87.
 437 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.02.063.
- 438 [28] Geerligs L, Tsvetanov KA, Cam-Can, Henson RN. Challenges in measuring individual differences in
 439 functional connectivity using fMRI: The case of healthy aging. Hum Brain Mapp 2017.
 440 doi:10.1002/hbm.23653.
- 441 [29] Passamonti L, Tsvetanov KA, Jones PS, Bevan-Jones WR, Arnold R, Borchert RJ, et al.

- 442 Neuroinflammation and functional connectivity in Alzheimer's disease: interactive influences on
 443 cognitive performance. BioRxiv Prepr 2019. doi:10.1101/532291.
- 444 [30] Shirer WR, Ryali S, Rykhlevskaia E, Menon V, Greicius MD. Decoding subject-driven cognitive states
 445 with whole-brain connectivity patterns. Cereb Cortex 2012;22:158–65.
 446 doi:10.1093/cercor/bhr099.
- 447 [31] Blankertz B, Lemm S, Treder M, Haufe S, Müller K-R. Single-trial analysis and classification of ERP
 448 components--a tutorial. Neuroimage 2011;56:814–25. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.06.048.
- 449 [32] Ledoit O, Wolf M. A well-conditioned estimator for large-dimensional covariance matrices. J
 450 Multivar Anal 2004;88:365–411. doi:10.1016/S0047-259X(03)00096-4.
- 451 [33] Lemm S, Blankertz B, Dickhaus T, Müller K-R. Introduction to machine learning for brain imaging.
 452 Neuroimage 2011;56:387–99. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.11.004.
- 453 [34] Fan L, Li H, Zhuo J, Zhang Y, Wang J, Chen L, et al. The Human Brainnetome Atlas: A New Brain Atlas
 454 Based on Connectional Architecture. Cereb Cortex 2016;26:3508–26. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhw157.
- 455 [35] Krishnan A, Williams LJ, McIntosh AR, Abdi H. Partial Least Squares (PLS) methods for
 456 neuroimaging: A tutorial and review. Neuroimage 2011;56:455–75.
 457 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.07.034.
- 458 [36] Dawson JF, Richter AW. Probing three-way interactions in moderated multiple regression:
 459 Development and application of a slope difference test. J Appl Psychol 2006;91:917–26.
 460 doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.917.
- 461 [37] Samu D, Campbell KL, Tsvetanov KA, Shafto MA, Consortium C-C, Brayne C, et al. Preserved
 462 cognitive functions with age are determined by domain-dependent shifts in network responsivity.
 463 Nat Commun 2017;8:ncomms14743. doi:10.1038/ncomms14743.
- 464 [38] Contreras JA, Goñi J, Risacher SL, Amico E, Yoder K, Dzemidzic M, et al. Cognitive complaints in
 465 older adults at risk for Alzheimer's disease are associated with altered resting-state networks.
 466 Alzheimer's Dement Diagnosis, Assess Dis Monit 2017;6:40–9. doi:10.1016/J.DADM.2016.12.004.
- 467 [39] Cabeza R, Albert M, Belleville S, Craik FIM, Duarte A, Grady CL, et al. Maintenance, reserve and
 468 compensation: the cognitive neuroscience of healthy ageing. Nat Rev Neurosci 2018;19:701–10.

doi:10.1038/s41583-018-0068-2.

- 470 [40] Hedden T, Van Dijk KRA, Becker JA, Mehta A, Sperling RA, Johnson KA, et al. Disruption of functional
 471 connectivity in clinically normal older adults harboring amyloid burden. J Neurosci 2009;29:12686–
 472 94. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3189-09.2009.
- 473 [41] Murley AG, Rowe JB. Neurotransmitter deficits from frontotemporal lobar degeneration. Brain
 474 2018;141:1263–85. doi:10.1093/brain/awx327.
- [42] Rittman T, Rubinov M, Vértes PE, Patel AX, Ginestet CE, Ghosh BCP, et al. Regional expression of
 the MAPT gene is associated with loss of hubs in brain networks and cognitive impairment in
 Parkinson disease and progressive supranuclear palsy. Neurobiol Aging 2016;48:153–60.
 doi:10.1016/J.NEUROBIOLAGING.2016.09.001.
- [43] Geerligs L, Tsvetanov KAKA. The use of resting state data in an integrative approach to studying
 neurocognitive ageing Commentary on Campbell and Schacter (2016). Lang Cogn Neurosci
 2016;32. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2016.1251600.
- 482 [44] Vemuri P, Lesnick TG, Przybelski SA, Knopman DS, Preboske GM, Kantarci K, et al. Vascular and
 483 amyloid pathologies are independent predictors of cognitive decline in normal elderly. Brain
 484 2015;138:761–71. doi:10.1093/brain/awu393.
- 485 [45] Rodrigue KM, Kennedy KM, Devous MD, Rieck JR, Hebrank AC, Diaz-Arrastia R, et al. β-Amyloid
 486 burden in healthy aging: regional distribution and cognitive consequences. Neurology
 487 2012;78:387–95. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e318245d295.
- 488 [46] Klöppel S, Gregory S, Scheller E, Minkova L, Razi A, Durr A, et al. Compensation in Preclinical
 489 Huntington's Disease: Evidence From the Track-On HD Study. EBioMedicine 2015;2:1420–9.
 490 doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2015.08.002.
- 491 [47] Gregory S, Long JD, Klöppel S, Razi A, Scheller E, Minkova L, et al. Operationalizing compensation
 492 over time in neurodegenerative disease. Brain 2017;140:1158–65. doi:10.1093/brain/awx022.
- [48] Sullivan MD, Anderson JAE, Turner GR, Spreng RN. Intrinsic neurocognitive network connectivity
 differences between normal aging and mild cognitive impairment are associated with cognitive
 status and age. Neurobiol Aging 2019;73:219–28. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROBIOLAGING.2018.10.001.

- 496 [49] Blesa J, Trigo-Damas I, Dileone M, del Rey NL-G, Hernandez LF, Obeso JA. Compensatory
 497 mechanisms in Parkinson's disease: Circuits adaptations and role in disease modification. Exp
 498 Neurol 2017;298:148–61. doi:10.1016/J.EXPNEUROL.2017.10.002.
- Wen M-C, Heng HSE, Hsu J-L, Xu Z, Liew GM, Au WL, et al. Structural connectome alterations in
 prodromal and de novo Parkinson's disease patients. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2017;45:21–7.
 doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2017.09.019.
- 502 [51] Stern Y. Cognitive reserve in ageing and Alzheimer's disease. Lancet Neurol 2012;11:1006–12.
 503 doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(12)70191-6.
- [52] Lattante S, Le Ber I, Galimberti D, Serpente M, Rivaud-Péchoux S, Camuzat A, et al. Defining the
 association of TMEM106B variants among frontotemporal lobar degeneration patients with GRN
 mutations and C9orf72 repeat expansions. Neurobiol Aging 2014;35:2658.e1-2658.e5.
 doi:10.1016/J.NEUROBIOLAGING.2014.06.023.
- Koriath C, Kenny J, Adamson G, Druyeh R, Taylor W, Beck J, et al. Predictors for a dementia gene
 mutation based on gene-panel next-generation sequencing of a large dementia referral series. Mol
 Psychiatry 2018. doi:10.1038/s41380-018-0224-0.
- 511 [54] Sami S, Williams N, Hughes LE, Cope TE, Rittman T, Coyle-Gilchrist ITS, et al. Neurophysiological
 512 signatures of Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal lobar degeneration: pathology versus
 513 phenotype. Brain 2018;141:2500–10. doi:10.1093/brain/awy180.
- [55] Campbell KL, Shafto MA, Wright P, Tsvetanov KA, Geerligs L, Cusack R, et al. Idiosyncratic
 responding during movie-watching predicted by age differences in attentional control. Neurobiol
 Aging 2015;36:3045–55. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2015.07.028.
- 517
- 518
- 519

520

521 6. Acknowledgements

Kamen A. Tsvetanov is supported by the British Academy (Postdoctoral Fellowship, PF160048).
James B Rowe is supported by the Wellcome Trust (103838) the Medical Research Council (SUAG/051
G101400) and the Cambridge NIHR Biomedical Research Centre. Raquel Sánchez-Valle is supported by the
Instituto de Salud Carlos III and the JPND network PreFrontAls (01ED1512/AC14/0013) and the Fundació
Marató de TV3 (20143810).

527

528

533

529 7. Tables

Table 1. Demographics of participants included in the analysis, grouped by genetic status
as non-carriers (NC) and presymptomatic carriers (PSC). * denotes whether demographics vary
between NC and PSC groups.

		Gene Carrier Group		Statistical tests*	
		NC	PSC	X ² or F-test	P-value
Ν		134	121		
Age				2.68	0.103
	Mean / SD	49 / 14	46/11		
	Range [Min/Max]	19 / 86	20 / 70		
Gender, n (%)				0.01	0.908
	Men	53 (39.6)	47 (38.8)		
	Women	81 (60.4)	74 (61.2)		
Expected Years to Onset				0.23	0.631
	Mean / SD	-10 / 12	-11 / 11		
	Range [Min/Max]	-25 / 10	-25 / 10		
Education	ı			0.05	0.826
	Mean / SD	14/3	14/3		
	Range [Min/Max]	5/24	5 / 22		
Mini-Mental State Examination				0.39	0.532
	Mean / SD	29 / 1	29/1		
	Range [Min/Max]	25 / 30	23 / 30		

534 8. Figures

535



536

Figure 1. Schematic representation of data processing and analysis pipeline to test for 537 brain-behaviour differences between presymptomatic carriers (PSC) and non-carriers (NC) as a 538 function of expected years to onset (EYO) of symptoms, while controlling for covariates of no 539 interest (Covs). Brain structural measures were based on the mean grey matter volume (GMV) in 540 246 nodes, as defined in the Brainnetome atlas [34]. Brain functional measures were based on the 541 542 functional connectivity between 15 nodes as part of four large-scale networks, which were defined in an independent cohort of 298 age-matched individuals part of the Cam-CAN dataset 543 (Passamonti et al 2019 BioArxiv). 544



545

Figure 2. Visualisation of spatial localisation of the nodes part of the four large-scale 546 networks and their mean functional connectivity (circular plot) across all participants in this study. 547 Nodes and networks were defined in an independent cohort of 298 age-matched individuals part 548 of the Cam-CAN dataset (Passamonti et al 2019). The default mode network (DMN) contained five 549 nodes: the ventral anterior cingulate cortex (vACC), dorsal and ventral posterior cingulate cortex 550 551 (vPCC and dPCC), and right and left inferior parietal lobes (rIPL and IIPL). The salience network (SN) was defined using right and left anterior insular (rAI and IAI) and dorsal anterior cingulate 552 cortex (dACC). The frontoparietal network (FPN) was defined using right and left anterior superior 553 frontal gyrus (raSFG and laSFG), and right and left angular gyrus (rAG and IAG). The dorsal 554 attention Network (DAN) was defined using right and left intraparietal sulcus (rIPS and IIPS). 555

- 556
- 557
- 558



559

Figure 3. Group differences between PSC and NC in grey matter volume (left panel) and functional connectivity between nodes within four large scale networks (right panel). Hot colour scheme indicates the strength of effect size of PSC showing higher GMV and FC than NC, while cold colour scheme indicates the opposite effect (i.e. NC > PSC).



Figure 4. PLS analysis of grey matter volume (GMV) and cognition indicating the spatial distribution of GMV loading values (a), where hot and cold colour schemes are used for the strength of positive and negative correlations with the profile of Cognitive LV (b). (c) The scatter plot on the left represents the relationship between subjects scores of GMV LV and Cognition LV for presymptomatic carriers (PSC) and non-carriers (NC). The scatter plots in the middle and right hand-side represent GMV-Cognition LV relationship as a function of expected years to onset (EYO, split in two groups, Near and Far, see text) in each gene group separately.

572

573 *Figure 5.* PLS analysis of functional connectivity and cognition indicating the connectivity 574 pattern of loading values (a), where hot and cold colour schemes are used for the strength of positive and negative correlations with the profile of Cognitive LV (b). (c) The scatter plot on the 575 left represents the relationship between subjects scores of Function LV and Cognition LV for 576 577 presymptomatic carriers (PSC) and non-carriers (NC). The scatter plots in the middle and right hand-side represents Function-Cognition LV relationship as a function of expected years to onset 578 579 (EYO split in two groups, Near and Far, see text) in each gene group separately, which is also 580 represented using a bar chart in (d). * denotes significant test at p-value < 0.05.

581 9. APPENDIX

- 582 List of other GENFI consortium members
- 583 Sónia Afonso Instituto Ciencias Nucleares Aplicadas a Saude, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
- 584 Maria Rosario Almeida Centre of Neurosciences and Cell Biology, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
- 585 Sarah Anderl-Straub Department of Neurology, Ulm University, Ulm, GermanyChristin Andersson Department of
- 586 Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- Anna Antonell Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive disorders unit, Neurology Department, Hospital Clinic,
 Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques, Barcelona, Spain
- 589 Silvana Archetti Biotechnology Laboratory, Department of Diagnostics, Spedali Civili Hospital, Brescia, Italy
- 590 Andrea Arighi Fondazione IRCSS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Neurodegenerative Diseases Unit, 591 Milan, Italy
- 592 Mircea Balasa Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive disorders unit, Neurology Department, Hospital Clinic, 593 Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques, Barcelona, Spain
- 594 Myriam Barandiaran Neuroscience Area, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Paseo Dr Begiristain sn, CP 20014, 595 San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain
- 596 Nuria Bargalló Radiology Department, Image Diagnosis Center, Hospital Clínic and Magnetic Resonance Image core
- 597 facility, IDIBAPS, Barcelona, Spain
- Robart Bartha Department of Medical Biophysics, Robarts Research Institute, University of Western Ontario,
 London, Ontario, Canada
- Benjamin Bender Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, University of Tuebingen,
 Tuebingen, Germany
- Luisa Benussi Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Centro San Giovanni di Dio Fatebenefratelli,
 Brescia, Italy
- Valentina Bessi Department of Neuroscience, Psychology, Drug Research, and Child Health, University of Florence,
 Florence, Italy
- 606 Giuliano Binetti Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Centro San Giovanni di Dio 607 Fatebenefratelli, Brescia, Italy
- 608 Sandra Black LC Campbell Cognitive Neurology Research Unit, Sunnybrook Research Institute, Toronto, Canada
- 609 Martina Bocchetta Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of 610 Neurology, Queen Square London, UK
- 611 Sergi Borrego-Ecija Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive disorders unit, Neurology Department, Hospital Clinic,
- 612 Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques, Barcelona, Spain
- Jose Bras Dementia Research Institute, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology,
 Queen Square, London, UK
- 615 Rose Bruffaerts Laboratory for Cognitive Neurology, Department of Neurosciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
- Paola Caroppo Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, Milan,
 Italy
- David Cash Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology,
 Queen Square, London, UK
- 620 Miguel Castelo-Branco Neurology Department, Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra, Instituto de Ciências 621 Nucleares Aplicadas à Saúde (ICNAS), Coimbra, Portugal
- 621 Nucleares Aplicadas à Saúde (ICNAS), Coimbra, Portugal
- 622 Rhian Convery Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology,
- 623 Queen Square, London, UK
- 624 Thomas Cope Department of Clinical Neuroscience, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
- 625 Maura Cosseddu Centre for Neurodegenerative Disorders, Neurology Unit, Spedali Civili Hospital, Brescia, Italy
- 626 María de Arriba Neuroscience Area, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Paseo Dr Begiristain sn, CP 20014, San 627 Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain
- 628 Giuseppe Di Fede Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta,
- 629 Milan, Italy
- 630 Zigor Díaz CITA Alzheimer, San Sebastian, Spain

- 631 Katrina M Moore Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of
- 632 Neurology, Queen Square, London, UK
- 633 Diana Duro Faculty of Medicine, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
- 634 Chiara Fenoglio University of Milan, Centro Dino Ferrari, Milan, Italy
- 635 Camilla Ferrari Department of Neuroscience, Psychology, Drug Research, and Child Health, University of Florence,
- 636 Florence, Italy
- 637 Carlos Ferreira Instituto Ciências Nucleares Aplicadas à Saúde, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
- 638 Catarina B. Ferreira Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal
- Toby Flanagan Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, Division of Neuroscience and Experimental Psychology,
- 640 University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- Nick Fox Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology,
 Queen Square, London, UK
- 643 Morris Freedman Division of Neurology, Baycrest Centre for Geriatric Care, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
- 644 Giorgio Fumagalli Fondazione IRCSS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Neurodegenerative Diseases Unit,
- 645 Milan, Italy; Department of Neuroscience, Psychology, Drug Research and Child Health, University of Florence, 646 Florence, Italy
- 647 Alazne Gabilondo Neuroscience Area, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Paseo Dr Begiristain sn, CP 20014, San
- 648 Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain
- 649 Roberto Gasparotti Neuroradiology Unit, University of Brescia, Brescia, Italy
- 650 Serge Gauthier Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada
- Stefano Gazzina Centre for Neurodegenerative Disorders, Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental
 Sciences, University of Brescia, Brescia, Italy
- 653 Giorgio Giaccone Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, 654 Milan, Italy
- Ana Gorostidi Neuroscience Area, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Paseo Dr Begiristain sn, CP 20014, San
 Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain
- 657 Caroline Greaves Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of
- 658 Neurology, Queen Square London, UK
- 659 Rita Guerreiro Dementia Research Institute, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of 660 Neurology, London, UK
- 661 Carolin Heller Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology,
- 662 Queen Square, London, UK
- Tobias Hoegen Department of Neurology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich, Munich, Germany
- 664 Begoña Indakoetxea Cognitive Disorders Unit, Department of Neurology, Donostia University Hospital, Paseo Dr 665 Begiristain sn, CP 20014, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain
- 666 Vesna Jelic Division of Clinical Geriatrics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- 667 Lize Jiskoot Department of Neurology, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
- 668 Hans-Otto Karnath Section of Neuropsychology, Department of Cognitive Neurology, Center for Neurology &
- 669 Hertie-Institute for Clinical Brain Research, Tübingen, Germany
- 670 Ron Keren University Health Network Memory Clinic, Toronto Western Hospital, Toronto, Canada
- 671 Maria João Leitão Centre of Neurosciences and Cell Biology, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
- 672 Albert Lladó Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive disorders unit, Neurology Department, Hospital Clinic, Institut
- 673 d'Investigacions Biomèdiques, Barcelona, Spain
- 674 Gemma Lombardi Department of Neuroscience, Psychology, Drug Research and Child Health, University of 675 Florence, Florence, Italy
- 676 Sandra Loosli Department of Neurology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich, Munich, Germany
- 677 Carolina Maruta Lisbon Faculty of Medicine, Language Research Laboratory, Lisbon, Portugal
- Simon Mead MRC Prion Unit, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen
 Square, London, UK
- 680 Lieke Meeter Department of Neurology, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, Netherlands
- 681 Gabriel Miltenberger Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal
- 682 Rick van Minkelen Department of Clinical Genetics, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
- 683 Sara Mitchell LC Campbell Cognitive Neurology Research Unit, Sunnybrook Research Institute, Toronto, Canada

- 684 Benedetta Nacmias - Department of Neuroscience, Psychology, Drug Research and Child Health, University of 685 Florence, Florence, Italy
- 686 Mollie Neason - Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, 687 Queen Square, London, UK
- 688 Jennifer Nicholas – Department of Medical Statistics, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK 689 Linn Öijerstedt - Department of Geriatric Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- 690 Jaume Olives - Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive disorders unit, Neurology Department, Hospital Clinic, Institut
- 691 d'Investigacions Biomèdiques, Barcelona, Spain
- 692 Alessandro Padovani - Centre for Neurodegenerative Disorders, Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and 693
- Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Brescia, Italy
- 694 Jessica Panman – Department of Neurology, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
- 695 Janne Papma - Department of Neurology, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
- 696 Irene Piaceri - Department of Neuroscience, Psychology, Drug Research and Child Health, University of Florence, 697 Florence
- 698 Michela Pievani - Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Centro San Giovanni di Dio 699 Fatebenefratelli, Brescia, Italy
- 700 Yolande Pijnenburg - VUMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- 701 Cristina Polito - Department of Biomedical, Experimental and Clinical Sciences "Mario Serio", Nuclear Medicine Unit,
- 702 University of Florence, Florence, Italy
- 703 Enrico Premi - Stroke Unit, Neurology Unit, Spedali Civili Hospital, Brescia, Italy
- 704 Sara Prioni - Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, Milan, 705 Italv
- 706 Catharina Prix - Department of Neurology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, Germany
- 707 Rosa Rademakers - Department of Neurosciences, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida, USA
- 708 Veronica Redaelli - Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, 709 Milan, Italy
- 710 Tim Rittman – Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
- 711 Ekaterina Rogaeva - Tanz Centre for Research in Neurodegenerative Diseases, University of Toronto, Toronto, 712 Canada
- 713 Pedro Rosa-Neto - Translational Neuroimaging Laboratory, McGill University Montreal, Québec, Canada
- 714 Giacomina Rossi - Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta,
- 715 Milan, Italy
- 716 Martin Rossor – Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology,
- 717 Queen Square, London, UK
- 718 Beatriz Santiago - Neurology Department, Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
- 719 Elio Scarpini - University of Milan, Centro Dino Ferrari, Milan, Italy; Fondazione IRCSS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Maggiore 720 Policlinico, Neurodegenerative Diseases Unit, Milan, Italy
- 721 Sonja Schönecker - Neurologische Klinik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, Germany
- 722 Elisa Semler – Department of Neurology, Ulm University, Ulm, Germany
- 723 Rachelle Shafei – Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology,
- 724 Queen Square, London, UK
- 725 Christen Shoesmith - Department of Clinical Neurological Sciences, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 726 Canada
- 727 Miguel Tábuas-Pereira - Centre of Neurosciences and Cell Biology, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
- 728 Mikel Tainta - Neuroscience Area, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Paseo Dr Begiristain sn, CP 20014, San 729 Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain
- 730 Ricardo Taipa - Neuropathology Unit and Department of Neurology, Centro Hospitalar do Porto - Hospital de Santo 731 António, Oporto, Portugal
- 732 David Tang-Wai - University Health Network Memory Clinic, Toronto Western Hospital, Toronto, Canada
- 733 David L Thomas - Neuroradiological Academic Unit, UCL Institute of Neurology, London, UK
- 734 Hakan Thonberg - Center for Alzheimer Research, Division of Neurogeriatrics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm,
- 735 Sweden
- 736 Carolyn Timberlake - University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

- 737 Pietro Tiraboschi Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta,
- 738 Milano, Italy
- 739 Philip Vandamme Neurology Service, University Hospitals Leuven, Belgium; Laboratory for Neurobiology, VIB-KU
- 740 Leuven Centre for Brain Research, Leuven, Belgium
- 741 Mathieu Vandenbulcke Geriatric Psychiatry Service, University Hospitals Leuven, Belgium; Neuropsychiatry,
- 742 Department of Neurosciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
- 743 Michele Veldsman University of Oxford, UK
- Ana Verdelho Department of Neurosciences, Santa Maria Hospital, University of Lisbon, Portugal
- 745 Jorge Villanua OSATEK Unidad de Donostia, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain
- Jason Warren Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology,
- 747 Queen Square, London, UK
- 748 Carlo Wilke Hertie Institute for Clinical Brain Research, University of Tuebingen, Tuebingen, Germany
- 749 Ione Woollacott Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of
 750 Neurology, Queen Square, London, UK
- 751 Elisabeth Wlasich Neurologische Klinik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, Germany
- 752 Henrik Zetterberg Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, London, UK
- 753 Miren Zulaica Neuroscience Area, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Paseo Dr Begiristain sn, CP 20014, San
- 754 Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain.
- 755