



HAL
open science

Structural progression of Alzheimer's disease over decades: the MRI staging scheme

Vincent Planche, José Manjon, Boris Mansencal, Enrique Lanuza, Thomas Tourdias, Gwenaëlle Catheline, Pierrick Coupé

► To cite this version:

Vincent Planche, José Manjon, Boris Mansencal, Enrique Lanuza, Thomas Tourdias, et al.. Structural progression of Alzheimer's disease over decades: the MRI staging scheme. *Brain Communications*, 2022, 4 (3), 10.1093/braincomms/fcac109 . hal-03694033

HAL Id: hal-03694033

<https://hal.science/hal-03694033v1>

Submitted on 13 Jun 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Structural progression of Alzheimer's disease over decades : the MRI staging scheme

Vincent Planche^{1,2}, José V. Manjon³, Boris Mansencal⁴, Enrique Lanuza⁵, Thomas
Tourdias^{6,7}, Gwenaëlle Catheline⁸ and Pierrick Coupé⁴

1. Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, UMR 5293, Institut des Maladies Neurodégénératives, F-33000 Bordeaux, France.
2. Centre Mémoire Ressources Recherches, Pôle de Neurosciences Cliniques, CHU de Bordeaux, F-33000 Bordeaux, France
3. Instituto de Aplicaciones de las Tecnologías de la Información y de las Comunicaciones Avanzadas (ITACA), Universitat Politècnica de València, Camino de Vera s/n, 46022, Valencia, Spain
4. CNRS, Univ. Bordeaux, Bordeaux INP, LABRI, UMR5800, F-33400 Talence, France
5. Univ. Valencia, Dept. of Cell Biology, Burjassot 46100, Valencia, Spain
6. Inserm U1215 - Neurocentre Magendie, Bordeaux F-33000, France
7. Service de Neuroimagerie diagnostique et thérapeutique, CHU de Bordeaux, F-33000 Bordeaux, France
8. Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, UMR 5287, Institut de Neurosciences Cognitives et Intégratives d'Aquitaine, F-33000 Bordeaux, France

Corresponding author: Dr Vincent Planche, MD., PhD., Institut des Maladies Neurodégénératives, UMR CNRS 5293, Centre Broca Nouvelle-Aquitaine, 146 rue Léo Saignat – 33076 Bordeaux cedex, France; vincent.planche@u-bordeaux.fr; Phone: +33 533 51 47 19

Short title : Alzheimer disease MRI staging scheme

Original article:

Word count: abstract: 224; article: 3316

Tables/Figures: 1 table, 4 figures.

References: 41

Abstract

The chronological progression of brain atrophy over decades, from presymptomatic to dementia stages, has never been formally depicted in Alzheimer's disease (AD). This is mainly due to the lack of cohorts with long enough MRI follow-ups in cognitively unimpaired young participants at baseline. To describe a spatiotemporal atrophy staging of AD at the whole-brain level, we built extrapolated lifetime volumetric models of healthy and AD brain structures by combining multiple large-scale databases (n=3512 quality controlled MRI from 9 cohorts of subjects covering the entire lifespan, including 415 MRI from ADNI1, ADNI2, and AIBL for AD patients). Then, we validated dynamic models based on cross-sectional data using external longitudinal data. Finally, we assessed the sequential divergence between normal aging and AD volumetric trajectories and described the following staging of brain atrophy progression in AD: (1) hippocampus and amygdala; (2) middle temporal gyrus; (3) entorhinal cortex, parahippocampal cortex, and other temporal areas; (4) striatum and thalamus and (5) middle frontal, cingular, parietal, insular cortices and pallidum. We concluded that this MRI scheme of atrophy progression in AD was close but did not entirely overlap with Braak staging of tauopathy, with a "reverse chronology" between limbic and entorhinal stages. AD structural progression may be associated with local tau accumulation but may also be related to axonal degeneration in remote sites and other limbic-predominant associated proteinopathies.

Keywords : Alzheimer, MRI, atrophy, staging, lifespan

Abbreviations: AD: Alzheimer's disease, ADNI: Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative, AIBL: Australian Imaging, Biomarkers and Lifestyle, CA: Cornu Ammonis, TDP-43: TAR DNA-binding protein 43, LATE: Limbic-predominant Age-related TDP-43 Encephalopathy, NFT: Neurofibrillary tangles, PET: Positron Emission Tomography

Introduction

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is a very slow progressing condition, likely to develop over three or four decades, from its preclinical phase to severe dementia and death.^{1,2} Unfortunately, to date, no longitudinal study has been long enough to describe such a slow progressing evolution through all these stages, and the model of AD progression over time remains partially hypothetical. However, providing insights into the spatio-temporal spreading of brain alterations, which will ultimately lead to the full spectrum of AD clinical symptoms, is crucial in the prospect of future therapeutic actions.

The current model of AD progression is mainly based on the Braak staging of AD tauopathy.³ This scheme was initially built on the concatenation of post-mortem pathological brain examinations from donors at all the stages of disease progression. Ongoing longitudinal tau-PET imaging studies support the Braak staging. However, the currently available follow-up is still relatively short, and only a few studies aimed at investigating the presymptomatic stages of the disease in cognitively unimpaired participants.⁴ Furthermore, first-generation tau-PET tracers do not allow the detailed investigation of medial-temporal structures due to off-target binding in the choroid plexus, and PET-histological correlation studies showed that these tracers lack sensitivity and could only identify patients with Braak stages ≥ 4 .⁵ Although the accumulation of AD tauopathy usually precedes measurable atrophy,⁶ the anatomical progression of brain atrophy in AD may not perfectly match with tau topography, and atrophy can experimentally precede overt cell loss.⁷

Indeed, many other factors are likely to explain brain atrophy in AD: the vascular pathology and the neuroinflammation coupled with AD neuropathological changes,⁸ interactions with other proteinopathies,⁹ network disruption due to local pathology combined with axonal degeneration and distant atrophy,¹⁰ local replication rate of tau aggregates,¹¹ and regional differential vulnerabilities to tau pathology and hypometabolism.¹² Thus, the chronological progression over decades of neurodegeneration and brain atrophy in AD has never been formally depicted at the whole-brain level, and it is unknown whether it strictly follows the Braak staging of AD tauopathy.

Because no single longitudinal data over decades is available, we proposed to take advantage of BigData sharing in neuroimaging by analyzing MRI databases of both AD patients and healthy subjects at different ages covering the entire lifespan. From these cross-sectional data,

1
2
3 we processed a massive number of MRI to generate extrapolated lifespan models of several
4 brain structure volumes evolution. Then, we validated such an approach by comparing profiles
5 extrapolated from these cross-sectional data with independent available “truly” longitudinal
6 data. Finally, we described an MRI staging of volume loss in AD by describing the timing (and
7 severity) of significant divergence between healthy subjects and AD patients’ volumetric
8 trajectories.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Methods**

21 ***Datasets***

22
23 Normal and AD trajectories of brain atrophy were estimated thanks to the aggregation of 9 open
24 access databases. The number of subjects included in the present study is provided after QC:

25
26
27 - *C-MIND*: 236 images of control subjects from the C-MIND dataset
28 (<https://research.cchmc.org/c-mind/>) are used in this study. All the 3D T1-weight (T1w)
29 MPRAGE high-resolution MRI were acquired at the same site on a 3T scanner with spatial
30 resolution of 1 mm³ acquired using a 32 channel SENSE head-coil.

31
32
33 - *NDAR*: 382 of control subjects from the Database for Autism Research (NDAR)
34 (<https://ndar.nih.gov>) are used in this study. The T1w 3D MRI were acquired on 1.5T MRI and
35 3T scanners. In our experiments, we used the NIHPD
36 (http://www.bic.mni.mcgill.ca/nihpd/info/data_access.html) dataset and 197 images of control
37 subjects from the Lab Study 19 of National Database for Autism Research. For the NIHPD
38 dataset, the 3D T1w SPGR MRI were acquired at six different sites with 1.5 Tesla systems by
39 General Electric (GE) and Siemens Medical Systems with spatial resolution of 1 mm³. The 3D
40 T1w MPRAGE MRI from the Lab Study 19 were scanned using a 3T Siemens Tim Trio scanner
41 at each site with spatial resolution of 1 mm³

42
43
44 - *ABIDE*: 492 control subjects from the Autism Brain Imaging Data Exchange (ABIDE) dataset
45 (http://fcon_1000.projects.nitrc.org/indi/abide/) are used in this study. The MRI are T1w
46 MPRAGE acquired at 20 different sites on 3T image and the details of acquisition, informed
47 consent, and site-specific protocols are available on the website.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 - *ICBM*: 294 normal subjects from the International Consortium for Brain Mapping (ICBM)
4 dataset (<http://www.loni.usc.edu/ICBM/>) obtained through the LONI website are used in this
5 study. The T1w MPRAGE MRI were acquired on a 1.5T Philips GyroScan imaging system
6 (Philips Medical Systems, Best, The Netherlands) with spatial resolution of 1 mm³.
7
8

9
10 - *IXI*: 549 normal control from Information eXtraction from Images (IXI) database (<http://brain-development.org/ixi-dataset/>) are used in this study. The MRI are T1w images collected at 3
11 sites with 1.5 and 3T scanners with spatial resolution close to 1mm³.
12
13

14 - *ADNI1&2*: 404 control subjects and 332 AD patients from the Alzheimer's Disease
15 Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (<http://adni.loni.usc.edu>) phase 1 and 2 are used in
16 this study. These baseline MRI are T1w MPRAGE and SPGR acquired on 1.5T scanners and
17 3T at 60 different sites across the United States and Canada with reconstructed spatial resolution
18 of 1 mm³. In ADNI1&2, the diagnosis of AD was made according to NINCDS/ADRDA criteria
19 for probable AD¹³. Patients were included whatever their clinical presentation (typical or
20 atypical AD), but all participants had abnormal memory functions at baseline, and Clinical
21 Dementia Rating scale (CDR)=0.5 or 1. AD biomarkers analysis was optional. The complete
22 list of inclusion/exclusion criteria is available here:
23 <http://adni.loni.usc.edu/methods/documents/>.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 - *AIBL*: 467 control subjects (857 images) and 83 AD patients (113 images) from the Australian
34 Imaging, Biomarkers and Lifestyle (AIBL) database (<http://www.aibl.csiro.au/>) are used in this
35 study. We used the longitudinal dataset as defined in [1] and provided on the platform Clinica
36 (<http://www.clinica.run>). These images are T1w acquired on 3T MR scanners with the ADNI
37 protocol (<http://adni.loni.ucla.edu/research/protocols/mri-protocols>) and with custom
38 MPRAGE sequence on the 1.5T scanners. In AIBL, the diagnosis of AD was made during
39 clinical review panel meetings¹⁴, according NINCDS/ADRDA criteria for possible or probable
40 AD¹³.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 ***Image processing***

51
52 All the considered T1-weighted MRI were processed with AssemblyNet.¹⁵ This software
53 produces whole brain segmentation of fine-grained structures using a large ensemble of deep
54 neural networks. On the 132 structures produced by AssemblyNet following the
55 Neuromorphometrics labels,¹⁶ we considered only 122 gray matter regions (61 left and 61
56 right). An illustration of the AssemblyNet segmentations is provided in figure 1. It included 9
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 subcortical structures, 17 frontal gyri/lobules, 8 temporal gyri/lobules, 6 parietal gyri/lobules,
4 8 occipital gyri/lobules, 6 gyri in the limbic cortex, 5 sub-regions of the insular cortex, ventricles
5 and the cerebellum.
6
7

8
9 The AssemblyNet pipeline included the following steps. After denoising,¹⁷ images were
10 corrected for inhomogeneity,¹⁸ affine-registered into the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI)
11 space using ANTS¹⁹ and tissue-based intensity normalized.²⁰ Then, the intracranial cavity was
12 segmented using NICE method.²¹ Afterwards, structure segmentation was achieved using 250
13 U-Nets through a multi-scale framework.
14
15
16

17
18 A multi-stage quality control procedure was performed by P.C., blinded of the subject's group,
19 as previously described^{22,23}. First, a visual assessment was done for all input images by
20 checking screen shots of one sagittal, coronal, and axial slice in the middle of the 3D volume.
21 Images were rejected if partial head coverage, motion artefact, high distortion or abnormal noise
22 level was detected. Then, a visual assessment of processing quality was carried out using the
23 segmentation report which provides screenshots for each step of the pipeline. Images were
24 rejected after this step in case of inaccurate registration in the MNI space, inaccurate intracranial
25 cavity extraction, missing brain structures or over/under-segmentation of brain structures. A
26 last control was performed by individually checking of all outliers (values higher/lower than 2
27 SD of the estimated model). For each outlier, the segmentation map was inspected using a 3D
28 viewer. In case of segmentation failure, the subject was removed from the study.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 *Statistical Analyses*

40
41 To compensate for the variability introduced by head size difference, models were estimated
42 on normalized volumes (% of total intracranial volume). Left and right volumes were added to
43 obtain the final volume structure. Statistics were performed with Matlab using default
44 parameters.
45
46
47
48

49 Different strategies were considered to model the trajectories of each brain structure over time,
50 as previously described.²³ Briefly, the candidate models were tested from the simplest to the
51 most complex: (1) a linear model, (2) a quadratic model, and (3) a cubic model. A model was
52 kept as a potential candidate only when simultaneously F-statistic based on ANOVA (*i.e.*,
53 model vs. constant model) was significant ($p < 0.05$) and when all its coefficients were
54 significant using t-statistic ($p < 0.05$). We finally used the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to compare the candidate models. This model selection procedure was applied to all the
4 considered structures.
5

6
7 Afterwards, z-score and “distance” between healthy and AD trajectories were computed on the
8 estimated models. The prediction bounds were estimated with a confidence level of 95%. A
9 brain structure was considered to be significantly smaller in AD compared to healthy aging
10 when the two structural trajectories diverged and when their 95% confidence intervals no longer
11 overlapped.
12
13
14

15
16 To compare our lifespan cross-sectional models and longitudinal models over restricted
17 periods, we followed a previously published strategy²⁴ where cross-sectional and longitudinal
18 models were compared using Spearman correlation over the age period defined by longitudinal
19 models. We performed two experiments to analyze model similarities and atrophy pattern
20 similarities. First, we estimated correlations between the models’ values for each structure.
21 Second, we estimated the correlation between vectors containing cross-sectional volume
22 shrinkage and longitudinal atrophy for all the structures **simultaneously**. These volume changes
23 were estimated as the difference between the value at the starting age of longitudinal models
24 and the final one.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Finally, the sequence of significant divergence of the different brain structures was listed in
33 chronological order to obtain the MRI staging scheme.
34
35
36
37

38 ***Data availability***

39 MRI raw data from the different cohorts are available online (see Acknowledgments). Other
40 data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Results**

50 ***Dataset description***

51
52
53 To study structures’ trajectories of healthy controls and AD across the entire lifespan, we
54 **compiled** several open-access databases to construct two datasets. Their composition and
55 characteristics are described in Table 1. After QC, 3512 MRI from healthy controls and 415
56
57
58
59
60

from AD patients remained for the analyses. MRI from the longitudinal AIBL database (n=113) were used as an external testing dataset to validate our models. Consequently, we used 2665 MRI from healthy controls to estimate our healthy lifespan models. To infer AD models over the entire lifespan, we combined 1874 healthy controls younger than 55 years of age (all the subjects younger than 55 in the 2665 that were used for healthy aging models) and 332 AD patients older than 55 to build our lifespan AD models.

DATASET	N	GENDER	AGE (YEARS)
HEALTHY CONTROLS (TOTAL)	3512	-	-
<i>C-MIND</i>	236	F = 129; M = 107	8.44 [0.74-18.86]
<i>NDAR</i>	382	F = 174; M = 208	12.39 [1.08-49.92]
<i>ABIDE</i>	492	F = 84; M = 408	17.53 [6.50-52.20]
<i>ICBM</i>	294	F = 142; M = 152	33.75 [18-80]
<i>IXI</i>	549	F = 307; M = 242	48.76 [20.0- 86.2]
<i>OASIS</i>	298	F = 187; M=111	45.34 [18 - 94]
<i>ADNI 1&2</i>	404	F = 203; M = 201	74.81 [56 – 90]
LONGITUDINAL AIBL (467 SUBJECTS)	857	F = 485; M = 372	74.15 [60.5 – 92.4]
ALZHEIMER DISEASE (TOTAL)	415	-	-
<i>ADNI 1&2</i>	332	F=151; M=181	75.13 [55 - 91]
LONGITUDINAL AIBL (83 SUBJECTS)	113	F=66; M=47	73.35 [55.5 – 93.4]

Table 1: Dataset description. This table provides the name of the dataset, the number (n) of considered images (after quality control), the gender proportion, and the average ages and intervals in brackets.

Identification of brain structures diverging between healthy subjects and AD patients trajectories

Figure 2 shows the 19 brain structures (out of the 61 grey matter structures we have tested using AssemblyNet) that significantly diverged during lifespan between AD and healthy aging models. The theoretical starting age of statistically significant divergence between healthy and pathological models appears to be between 38 and 68 years old, depending on the structure. The most affected structures over time were the amygdala and the hippocampus (distance between healthy and aging model at 90 years old = 3.20 and 2.65 respectively), followed by the

1
2
3 entorhinal and parahippocampal cortices (distance = 1.18 and 1.13), the insula, and the inferior
4 temporal gyrus (distance = 0.96 and 0.96).
5
6
7
8

9 ***Comparison of cross-sectional and longitudinal lifespan models***

10
11 For all the 19 structures detected as significantly different between normal aging and
12 Alzheimer's disease, we noticed a significant correlation between cross-sectional and
13 longitudinal models ($p < 0.05$) in the age range of [55.5–93.4] for AD patients and [60.5–92.4]
14 for healthy subjects. The average correlation between the models' values over these 19
15 structures were 0.91 for AD models and 0.82 for healthy aging models. Moreover, we found
16 significant correlations between cross-sectional volume shrinkage and longitudinal atrophy for
17 both AD and healthy aging trajectories ($p < 0.05$). The atrophy pattern correlation for these 19
18 structures were 0.90 for AD models and 0.85 for healthy aging models. Figure 3 showed the
19 graphical congruence of models based on cross-sectional and longitudinal data on all the 19
20 affected structures.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 ***The MRI staging scheme***

32
33 We then mapped the sequential divergence of healthy and AD trajectories in Figure 4.
34 Schematically, five major stages in AD structural progression seemed to appear : (1)
35 hippocampus and amygdala; (2) middle temporal gyrus; (3) entorhinal cortex, parahippocampal
36 cortex, and other temporal areas (inferior temporal gyrus, superior temporal gyrus, temporal
37 pole and fusiform gyrus); (4) thalamus and striatum (accumbens, caudate, putamen) and (5)
38 middle frontal, anterior cingular, parietal (angular gyrus), insular cortices and pallidum.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Discussion**

50
51
52
53 In this study, we combined multiple large-scale MRI databases and whole-brain segmentation
54 of fine-grained structures using a large ensemble of deep neural networks to describe the first
55 exhaustive chronological structural progression of AD over decades and the differential severity
56 of volumetric structure alterations. We finally proposed the following brain MRI staging
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 scheme of structural progression in AD : (1) hippocampus and amygdala; (2) middle temporal
4 gyrus; (3) entorhinal cortex, parahippocampal cortex, and other temporal areas; (4) striatum
5 and thalamus and (5) middle frontal, cingular, parietal and insular cortices. The most severely
6 affected structures during the entire course of AD were the amygdala and the hippocampus,
7 followed by the entorhinal and parahippocampal cortices.
8
9

10
11
12 This MRI staging scheme of atrophy progression is close to but does not fully overlap with
13 Braak staging of AD tauopathy.³ The main difference between these two staging models is the
14 “reverse chronology” between limbic and entorhinal stages (the earliest stages). Indeed,
15 transentorhinal and entorhinal cortices are the first affected by tau neurofibrillary tangles (Braak
16 stage I and II) before hippocampus (CA1 pyramidal cells) and amygdala (Braak stage III and
17 IV). After these entorhinal and limbic stages, the sequential involvement of the thalamus and
18 the striatum before the isocortical associative areas is concordant between MRI and Braak
19 staging. However, Braak staging can be questioned. A recent 3D mapping of human tau
20 pathology suggests, for instance, a more widespread distribution of neurofibrillary tangles at
21 the early stages of AD: similar levels of tau burden were found in entorhinal areas and the
22 amygdala, the hippocampus, and the temporopolar cortex, supporting our MRI findings.²⁵
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Although tau distribution is usually correlated with focal atrophy in AD, recent tau-PET studies
33 support our findings and the “early-stage discrepancy hypothesis” between atrophy and tau
34 staging schemes. On the one hand, Mak *et al.* reported a disproportionate increase in tau
35 accumulation in widespread regions compared to cortical atrophy that was restricted to the
36 temporal areas during the same period.²⁶ On the other hand, Harrison and colleagues reported
37 that atrophy might exceed tau accumulation by including brain regions relatively unaffected by
38 tauopathy.²⁷ Furthermore, MRI-pathological studies failed to correlate the rate of hippocampal
39 atrophy with early hippocampal tau neurofibrillary tangles during aging.²⁸ In turn, the
40 exceptional vulnerability of hippocampal CA1 pyramidal neurons to AD neuropathological
41 changes²⁹ may explain differential atrophy between the hippocampus and the entorhinal cortex
42 over time.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Experimentally, when pathological tau is specifically expressed in the entorhinal cortex of
53 transgenic mice, atrophy is described in the hippocampus, a remote unaffected brain region at
54 the early stage of this model, through axon degeneration of the perforant pathway (major
55 afference from the entorhinal cortex to the hippocampus).⁷ The pathological accumulation of
56 tau oligomers is also known to impair axonal transport before neurofibrillary tangles formation,
57 inducing early axonal degeneration and the loss of synaptic transmission in the target
58
59
60

1
2
3 structures.^{30,31} In the case of the amygdala, early atrophy may also be due to the presence of
4 pathological tau in the perirhinal, postrhinal, and transentorhinal cortices (Braak stage I), which
5 give rise to important afferent projections to the amygdala in primates.³² Finally, atrophy has
6 to be considered as the result of complex cellular processes including cell death associated with
7 tau accumulation, but also from axonal degeneration in remote sites. This diaschisis
8 phenomenon may precede tau tangles in the limbic system, explaining the “early-stage
9 discrepancy” between MRI and Braak staging.

10
11
12 In addition, regional atrophy in AD does not rely on a single biological process, but instead
13 reflects the local impact of many different possible mechanisms leading to neurodegeneration.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Mainly, limbic-predominant age-related TDP-43 encephalopathy (LATE) neuropathological
changes are frequent during aging and often associated with AD neuropathological changes.
TDP-43 inclusions are known to accelerate brain atrophy and mainly affect the amygdala (stage
1) and the hippocampus (stage 2). The frequent co-occurrence (up to 75% of cases) of these
proteinopathies may explain the excess of limbic atrophy compared to entorhinal atrophy at the
early stages of AD.³³ Indeed, pathological-MRI correlation studies showed that the
hippocampus and the amygdala were the most frequently affected regions in TDP-43 positive
brains and that the magnitude of atrophy mediated by TDP-43 inclusions was similar to tau-
related atrophy.³⁴

From the conceptual point of view, it is essential to keep in mind that the present MRI staging
scheme (such as the Braak staging scheme) only describes the most frequent “limbic-
predominant” and “typical” progressions of AD.^{35,36} This model only describes the “average”
structural course of AD and does not apply to “atypical” AD, such as logopenic primary
progressive aphasia, posterior cortical atrophy or behavioral AD, which are driven by different
patterns of atrophy and represent less common “extremes” of the AD anatomical spectrum³⁷.
Indeed, the methodology used in the present work does not take into account the recent
description by Vogel and colleagues of distinct trajectories of tau deposition in AD³⁸. This work
proposes an alternative to Braak’s model concerning tau spreading pattern, underlining the
heterogeneity of AD development from one subject to another (not using pathological
examination, but cross-sectional tau-PET with its limitations in terms of sensitivity). However,
the most prevalent spatiotemporal trajectory of tau pathology was limbic in Vogel’s work, and
spatial convergence was observed between AD trajectories. Furthermore, our MRI scheme of
atrophy progression includes structures characterizing three of the four distinct trajectories of
tau deposition, namely amygdala, hippocampus and entorhinal cortex (limbic trajectory),

1
2
3 middle temporal gyrus, parahippocampal cortex, and other temporal areas (lateral temporal
4 trajectory) and parietal (angular gyrus) cortices (medial temporal lobe-sparing trajectory). Thus,
5 our "average" MRI staging scheme may not apply to all patients with AD, but to the greatest
6 number, especially because cohorts such as ADNI 1&2 and AIBL included patients with
7 "Alzheimer clinical syndrome"³⁹ or "probable" AD criteria^{13,40} (*i.e.* subjects with a single or
8 multi-domain amnesic presentation, likely to have a limbic-predominant pattern of atrophy).
9

10
11
12
13
14 From the methodological point of view, we acknowledge that the estimated point of divergence
15 between healthy and pathological trajectories remains hypothetical because of the lack of AD
16 patients younger than 55 in the analyzed cohorts. Another limitation of this study is that we
17 cannot exclude that the anatomy of a structure of interest (the definition of boundaries on brain
18 atlas, the precision of segmentation using MRI contrast, ...) may impact the capability to depict
19 volumetric modifications; this observation being particularly relevant for the entorhinal
20 cortex.⁴¹ Thanks to an external validation using AIBL data, we have shown that our models
21 based on cross-sectional ADNI data are reliable approximate of "true" longitudinal trajectories,
22 at least after 55 years old. Furthermore, the early atrophy in the amygdala and the hippocampus
23 are consistent with a previous work from our group using a different method for structure
24 segmentation.²³ We also found substantial similarities with a previous article from another lab
25 comparing the pattern of change of subcortical structures estimated on lifespan cross-sectional
26 and longitudinal models in healthy aging.²⁴ Our study is however the first to assess the
27 divergence between this healthy aging trajectory and AD structural progression using inferred
28 lifespan AD model, and at the whole-brain level.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 To conclude, we have modeled the "average" global structural progression of AD over the
41 entire course of the disease. We found that the time-course and the severity of structural
42 alterations were close but did not completely overlap with Braak staging. We proposed a
43 descriptive MRI staging scheme that will help better define the disease and interpret future
44 studies looking at the differential vulnerabilities of brain structures to AD pathological
45 processes.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure legends

Figure 1. Illustration of the AssemblyNet segmentation in the three axes. It included the bilateral segmentation of 9 subcortical structures, 17 frontal gyri/lobules, 8 temporal gyri/lobules, 6 parietal gyri/lobules, 8 occipital gyri/lobules, 6 gyri in the limbic cortex, 5 sub-regions of the insular cortex, the ventricles and the cerebellum.

Figure 2. Lifespan trajectories based on z-scores of normalized brain volumes for health aging subjects (black line) and AD patients (red line). Black dots represent all healthy individuals and red dots AD patients. The prediction bounds of the models are estimated with a confidence level at 95%. The orange curve represents the distance between the healthy and pathological models. The orange area indicates the time period where confidence intervals of both models do not overlap. Only models detected as significantly different between healthy aging and AD are presented in this figure (19 brain structures out of 61 tested using AssemblyNet).

Figure 3. Graphical comparison of cross-sectional (whole lines) and longitudinal (dotted lines) trajectories based on z-scores of normalized brain volumes for health aging (black lines and dots) and AD patients (red lines and dots). Only the 19 structures detected as significantly different between healthy and pathological conditions are represented here. The average correlation coefficients for these 19 structures were 0.91 for AD models and 0.82 for healthy aging models.

Figure 4. The MRI staging scheme of structural progression of AD. The figure represents the chronological progression of distances between healthy and AD trajectories. The severity of structural divergence is color-coded according to the bar at the bottom right of the figure.

Acknowledgements

The C-MIND data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the C-MIND Data Repository created by the C-MIND study of Normal Brain Development. A listing of the participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at <https://research.cchmc.org/c-mind>. The NDAR data used in the preparation of this manuscript were obtained from the NIH-supported National Database for Autism Research (NDAR). This is supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke. A listing of the participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at http://pediatricmri.nih.gov/nihpd/info/participating_centers.html. The ICBM data used in the preparation of this manuscript were supported by Human Brain Project grant PO1MHO52176-11 and Canadian Institutes of Health Research grant MOP- 34996. The IXI data used in the preparation of this manuscript were supported by the U.K. Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) GR/S21533/02 - <http://www.brain-development.org/>. The ABIDE data used in the preparation of this manuscript were supported by ABIDE funding resources listed at http://fcon_1000.projects.nitrc.org/indi/abide/. The ADNI data used in the preparation of this manuscript were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (National Institutes of Health Grant U01 AG024904). The ADNI is funded by the National Institute on Aging and the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering and through generous contributions from the following: Abbott, AstraZeneca AB, Bayer Schering Pharma AG, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eisai Global Clinical Development, Elan Corporation, Genentech, GE Healthcare, GlaxoSmithKline, Innogenetics NV, Johnson & Johnson, Eli Lilly and Co., Medpace, Inc., Merck and Co., Inc., Novartis AG, Pfizer Inc., F. Hoffmann-La Roche, Schering-Plough, Synarc Inc., as well as nonprofit partners, the Alzheimer's Association and Alzheimer's Drug Discovery Foundation, with participation from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Private sector contributions to the ADNI are facilitated by the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health (www.fnih.org). The grantee organization is the Northern California Institute for Research and Education, and the study was coordinated by the Alzheimer's Disease Cooperative Study at the University of California, San Diego. ADNI data are disseminated by the Laboratory for NeuroImaging at the University of California, Los Angeles. This research was also supported by NIH grants P30AG010129, K01 AG030514 and the Dana Foundation. The OASIS data used in the preparation of this

1
2
3 manuscript were obtained from the OASIS project funded by grants P50 AG05681, P01
4 AG03991, R01 AG021910, P50 MH071616, U24 RR021382, R01 MH56584. See
5 <http://www.oasis-brains.org/> for more details. The AIBL data used in the preparation of this
6 manuscript were obtained from the AIBL study of ageing funded by the Common-wealth
7 Scientific Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO; a publicly funded government research
8 organization), Science Industry Endowment Fund, National Health and Medical Research
9 Council of Australia (project grant 1011689), Alzheimer's Association, Alzheimer's Drug
10 Discovery Foundation, and an anonymous foundation. See www.aibl.csiro.au for further
11 details. We wish to thank all investigators of these projects who collected these datasets and
12 made them freely accessible. This manuscript reflects the views of the authors and may not
13 reflect the opinions or views of the database providers.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Funding**

27
28 This study was achieved within the context of the Human Brain Project, the French National
29 Research Agency for the DeepvolBrain project (ANR-18-CE45-0013), the Laboratory of
30 Excellence TRAIL ANR-10-LABX-57 for the BigDataBrain project and the CNRS/INSERM
31 for the DeepMultiBrain project. VP received grants from Foundation Bettencourt Schueller
32 (CCA-Inserm-Bettencourt). JVM research was supported by the Spanish DPI2017-87743-R
33 grant from the Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competitividad of Spain. The sponsors did
34 not participate in any aspect of the design or performance of the study, including data collection,
35 management, analysis, and the interpretation or preparation, review, and approval of the
36 manuscript.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Author Contributions**

47
48 Conception and design of the study: VP, TT, GC and PC. Analysis of data: JVM, BM and PC.
49 Drafting the manuscript: VP and PC. Revision of the manuscript for important intellectual
50 contents: all authors.
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Potential Conflicts of Interest**

57
58 The authors declare no competing financial interests relative to the present study.
59
60

References

1. Sperling RA, Aisen PS, Beckett LA, et al. Toward defining the preclinical stages of Alzheimer's disease: recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2011;7(3):280-292. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.003
2. Barthélemy NR, Li Y, Joseph-Mathurin N, et al. A soluble phosphorylated tau signature links tau, amyloid and the evolution of stages of dominantly inherited Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(3):398-407. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0781-z
3. Braak H, Braak E. Neuropathological staging of Alzheimer-related changes. *Acta Neuropathol*. 1991;82(4):239-259. doi:10.1007/bf00308809
4. Jack CR, Wiste HJ, Weigand SD, et al. Predicting future rates of tau accumulation on PET. *Brain*. 2020;143(10):3136-3150. doi:10.1093/brain/awaa248
5. Soleimani-Meigooni DN, Iaccarino L, La Joie R, et al. 18F-flortaucipir PET to autopsy comparisons in Alzheimer's disease and other neurodegenerative diseases. *Brain*. 2020;143(11):3477-3494. doi:10.1093/brain/awaa276
6. Joie RL, Visani AV, Baker SL, et al. Prospective longitudinal atrophy in Alzheimer's disease correlates with the intensity and topography of baseline tau-PET. *Science Translational Medicine*. 2020;12(524). doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aau5732
7. Fung CW, Guo J, Fu H, Figueroa HY, Konofagou EE, Duff KE. Atrophy associated with tau pathology precedes overt cell death in a mouse model of progressive tauopathy. *Sci Adv*. 2020;6(42). doi:10.1126/sciadv.abc8098
8. Hayley S, Hakim AM, Albert PR. Depression, dementia and immune dysregulation. *Brain*. 2021;144(3):746-760. doi:10.1093/brain/awaa405
9. Spires-Jones TL, Attems J, Thal DR. Interactions of pathological proteins in neurodegenerative diseases. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2017;134(2):187-205. doi:10.1007/s00401-017-1709-7
10. Villain N, Fouquet M, Baron JC, et al. Sequential relationships between grey matter and white matter atrophy and brain metabolic abnormalities in early Alzheimer's disease. *Brain*. 2010;133(11):3301-3314. doi:10.1093/brain/awq203
11. Meisl G, Hidari E, Allinson K, et al. In vivo rate-determining steps of tau seed accumulation in Alzheimer's disease. *Sci Adv*. 2021;7(44):eabh1448. doi:10.1126/sciadv.abh1448
12. La Joie R, Perrotin A, Barré L, et al. Region-specific hierarchy between atrophy, hypometabolism, and β -amyloid (A β) load in Alzheimer's disease dementia. *J Neurosci*. 2012;32(46):16265-16273. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2170-12.2012
13. McKhann G, Drachman D, Folstein M, Katzman R, Price D, Stadlan EM. Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: report of the NINCDS-ADRDA Work Group under the

1
2
3 auspices of Department of Health and Human Services Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease.
4 *Neurology*. 1984;34(7):939-944. doi:10.1212/wnl.34.7.939

5
6 14. Ellis KA, Bush AI, Darby D, et al. The Australian Imaging, Biomarkers and Lifestyle
7 (AIBL) study of aging: methodology and baseline characteristics of 1112 individuals recruited
8 for a longitudinal study of Alzheimer's disease. *Int Psychogeriatr*. 2009;21(4):672-687.
9 doi:10.1017/S1041610209009405

10
11 15. Coupé P, Mansencal B, Clément M, et al. AssemblyNet: A large ensemble of CNNs for
12 3D whole brain MRI segmentation. *Neuroimage*. 2020;219:117026.
13 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117026

14
15 16. Klein A, Tourville J. 101 labeled brain images and a consistent human cortical labeling
16 protocol. *Front Neurosci*. 2012;6:171. doi:10.3389/fnins.2012.00171

17
18 17. Manjón JV, Tohka J, Robles M. Improved estimates of partial volume coefficients from
19 noisy brain MRI using spatial context. *Neuroimage*. 2010;53(2):480-490.
20 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.06.046

21
22 18. Tustison NJ, Avants BB, Cook PA, et al. N4ITK: improved N3 bias correction. *IEEE*
23 *Trans Med Imaging*. 2010;29(6):1310-1320. doi:10.1109/TMI.2010.2046908

24
25 19. Avants BB, Tustison NJ, Song G, Cook PA, Klein A, Gee JC. A reproducible evaluation
26 of ANTs similarity metric performance in brain image registration. *Neuroimage*.
27 2011;54(3):2033-2044. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.09.025

28
29 20. Manjón JV, Tohka J, García-Martí G, et al. Robust MRI brain tissue parameter
30 estimation by multistage outlier rejection. *Magn Reson Med*. 2008;59(4):866-873.
31 doi:10.1002/mrm.21521

32
33 21. Manjón JV, Eskildsen SF, Coupé P, Romero JE, Collins DL, Robles M. Nonlocal
34 intracranial cavity extraction. *Int J Biomed Imaging*. 2014;2014:820205.
35 doi:10.1155/2014/820205

36
37 22. Coupé P, Catheline G, Lanuza E, Manjón JV, Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging
38 Initiative. Towards a unified analysis of brain maturation and aging across the entire lifespan:
39 A MRI analysis. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2017;38(11):5501-5518. doi:10.1002/hbm.23743

40
41 23. Coupé P, Manjón JV, Lanuza E, Catheline G. Lifespan Changes of the Human Brain In
42 Alzheimer's Disease. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):3998. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-39809-8

43
44 24. Fjell AM, Westlye LT, Grydeland H, et al. Critical ages in the life course of the adult
45 brain: nonlinear subcortical aging. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2013;34(10):2239-2247.
46 doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2013.04.006

47
48 25. Yushkevich PA, López MM, Martín MMI de O, et al. Three-dimensional mapping of
49 neurofibrillary tangle burden in the human medial temporal lobe. *Brain*. Published online July
50 14, 2021:awab262. doi:10.1093/brain/awab262

51
52 26. Mak E, Bethlehem RAI, Romero-Garcia R, et al. In vivo coupling of tau pathology and
53 cortical thinning in Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2018;10:678-687.
54 doi:10.1016/j.dadm.2018.08.005

- 1
2
3 27. Harrison TM, La Joie R, Maass A, et al. Longitudinal tau accumulation and atrophy in
4 aging and alzheimer disease. *Ann Neurol*. 2019;85(2):229-240. doi:10.1002/ana.25406
5
6 28. Erten-Lyons D, Dodge HH, Woltjer R, et al. Neuropathologic basis of age-associated
7 brain atrophy. *JAMA Neurol*. 2013;70(5):616-622. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2013.1957
8
9 29. West MJ, Coleman PD, Flood DG, Troncoso JC. Differences in the pattern of
10 hippocampal neuronal loss in normal ageing and Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet*.
11 1994;344(8925):769-772. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(94)92338-8
12
13 30. Gyparaki MT, Arab A, Sorokina EM, et al. Tau forms oligomeric complexes on
14 microtubules that are distinct from tau aggregates. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.
15 2021;118(19):e2021461118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2021461118
16
17 31. Combs B, Mueller RL, Morfini G, Brady ST, Kanaan NM. Tau and Axonal Transport
18 Misregulation in Tauopathies. *Adv Exp Med Biol*. 2019;1184:81-95. doi:10.1007/978-981-32-
19 9358-8_7
20
21 32. McDonald AJ. Cortical pathways to the mammalian amygdala. *Prog Neurobiol*.
22 1998;55(3):257-332. doi:10.1016/s0301-0082(98)00003-3
23
24 33. Josephs KA, Martin PR, Weigand SD, et al. Protein contributions to brain atrophy
25 acceleration in Alzheimer's disease and primary age-related tauopathy. *Brain*.
26 2020;143(11):3463-3476. doi:10.1093/brain/awaa299
27
28 34. Bejanin A, Murray ME, Martin P, et al. Antemortem volume loss mirrors TDP-43
29 staging in older adults with non-frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Brain*. 2019;142(11):3621-
30 3635. doi:10.1093/brain/awz277
31
32 35. Planche V, Bouteloup V, Mangin JF, et al. Clinical relevance of brain atrophy subtypes
33 categorization in memory clinics. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2021;17(4):641-652.
34 doi:10.1002/alz.12231
35
36 36. Planche V, Coupé P, Helmer C, et al. Evolution of brain atrophy subtypes during aging
37 predicts long-term cognitive decline and future Alzheimer's clinical syndrome. *Neurobiol*
38 *Aging*. 2019;79:22-29. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2019.03.006
39
40 37. Vogel JW, Hansson O. Subtypes of Alzheimer's disease: questions, controversy, and
41 meaning. *Trends Neurosci*. Published online February 25, 2022:S0166-2236(22)00033-9.
42 doi:10.1016/j.tins.2022.02.001
43
44 38. Vogel JW, Young AL, Oxtoby NP, et al. Four distinct trajectories of tau deposition
45 identified in Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Med*. 2021;27(5):871-881. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-
46 01309-6
47
48 39. Jack CR, Bennett DA, Blennow K, et al. NIA-AA Research Framework: Toward a
49 biological definition of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14(4):535-562.
50 doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2018.02.018
51
52 40. McKhann GM, Knopman DS, Chertkow H, et al. The diagnosis of dementia due to
53 Alzheimer's disease: recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's
54 Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement*.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2011;7(3):263-269. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.005

41. Fung YL, Ng KET, Vogrin SJ, et al. Comparative Utility of Manual versus Automated Segmentation of Hippocampus and Entorhinal Cortex Volumes in a Memory Clinic Sample. *J Alzheimers Dis.* 2019;68(1):159-171. doi:10.3233/JAD-181172

For Review Only




Figure 1. Illustration of the AssemblyNet segmentation in the three axes. It included the bilateral segmentation of 9 subcortical structures, 17 frontal gyri/lobules, 8 temporal gyri/lobules, 6 parietal gyri/lobules, 8 occipital gyri/lobules, 6 gyri in the limbic cortex, 5 sub-regions of the insular cortex, the ventricle and the cerebellum.

150x46mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2. Lifespan trajectories based on z-scores of normalized brain volumes for health aging subjects (black line) and AD patients (red line). Black dots represent all healthy individuals and red dots AD patients. The prediction bounds of the models are estimated with a confidence level at 95%. The orange curve represents the distance between the healthy and pathological models. The orange area indicates the time period where confidence intervals of both models do not overlap. Only models detected as significantly different between healthy aging and AD are presented in this figure (19 brain structures out of 61 tested using AssemblyNet).

184x188mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3. Graphical comparison of cross-sectional (whole lines) and longitudinal (dotted lines) trajectories based on z-scores of normalized brain volumes for health aging (black lines and dots) and AD patients (red lines and dots). Only the 19 structures detected as significantly different between healthy and pathological conditions are represented here. The average correlation coefficients for these 19 structures were 0.91 for AD models and 0.82 for healthy aging models.

185x197mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 4. The MRI staging scheme of structural progression of AD. The figure represents the chronological progression of distances between healthy and AD trajectories. The severity of structural divergence is color-coded according to the bar at the bottom right of the figure.


180x124mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4 Abbreviated summary
5
6
7
8

9 Using extrapolated lifetime volumetric models of healthy and AD brain structures, Planche *et*
10 *al* propose a staging of atrophy progression in AD including (1) hippocampus and amygdala;
11 (2) middle temporal gyrus; (3) entorhinal cortex, and other temporal areas; (4) striatum and
12 thalamus and (5) middle frontal, cingular, parietal, insular cortices and pallidum.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

The MRI staging scheme of Alzheimer's disease: atrophy progression over decades



115x61mm (300 x 300 DPI)