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Abstract

Background: Scales of global cognition and behavior, often used as endpoints for intervention trials in Alzheimer’s disease (AD) and mild cognitive impairment (MCI), are insufficiently responsive (i.e., relatively insensitive to change). Large patient samples are needed to detect beneficial drug effects. Therefore, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) measures of cerebral atrophy have been proposed as surrogate endpoints.

Objective: To examine how neuropsychological assessment compares to MRI in this respect.

Methods: We measured hippocampal atrophy, cortical thickness, and performance on neuropsychological tests in memory clinic patients at baseline and after two years. Neurologists rated the patients as cognitively normal (n = 28; Clinical Dementia Rating, CDR = 0) or as impaired (n = 34; CDR > 0). We administered five tests of memory, executive functioning, and verbal fluency. A composite neuropsychological score was calculated by taking the mean of the demographically corrected standard scores. MRI was done on a 3 Tesla scanner. Volumetric measurements of the hippocampus and surrounding cortex were made automatically using FreeSurfer software.

Results: The composite neuropsychological score deteriorated 0.6 SD in the impaired group, and was virtually unchanged in the normal group. Annual hippocampal atrophy rates were 3.4% and 0.6% in the impaired and normal cognition groups, respectively. Estimates of required sample sizes to detect a 50% reduction in rate of change were larger using rate of hippocampal atrophy (n = 131) or cortical thickness (n = 488) as outcome compared to change scores on neuropsychological assessment (n = 62).

Conclusion: Neuropsychological assessment is more responsive than MRI measures of brain atrophy for detecting disease progression in memory clinic patients with MCI or AD.
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INTRODUCTION

Responsiveness is an important quality of evaluative measures that assess effects of experimental treatments in intervention trials. It refers to the capacity of detecting changes in health status. A responsive instrument detects changes over time when they actually occur, whereas it does not show any change when the patient remains stable [1, 2]. Thus, the more responsive an instrument, the better it uncovers real change. An important practical consequence is that the statistical power of a trial is larger if a more responsive outcome measure is used, and the sample size can be smaller, or the duration of the intervention can be shorter.

In the context of Alzheimer’s disease (AD) and mild cognitive impairment (MCI), outcome measures used in clinical trials are cognitive and behavior rating scales, mostly the Alzheimer’s Disease Assessment Scale (ADAS) [3] and the Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR) [4]. Until today, these scales are gold standards for pharmacological research on AD [5], although regulatory authorities are considering changing the requirements [6]. The ADAS and the CDR are often used as co-primary endpoints [7]. Other clinical scales frequently used are the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) [8], and, in Europe, the cognitive section of the Cambridge Mental Disorders of the Elderly Examination (Cam-cog) [9].

Such scales are often considered unreliable [10, 11] and not sufficiently responsive [12–14] except in moderately severe AD [7, 15]. Several authors therefore proposed to replace these clinical scales as the gold standard with more reliable or more reproducible measures, in particular magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) measures of cerebral atrophy [16–19]. For example, if atrophy of the hippocampus would serve as the main outcome in trials of anti-AD compounds, the required sample sizes would be much smaller than those in current clinical trials. Calculations based on the dataset of the Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) showed that samples might be reduced by a factor 5 in trials with AD patients, and even more in trials with MCI patients [17, 18]. Meta-analytic studies of the rate of hippocampal atrophy and of decline on global cognitive scales in untreated patients corroborate that effect sizes are larger for MRI than for most clinical scales [20–22]. Also the cortical thickness of temporal areas surrounding the hippocampus might be sensitive measures in this context [23, 24].

The status of the ADAS and similar scales as the gold standard for pharmacological trials can also be criticized on psychometric grounds [12, 25–28]. The question arises, therefore, how the comparison with MRI would be if neuropsychological tests with sound psychometric properties were used instead of global scales with intrinsic psychometric shortcomings. Primary candidates would be tests of memory, verbal fluency (i.e., speeded naming), and executive functioning, because these domains are affected most in MCI and early AD [7, 12, 29]. Moreover, these outcome measures directly assess the actual symptoms. This is in general preferable over indirect outcome measures assessing a biological process without direct link to clinical symptoms.

Cross-sectional studies in prevalent AD patients and healthy elderly show large effect sizes for memory tests, especially delayed recall, much larger than for hippocampal atrophy [30, 31]. This is not surprising, because amnesia is a defining characteristic of AD. Also longitudinal studies in healthy elderly and MCI patients show larger differences for memory tests than for hippocampal atrophy between subjects who converted to dementia within a few years and those who did not [29, 32].

In view of these promising research findings on neuropsychological tests, and given the psychometric weaknesses of global scales, we conducted a longitudinal study to directly compare the responsiveness of MRI measures of brain atrophy and tests of memory, fluency, and executive functioning in an unselected sample of memory clinic patients. We expected that the cognitive tests would be at least as responsive as the rate of atrophy of the hippocampus and surrounding areas in the subset of patients who showed clinical signs of cognitive decline. We also calculated required sample sizes for a hypothetical trial with neuropsychological assessment, hippocampal atrophy, or cortical thickness as surrogate endpoints.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is part of the project “Improving the early Diagnosis of Alzheimer’s Disease and Other dementias” (IDADO) of the department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, and the departments of Neurology and Radiology of the Academic Medical Centre (AMC), Amsterdam.

Participants

Included were consecutive patients of the AMC memory clinic who were between 50 and 85 years of age, and who had subjective cognitive complaints that might signify MCI, an early stage of AD (but with...
CDR < 1), or another type of dementia. The inclusion lasted from February 2007 until November 2009. To support external validity, we attempted to create a naturalistic sample representative of memory clinic patients with possible pre-dementia and early dementia. Therefore, we used as few exclusion criteria as possible. Exclusion criteria were a diagnosis of AD or other dementia established by a dementia specialist (i.e., CDR ≥ 1), other brain or systemic disease sufficient to cause the mental complaints, current substance abuse or addiction, contra-indications for MRI scanning, insufficient command of Dutch language, pre-existing mental retardation, and serious somatic disease or handicaps that prevented neuropsychological evaluation. Psychiatric disorders were not excluded, except severe syndromes that could mimic dementia, such as chronic psychosis or severe mood disorder with psychotic features. An additional exclusion criterion was non-credible test performance, i.e., patients who do not invest a reasonable amount of effort, and thus do not perform to the best of their abilities. These patients were excluded because they obscure brain-behavior relations [33]. Patients gave written informed consent at study entry. The ethical review board of the AMC approved the project.

Procedures

At baseline and at follow-up after two years all patients had a neurological consultation at the memory clinic. The neurologist (WAvG, ER, GW) performed a neurological examination including history taking, interview with an informant (if available), and administration of MMSE and CDR. If necessary, this was done during a second visit, but within a month after the first. The neuropsychological testing was done in a quiet room by a neuropsychologist or a master student supervised by the neuropsychologist (AR, HT). Sixteen tests were administered, of which part is reported here (see next paragraph). We selected tests of memory, verbal fluency, executive functioning, and manual volumetry [42, 43]. FreeSurfer is considered a reasonable substitute for manual tracing, revised. In a third visit, the neurologist discussed the results, possible diagnoses, and treatment options with the individual patients and their relatives.

Materials

Two instruments were used during the neurological consultation, viz. the MMSE [8] and the CDR [4]. The neuropsychological evaluation contained tests of verbal fluency (Controlled Oral Word Association Task), memory (subtest Prose Recall from the Rivermead Behavioural Memory Test and Rey’s Auditory Verbal Learning Test), and executive function (Trail Making Test and Stroop Color-Word Test). Parallel test versions were used at follow-up, except for the Stroop test. The Test of Memory Malingering and Word Memory Test were used to detect non-credible responding. For references of the tests, see Lezak et al. [34]. Raw test scores were transformed into T-scores corrected for gender, age, and level of education using recently published Dutch normative data [35]. Level of education was scored on the UNESCO ISCED scale [36].

MRI acquisition and processing

Imaging was performed at baseline and at 2-year follow-up on a 3.0 Tesla MRI system (Philips Intera, Best, The Netherlands) with a 6-channel SENSE head coil. A gradient echo 3D FFE, T1-weighted, sagittal sequence was used with the following pulse sequence parameters: echo time [TE] = 3.5 ms, repetition time [TR] = 9 ms, field of view [FOV] = 256, 232, 170 mm (FH, AP, RL), scanning matrix = 256 × 231, flip angle = 8°, voxel size = 1 × 1 × 1 mm. Volumetric measurements of the hippocampus and measurement of cortical thickness of the entorhinal, parahippocampal, and middle temporal cortices were made automatically using the FreeSurfer image analysis suite, release version 5.2.0 (http://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu) [37, 38]. MR images were processed using the longitudinal processing stream [39] (https://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu/fswiki/FreeSurferMethod sCitation), with the exception that only two structural scans were available for every patient and that surface statistics were not taken into account. Details of the procedures for subcortical segmentation are described by Fischl et al. [40]. Thickness of the entorhinal cortex was determined with the help of an ex vivo atlas [41]. Validation studies showed reasonable overlap in absolute hippocampal volumes between FreeSurfer and manual volumetry [42, 43]. FreeSurfer is considered a reasonable substitute for manual tracing,
with only a small size increase compared to manual tracing [44]. The left and right hippocampi were selected as MRI measures in this study, because these regions are considered to best differentiate between controls and AD subjects [43]. Images were visually inspected for gross structural abnormalities, presence of artifacts and accurate hippocampal segmentations. The hippocampal volumes were described in cubic millimeters, and the total volume of the hippocampus was also expressed as percentage of the total intracranial volume (% ICV) to control for variation in head size. Statistical calculations were done with the % ICV measure. Cortical thickness was not corrected and was expressed in millimeters.

Statistical analyses

At follow-up, the neurologists divided the patients into two groups based on the CDR scores. One group had normal cognition (CDR = 0), whereas the other group showed clinical signs of cognitive impairment (CDR ≥ 0.5). For each patient, the mean T-score of the neuropsychological tests and the hippocampal volumes at baseline and at follow-up were calculated. At baseline, two patients in the impaired group had one missing test value. At follow-up, one of the impaired patients refused to do the neuropsychological tests (diagnosed as AD by the treating neurologist). One patient was unable to do the tests (diagnosed as mixed AD/vascular). Two patients had one or two missing values. For patients with a missing value, mean T-scores were calculated using their remaining test results; the patient who was untestable was given the lowest mean T-score of the group, the patient who refused was given her baseline T-score minus the mean decline. Responsiveness of neuropsychological and MRI measures was expressed as the standardized mean change, i.e., the ratio of the mean change between baseline and follow-up relative to the standard error of the difference (SED) or the standard deviation of the change scores: (M0–M1)/SED.

Required sample sizes for a hypothetical two-arm intervention trial of treatment versus placebo were calculated using the following formula:

\[
n = 2\sigma^2 (Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_{\text{power}})^2 / 0.25\Delta^2 \text{ [17, 45].}
\]

In this formula \( \Delta \) denotes the mean change in the intervention group minus the mean change in the placebo group, \( \sigma \) represents the standard deviation of the change scores, and \( n \) is the required number per study arm. A level of significance of \( \alpha = 0.05 \) was used. \( Z_{\text{power}} \) denotes \( z \)-value of the power with which a hypothetical treatment effect of 25% reduction of the rate of decline (0.25 in this formula) can be detected in the calculated sample size \( n \). Power was set at 80%.

In the present analyses, we substituted \( \Delta \) by the mean change in the impaired group minus the mean change in the cognitively normal group, and \( \sigma \) by the SD of the change scores in the impaired group.

Statistical analyses were done with SPSS version 19.0 (SPSS/IBM 2010).

RESULTS

Seventy-one patients had full baseline and follow-up assessments and MRI (see Fig. 1). Nine patients were excluded, five because of non-credible responding (i.e., insufficient effort), three because of other than neu-rodegenerative diseases that might have caused their cognitive decline (history of malignant hypertension and diabetes mellitus with severe white matter abnormalities; Gaucher disease; stroke during the follow-up interval), and one because of insufficient scan quality. Sixty-two patients satisfied the inclusion and exclusion criteria. After two-year follow-up, 28 patients had normal cognition (CDR = 0), and 34 showed clinical signs of cognitive impairment (CDR ≥ 0.5) according to the neurologist’s provisional diagnosis. The groups were comparable in level of education and gender distribution (Table 1), but the normal cognition group was younger than the impaired group. Note that the neurologist made this group division without considering MRI and neuropsychological evaluations. Two patients, who the neurologist considered to be normal at follow-up, appeared to satisfy MCI criteria after MRI and neuropsychological evaluation. Three patients, who the neurologist considered to
Table 1

Demographic and clinical characteristics. Patients who at follow-up after two years were considered to have normal cognition or to show cognitive impairment after neurological consultation. Diagnoses at baseline and at follow-up were the revised diagnoses after taking MRI and neuropsychological results into consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal cognition at follow-up (CDR = 0; n = 28)</th>
<th>Cognitive impairment at follow-up (CDR &gt; 0; n = 34)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male/female</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>62.0 (8.1)</td>
<td>70.3 (8.9)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level (0–6 ISCED)</td>
<td>4.1 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.8 (1.2)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMSE at baseline</td>
<td>28.0 (1.8)</td>
<td>26.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.011c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMSE at follow-up</td>
<td>28.2 (1.3)</td>
<td>23.0 (4.5)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised diagnosis at baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychotropic disorder</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worried well</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised diagnosis at follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dementia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychotropic disorder</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worried well</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* chi-square; *t* test; *c* Mann-Whitney test.

Table 2a

Demographically corrected T-scores on neuropsychological tests of patients who at follow-up were considered by neurological consultation to have normal cognition or to show cognitive impairment. Mean (standard deviation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline test scores</th>
<th>Follow-up test scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal cognition at follow-up (CDR = 0; n = 28)</td>
<td>Cognitive impairment at follow-up (CDR &gt; 0; n = 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter fluency COWAT</td>
<td>48.6 (5.5)</td>
<td>40.5 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVLT immediate recall</td>
<td>51.9 (8.1)</td>
<td>36.4 (10.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVLT delayed recall</td>
<td>54.1 (5.8)</td>
<td>36.5 (12.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBMT prose immediate recall</td>
<td>48.6 (10.7)</td>
<td>39.4 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBMT prose delayed recall</td>
<td>46.8 (10.6)</td>
<td>37.2 (10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroop CWT interference</td>
<td>49.0 (8.8)</td>
<td>39.8 (10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Making Test part B</td>
<td>51.5 (9.8)</td>
<td>54.2 (19.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean T-score</td>
<td>49.8 (5.9)</td>
<td>57.7 (7.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean T change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be impaired, appeared to have normal cognition at neuropsychological testing; they were reclassified as worried well. The latter label was used for people who were cognitively normal, did not have cognitive test scores in the impaired range, and who did not meet criteria for a psychiatric disorder. Although they had cognitive complaints and were unsure about their mental status, these worries appeared to be unjustified. Two patients, who had MCI at baseline, had improved clinically and were considered normal on follow-up. Psychiatric comorbidity mostly concerned mood disorders (dysthymia and depression). Note that the presence of a psychiatric syndrome does not conflict with a diagnosis of normal cognition. All dementia cases were diagnosed as probable AD except two who had mixed AD-vascular dementia, and one patient who had frontotemporal dementia.

These revised diagnoses are given to describe the sample. However, all statistical analyses were done with the CDR classification to prevent incorporation bias, i.e., circularity of diagnostic reasoning.

The normal cognition group performed around the population mean of $T = 50$ (Table 2a), and did not decline during follow-up. The impaired group performed on most tests about one SD below the population mean at baseline, and declined 0.6 SD (mean of 6.3 T-score points) during the follow-up interval. The difference in decline between both groups was 6.4 T-score points (95% CI 3.5–9.3; $p = 0.00002$ two-tailed t-test).

At baseline, the magnitudes of group differences in cortical thickness measures were around 0.3–0.4 SD (Table 2b). In the impaired group, the mean thickness of the entorhinal, middle temporal, and parahip-
Table 2b
Cortical thickness (in mm) of entorhinal, middle temporal and parahippocampal cortices, and hippocampal volumes (in mm³, as percentage of intracranial volume, and hippocampal atrophy rate) of patients who at follow-up were considered by neurological consultation to have normal cognition or to show cognitive impairment. Mean (standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline cortical thickness</th>
<th>Follow-up cortical thickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal cognition (CDR = 0; n = 28)</td>
<td>Cognitive impairment (CDR &gt; 0; n = 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entorhinal cortex left (mm)*</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entorhinal cortex right (mm)*</td>
<td>3.7 (0.4)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entorhinal cortex mean (mm)*</td>
<td>3.6 (0.4)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle temporal cortex left (mm)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle temporal cortex right (mm)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle temporal cortex mean (mm)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parahippocampal cortex left (mm)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parahippocampal cortex right (mm)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parahippocampal cortex mean (mm)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean thickness (ER, MT, PH) (mm)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean change in thickness (mm)</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.155)</td>
<td>-0.064 (0.106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampal volume left (mm³)</td>
<td>3520 (436)</td>
<td>2936 (471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampal volume right (mm³)</td>
<td>3571 (427)</td>
<td>3005 (539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampal volume total (mm³)</td>
<td>7091 (829)</td>
<td>5941 (966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampal volume %ICV</td>
<td>0.46 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.39 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean change %ICV</td>
<td>-0.007 (0.023)</td>
<td>-0.025 (0.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrophy rate %/year</td>
<td>0.6 (2.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p-determined with ex vivo atlas (Fischl et al. [41]).

The baseline group difference in (uncorrected) total hippocampal volume was about one SD, and the volume decreased 0.4 SD in the impaired group (i.e., 5941–5553 = 388/966; Table 2b). This corresponds to a hippocampal atrophy rate of 3.4% per year. The normal cognition group showed an atrophy rate in the order of 0.1 SD or 0.6% per year. The difference between both groups was significant (95% CI 1.3–4.3; p = 0.0005; two-tailed t-test). The longitudinal FreeSurfer processing stream could not analyze three scan pairs; they were segmented separately. Cognitive decline and hippocampal atrophy are illustrated in Fig. 2.

Substituting the mean change in the impaired group minus the mean change in the normal group for ∆T in the above formula, and the SD of the mean change in the normal group for σ, the estimated required sample sizes per study arm are n = 488 for mean cortical thickness, n = 246 for hippocampal atrophy, and n = 246 for neuropsychological assessment (Table 3). These sample sizes would have a power of 80% to detect an effect size of 25% reduction in atrophy rate or cognitive decline, respectively, at 5% significance. Samples of n = 488, n = 131, or n = 62 per study arm would be required to include about twice the number of participants than a study with NPA as the endpoint. If cortical thickness
At baseline, the cognitive test scores in the declining group were between 1.0 and 1.6 SD below the demographically corrected mean, and the scores of the normal group were around the population mean. Thus, the latter group indeed had normal cognitive functions and did not decline during follow-up, unlike the patients who were rated as impaired. These patients declined 0.6 SD (6 T-score points). The hippocampal volumes we reported might have been systematically overestimated by FreeSurfer [44], but the annual atrophy rates of the hippocampi of 0.6% and 3.4% in the normal and declining groups respectively, are in line with the literature. Two meta-analyses found mean rates of hippocampal atrophy of 1.4% per year in healthy elderly and 4.7% in AD patients [46], with MCI patients in an intermediate position [20]. Our patients were relatively young compared to the subjects in these meta-analyses, and our declining group was a mix of MCI and dementia cases. Both these factors likely resulted in somewhat lower atrophy rates. Nevertheless, the resulting sample size estimates for hippocampal atrophy were in the same order of magnitude, i.e., several hundred per arm, as those found in ADNI [17]. As an aside, the absolute values of these estimates are only indicative. They strongly fluctuate with relatively small changes in deltas and SDs of the n-per-arm formula. At any rate, we conclude that our cognitive and neuroimaging results are plausible, and compatible with previous findings.

Our sample was relatively small. Furthermore, we did not exclude psychiatric comorbidity, unlike many other similar studies. This may be unusual, but it ensures that our analyses reflect daily clinical practice. We treated the patients with normal cognition as if they were healthy controls. Although one could question if patients with subjective cognitive complaints should be considered ‘normal’, our data show that this was acceptable, since their cognitive scores were normal and did not decline, and the age-related rate of atrophy of their hippocampi was within normal limits. Thus, the fact that some patients had a mood disorder or another psychiatric problem was apparently irrelevant. A similar reasoning may justify the composition of our impaired group. This group was diluted somewhat with psychiatric cases and even with a few worried well, who were misclassified by the neurologists. Nevertheless, at group level their cognitive scores and hippocampal volumes, and the changes over time of these measures, including the greater change in the left than in the right hippocampus, corresponded to what is reported in the literature, as we saw above. Eight patients in this group appeared to be demented at baseline when their diagnosis was revised (Table 1), and we did not treat them differently from the majority, i.e., the MCI patients. Note however, that the revised demen-

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Minimum n per arm for each variable if it would be an isolated outcome measure in a theoretical trial to detect 25% or 50% reduction in rate of change at 80% study power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum n per arm for each variable if it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be the outcome measure, the required sample sizes would be about eight times larger. These analyses were repeated without the three patients whose scans had to be analyzed separately and without the patient with frontotemporal dementia. This did not change the results. Application of analysis of variance covarying for age only marginally affected the estimated means and standard deviations, and left the resulting numbers needed per arm virtually unchanged. The neuropsychological measure that performed best in isolation was Rey’s AVLT total learning score. The best performing isolated MRI measure was volume of the left hippocampus (Table 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be the outcome measure, the required sample sizes would be about eight times larger. These analyses were repeated without the three patients whose scans had to be analyzed separately and without the patient with frontotemporal dementia. This did not change the results. Application of analysis of variance covarying for age only marginally affected the estimated means and standard deviations, and left the resulting numbers needed per arm virtually unchanged. The neuropsychological measure that performed best in isolation was Rey’s AVLT total learning score. The best performing isolated MRI measure was volume of the left hippocampus (Table 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION

Our analysis suggests that neuropsychological assessment is more responsive than hippocampal atrophy or cortical thickness of temporal lobe areas in patients with MCI and early dementia, using the neurologist’s clinical diagnosis of progressive disease as gold standard. Our estimates of required sample sizes for intervention trials in MCI and AD are about 50% smaller if a brief neuropsychological test battery would be the outcome measure instead of hippocampal atrophy. Cortical thickness of temporal areas as outcome measure would require much larger samples. At baseline, the cognitive test scores in the declining group were between 1.0 and 1.6 SD below the demographically corrected mean, and the scores of the normal group were around the population mean. Thus, the latter group indeed had normal cognitive functions and did not decline during follow-up, unlike the patients who were rated as impaired. These patients declined 0.6 SD (6 T-score points). The hippocampal volumes we reported might have been systematically overestimated by FreeSurfer [44], but the annual atrophy rates of the hippocampi of 0.6% and 3.4% in the normal and declining groups respectively, are in line with the literature. Two meta-analyses found mean rates of hippocampal atrophy of 1.4% per year in healthy elderly and 4.7% in AD patients [46], with MCI patients in an intermediate position [20]. Our patients were relatively young compared to the subjects in these meta-analyses, and our declining group was a mix of MCI and dementia cases. Both these factors likely resulted in somewhat lower atrophy rates. Nevertheless, the resulting sample size estimates for hippocampal atrophy were in the same order of magnitude, i.e., several hundred per arm, as those found in ADNI [17]. As an aside, the absolute values of these estimates are only indicative. They strongly fluctuate with relatively small changes in deltas and SDs of the n-per-arm formula. At any rate, we conclude that our cognitive and neuroimaging results are plausible, and compatible with previous findings.

Our sample was relatively small. Furthermore, we did not exclude psychiatric comorbidity, unlike many other similar studies. This may be unusual, but it ensures that our analyses reflect daily clinical practice. We treated the patients with normal cognition as if they were healthy controls. Although one could question if patients with subjective cognitive complaints should be considered ‘normal’, our data show that this was acceptable, since their cognitive scores were normal and did not decline, and the age-related rate of atrophy of their hippocampi was within normal limits. Thus, the fact that some patients had a mood disorder or another psychiatric problem was apparently irrelevant. A similar reasoning may justify the composition of our impaired group. This group was diluted somewhat with psychiatric cases and even with a few worried well, who were misclassified by the neurologists. Nevertheless, at group level their cognitive scores and hippocampal volumes, and the changes over time of these measures, including the greater change in the left than in the right hippocampus, corresponded to what is reported in the literature, as we saw above. Eight patients in this group appeared to be demented at baseline when their diagnosis was revised (Table 1), and we did not treat them differently from the majority, i.e., the MCI patients. Note however, that the revised demen-
nia diagnosis could be made only after MRI scanning and neuropsychological assessment. Had we excluded the dementia cases, we would have introduced incorporation bias or circularity of diagnostic reasoning. Moreover, the line between MCI and dementia is hard to draw in practice, and there is a trend toward investigating these categories jointly [47]. Our study design conformed to the STARD and QUADAS-2 criteria [48, 49].

The most likely explanation of our results is perhaps that neurologists base their decision whether or not a patient’s cognition is normal mainly on the patient history, the informant report, and on their own observations during the consultation, supported by results of a dementia-screening instrument such as the MMSE. Thus, their decision is based on behavioral information, and rightly so because the dementias are defined by behavioral symptoms. Neuropsychological evaluation assesses these behavioral symptoms. It is therefore to be expected that clinical judgment correspond closer to neuropsychological assessment than to volumetric measures.

Neuropsychological assessment largely is a quantitative technique, and it is more precise and more reliable than the clinician’s naked eye, which serves a more qualitative judgment. This precision of neuropsychological assessment and its focus on the defining symptoms of dementia probably explain its superior responsiveness. Another important characteristic of neuropsychological tests is that they allow to correct the scores for age, educational level, and if necessary for gender and ethnicity in a statistically sound way. This removes a major portion of the variance in final scores, and allows more clearly identifying the cognitive deficits due to the disease.

There are caveats to our study. First, we simply took the mean standard score of the cognitive tests. However, more powerful statistical methods are available to detect cognitive changes [50]. Second, the FreeSurfer software could not analyze the MRI scans able to detect cognitive changes [50]. Second, the FreeSurfer software could not analyze the MRI scans available. Finally, we did not consider other biomarkers than hippocampal atrophy and cortical thickness, nor did we take genetic variation, such as APOE genotype, into account. It seems unlikely that cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers, such as amyloid and tau concentrations, will reflect cognitive and behavioral deterioration better than neuropsychological assessment [23, 51, 52]. However, if one would combine neuropsychological measures as endpoints with sample enrichment strategies by neuromaging, genetic, and neurochemical biomarkers, the statistical power of intervention studies might be increased even further [5, 13, 18].

Our results have important implications for pharmacological research into MCI and AD. Hundreds of compounds for symptomatic or disease-modifying treatment of AD have been tested by now, and they all failed, apart from a handful of modestly effective drugs [53]. We have shown that neuropsychological tests can provide the evaluative measures that are so badly needed to speed up the discovery of disease modifying or preventive drugs [7]. However, in clinical practice the effects of drugs should in the first place be visible to the patients and their relatives.
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