It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 A DATA-DRIVEN EXAMINATION OF APATHY AND DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS

2 IN DEMENTIA WITH INDEPENDENT REPLICATION

- 3
- 4 AUTHORS: Miguel Vasconcelos Da Silva^{1,2*}, G.J. Melendez-Torres¹, Zahinoor
- 5 Ismail^{1,3}, Ingelin Testad², Clive Ballard¹, Byron Creese¹, for the Alzheimer's
- 6 Disease Neuroimaging Initiative**
- 7 1 Medical School, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Exeter,
- 8 Exeter, UK, EX4 4QG.
- 9 2 Department of Old Age Psychiatry, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and
- 10 Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK, SE5 8AF.
- 11 **3** Department of Psychiatry, Hotchkiss Brain Institute & O'Brien Institute for
- 12 Public Health, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada, T2N 4Z6.
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16 *Corresponding Author: email: <u>Miguel.1.dasilva@kcl.ac.uk</u>. Address: Department of
- 17 Old Age Psychiatry, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's
- 18 College London, De Crespigny Park, London, UK SE5 8AF

**Data used in preparation of this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.usc.edu). As such, the investigators within the ADNI contributed to the design and implementation of ADNI and/or provided data but did not participate in analysis or writing of this report. A complete listing of ADNI investigators can be found on appendix and at: http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wpcontent/uploads/how to apply/ADNI Acknowledgement List.pdf

- 26
- 27 Word count: 3224
- 28
- 29 Key words: Apathy, Depression, Dementia, Latent Class Analysis

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 ABSTRACT

2	Introduction: Apathy is one of the most common neuropsychiatric symptoms (NPS)				
3	and is associated with poor clinical outcomes. Research that helps define the apathy				
4	phenotype is urgently needed, particularly for clinical and biomarker studies.				
5	Methods: We used latent class analysis (LCA) with two independent cohorts to				
6	understand how apathy and depression symptoms co-occur statistically. We further				
7	explored the relationship between latent class membership, demographics and the				
8	presence of other NPS.				
9	Results: The LCA identified a 4-class solution (No Symptoms, Apathy, Depression,				
10	and Combined Apathy/Depression), reproducible over both cohorts, providing robust				
11	support for an apathy syndrome distinct from depression and confirming that an				
12	apathy/depression syndrome exists.				
13	Discussion: Using a data-driven method, we show distinct and statistically				
14	meaningful co-occurrence of apathy and depressive symptoms. There was evidence				
15	that these classes have different clinical associations which may help inform				
16	diagnostic categories for research studies and clinical practice.				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 **1. BACKGROUND**

2

3 Apathy is one of the most common neuropsychiatric symptoms (NPS) seen in 4 dementia [1], with a reported prevalence of 43% [2] (though estimates vary widely 5 according to dementia stage and study setting). Characterised by a lack of 6 motivation, decreased initiative, akinesia, and emotional indifference [3-7], apathy is 7 a multidimensional syndrome that can lead to functional impairment, poorer 8 treatment response, and greater mortality [8-10]. Understanding the clinical 9 presentation of such a common and clinically important syndrome is of utmost 10 importance both for the effective targeting of new interventions and for the 11 identification of biomarkers or other research aimed at understanding biological 12 correlates.

13

14 One of the key diagnostic challenges in apathy is its relationship with depression. 15 Although clinically distinct, symptoms of apathy and of depression are commonly 16 comorbid and have overlapping features [3, 11], thus complicating clinical 17 distinctions between the two [1, 7, 12]. Recognizing this, new diagnostic criteria for 18 apathy in neurocognitive disorders were developed in 2021, representing a major 19 step forward in clinical management of apathy and in associated research by 20 providing a standardised framework for assessment [13]. Central to these criteria is 21 that the symptoms of apathy cannot be explained by another psychiatric condition 22 (e.g., depression), but it remains the case that criteria for apathy can, in principle, be 23 met in the presence of heterogeneous depressive symptomatology. This co-24 occurrence has the potential to cause a lack of reproducibility, particularly in disease 25 mechanism research where control groups must be precisely defined. It may also be

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

a barrier to targeting the right interventions to the right people. A data-driven
 approach to distinguish apathy and depression symptomatology can support more
 precision approaches to treatment and augment the application of the clinically
 informed diagnostic criteria.

5

Latent class analysis (LCA) is one example of a data-driven approach. A form of
latent variable modelling, LCA describes combinations of generally binary variables
in terms of statistically likely patterns that are not directly observed (i.e., latent
classes), where these patterns are characterised on the basis of the conditional
probability of each binary variable within a class.

11

12 Thus, using LCA on questionnaire-based measures of apathy and depression, we 13 aimed to 1) examine how symptoms co-occur in two independent observational 14 cohort studies; and 2) establish whether the latent classes identified were associated 15 with different NPS profiles.

- 16
- 17 **2. METHODS**
- 18 **2.1 Sample descriptions**
- 19 **2.1.1 L-study**

Participants were from the Measuring Long Term Outcomes in People with Dementia in Care Homes (L-study). This study has been running since 2015 through the King's College London and Maudsley Care Home Research Network (CHRN). Participants with a diagnosis of dementia living in care homes across the southeast of England were recruited. Consent was obtained from participants or next of kin if participants were unable to consent for themselves. The recruitment and assessments were completed by a trained researcher. The Southampton and South West Hampshire

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Research Ethics Committee A (formally South Central – Southampton A) approved
 the study (REC number 13/SC/0265).

3

4 2.1.2 ADNI

5 Additional data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the 6 Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.usc.edu). 7 The ADNI was launched in 2003 as a public-private partnership, led by Principal Investigator Michael W. Weiner, MD. The primary goal of ADNI has been to test 8 9 whether serial magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), positron emission tomography 10 (PET), other biological markers, and clinical and neuropsychological assessment can 11 be combined to measure the progression of mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and 12 early Alzheimer's disease (AD). For up-to-date information, see www.adni-info.org.

13

14 **2.2 Measures**

15

2.2.1 Neuropsychiatric symptoms

16 NPS were assessed with the Neuropsychiatric Inventory (NPI), completed by a 17 researcher-led interview with an informed caregiver [14]. The NPI assesses the 18 following 12 NPS, within a reference period of the past 4 weeks: delusions; 19 hallucinations: agitation/aggression: depression/dysphoria; anxiety; elation/euphoria; 20 apathy/indifference; disinhibition; irritability/lability; aberrant motor behaviour; sleep 21 and night-time behaviour disorders, and appetite and eating disorders [15]. Each 22 item is rated as present or absent. If a screening question is rated present, a 23 number of sub-questions are then completed which cover detailed NPS relating to 24 each domain; each is coded with a yes or no response. If any of these symptoms are 25 rated present, frequency (1-4) and severity (1-3) are rated, with the product of these 26 representing the overall symptom score.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

For the L-study, the NPI Nursing Home (NPI-NH) version was used as this is the
 adapted version for institutional settings whilst the ADNI cohort used the standard
 NPI [16].

4

5

2.2.2 Apathy and Depression

6 Apathy and depression were measured using the sub-questions on item G (Apathy) 7 and item D (Depression) of the NPI (see Appendix A for list of questions). For the 8 NPI-NH there are 15 sub-questions while for the standard NPI there are 16, with the 9 standard NPI scale used in ADNI having one fewer sub-question on the Apathy 10 section.

- 11
- 12

2.2.3 Other neuropsychiatric symptoms

Our second aim was to evaluate the relationship between latent classes of apathy and depression and other NPS. To do this, NPS status (defined as present or absent) was determined for the remaining 10 items on the NPI using binary coding. Participants with a frequency x severity score of ≥1 were considered as 'symptom present'. The symptom was considered absent if the score was 0.

18

19 **2.2.4 Dementia severity**

The Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR) is a scale for assessing, diagnosing and staging cognitive impairment [17]. A researcher/clinician conducts a semi-structured interview with the patient and a reliable informant to rate performance in six domains: memory; orientation; judgement and problem solving; community affairs, homes and hobbies; and personal care. The domains are rated in terms of the impairment level (0 = none, 0.5 = questionable, 1 = mild, 2 = moderate, 3 = severe). A final global rating is then calculated to indicate the level of impairment (0 = normal cognition, 0.5

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 = questionable or very mild dementia, 1 = mild dementia, 2 = moderate dementia,
2 and 3 = severe dementia).

3

4 **2.3 Data Cleaning**

5 Participants with a CDR of 0 or 0.5 were excluded from both cohorts given this would 6 indicate normal cognition or questionable dementia. Data were checked for 7 completeness, participants with missing age, sex, or CDR were removed from the 8 dataset. Participants with missing NPI/NPI-NH items D and G were also excluded. A 9 total of 22 participants were removed from L-study cohort and a total of 135 10 participants were removed from ADNI. Furthermore, within the ADNI cohort only 4 participants had a CDR of 3 so these were merged with the group scoring 2. See 11 12 Appendix B for study flow diagram.

13

14 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

To summarise, first we estimated latent classes of the NPI apathy and depression subscale questions with two to six class solutions. This was followed by the bootstrap test to analyse the best fitting solution. Then we explored the relationship between latent classes from the best fitting LCA model and the presence of other NPI domains. The same steps were performed for the L-study and ADNI datasets. Further detail is provided below.

21

We used the Stata LCA plugin version 1.2.1 [18] to estimate the latent classes, measured by categorical indicators, within the NPI category D (depression) and G (apathy) sub-questions. The LCA Bootstrap version 1.0 plugin [19] was then used to evaluate models with two to six latent classes and determine the optimal number of

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

classes using the model-fit criteria of bootstrapped likelihood ratio test (BLRT), adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (aBIC), scaled relative entropy, and log likelihood. A simulation study has shown that BLRT was the best test to identify the correct number of classes, followed by the Bayesian Information Criterion and the aBIC [20]. Thus, a model with k classes would be considered a better fit than a model with k-1 classes if it had a lower BLRT, p-value and a lower aBIC value. In addition, we considered the clinical interpretability of the final model.

8

9 Following this we used the plugin LCA Distal BCH version 1.1 [21] to analyse the 10 relationship between the latent classes with other NPI items. This test estimates the 11 association between a latent class variable and an observed distal outcome, i.e., 12 other NPI items, using the approach of Bolck, Croon, and Hagenaars [22], as 13 adapted by Vermunt [23], allowing for the probability of misclassification of classes. 14 Distal probabilities for each NPI item for each latent class are reported along with the Wald test for significance. The Wald test tests the null hypothesis that the 15 16 probabilities are the same across all latent classes. Pairwise comparisons between 17 latent classes were then performed to determine which latent classes differed with 18 respect to the probabilities of other NPI items.

19

20 **3. RESULTS**

- 21 **3.1 Participant characteristics**
- 22

After data cleaning, the L-study comprised of 326 people. Mean age was 87 (SD 6.99), 73% were female and median CDR was 2 (see Table 1). The ADNI data

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 comprised of 271 people. Mean age was 74 (SD 7.4), 42% were female with a

- 2 median CDR of 1 (see Table 1).
- 3

4 **Table 1 Cohorts Demographics**

- 5 [INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]
- 6

7 **3.2 Latent Class analysis identifies a reproducible 4-class solution**

8 **3.2.1** L-study

A 4-class model was considered optimal based on the higher aBIC score and higher
log likelihood score, p-value and clinical interpretability. Although the 5-class model
had same p-value, on balance comparing the other metrics and clinical
interpretability the 4-class model was chosen (see Table 2).

13

14 The four classes were labelled No Symptoms, Combined Apathy/Depression, 15 Depression, and Apathy. Looking at the symptom probability across the different 16 classes (Figure 1), the No Symptoms class showed very low or zero probability of 17 apathy and depressive symptoms; the Combined Apathy/Depression class exhibited 18 high probabilities across a range of depressive and apathy symptoms; the 19 Depression class comprised mostly of depressive symptoms with low probability of 20 some apathy symptoms; the Apathy class had high probabilities across apathy 21 symptoms and very low or no probability of depressive symptoms. The probabilities 22 of participants falling into each class was 42.13%, 18.37%, 9.06% and 30.42% for 23 the No Symptom, Combined Apathy/Depression, Depression, and Apathy classes 24 respectively (see Appendix C).

25

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 2 3.2.2 ADNI 3 Considering aBIC and p-value and clinical interpretability, a 4-class model was again 4 considered optimal, with a notable similarity to the L-study across the symptom 5 probabilities (Figure 2). We note that a case could be made for selecting a 5-class 6 model, however the additional class in the 5-class model was very similar to class 2 7 in the 4-class model (see Appendix E for more detailed discussion of model 8 selection). 9 10 The four classes were given the same labels as the L-Study, with the same 11 descriptions. The probabilities of participants falling into each class in the 4-class 12 model were 40.7%, 20.1%, 15.6% and 23.6% for the No Symptoms, Combined 13 Apathy/Depression, Depression, and Apathy classes respectively (see Appendix C). 14 15 16 Table 2 Bootstrap Likelihood Ratio test and Scalars for best model fit 17 [INSERT TABLE 2 HERE] 18 19 Figure 1 - Apathy and depression symptoms probability across the 4 classes 20 in L-study 21 [INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE] 22 23 Figure 2 - Apathy and depression symptoms probability across the 4 classes 24 in ADNI

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 [INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

2

3

4

3.3 In individuals with apathy, co-morbid depressive symptoms have higher probability of additional NPS burden.

5

Broadly, the latent classes that were characterised by the presence of depressive symptoms (i.e., Combined Apathy/Depression and Depression) were associated with a higher burden of comorbid NPS, particularly delusions, anxiety and irritability, which replicated across the two cohorts. The Apathy class (i.e., no depression symptoms) relative to the No Symptoms class was associated with a higher probability for agitation in the L-study, but not in ADNI. This was the only comparison where Apathy conferred a higher probability for any comorbid NPS.

13

Specific pairwise comparisons between latent classes are described in more detail below. Only NPS domains where there was evidence of replication across the two cohorts are considered in detail and shown in Table 3. All other results are in Table F.1. in Appendix F.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3 – Delusions, Anxiety and irritability probabilities across the 4 classes,

with pairwise comparisons

[INSERT TABLE 3 HERE]

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 **3.3.1 Delusions**

2	The probability for delusions was highest in the classes characterised by depressive
3	symptoms (Combined Apathy/Depression class in L-study = 0.56 and in ADNI =0.25;
4	Depression class in L-study = 0.54 and in ADNI = 0.20) and lowest in the No
5	Symptoms and Apathy class (No symptoms L-study= 0.39 ADNI = 0.14; Apathy
6	class L-study=0.23; ADNI=0.04), with L-study Wald test= 16.49, p<0.001 and ADNI
7	Wald test=8.3, p=0.04 see Table 3.

8

9 **3.3.2 Anxiety**

The probability for Anxiety was highest in the classes characterised by depressive symptoms (Combined Apathy/Depression class L-study = 0.70 and in ADNI =0.59; Depression class in L-study = 0.41 and in ADNI = 0.30) and lowest in the No Symptoms and Apathy class (No symptoms in L-study= 0.22 ADNI = 0.16; Apathy class in L-study=0.27 ADNI=0.29], with L-study Wald test= 33.81, p<0.001 and ADNI Wald test=25.74, p<0.001 see Table 3.

16

17 **3.3.3 Irritability**

The probability for irritability was highest in the classes characterised by depressive symptoms (Combined Apathy/Depression class L-study = 0.69 and in ADNI =0.51; Depression class in L-study = 0.68 and in ADNI = 0.45) and lowest in the No Symptoms and Apathy class (No symptoms in L-study= 0.38 ADNI = 0.25; Apathy class in L-study=0.47 ADNI=0.29], with L-study Wald test= 16.92, p<0.001 and ADNI Wald test=13.27, p=0.004 see Table 3.

24

25 **3.3.4 Other associations**

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1	Other associations that did not replicate across the two datasets are shown in the
2	supplement, but we highlight here the findings relating to agitation as one of the most
3	clinically interesting of the remaining findings. The Combined Apathy/Depression
4	and Apathy classes had a higher probability of agitation relative to the No Symptoms
5	class in the L-study only (probability of agitation for No Symptoms, Combined
6	Apathy/Depression, Depression, and Apathy Class was 0.52, 0.80, 0.64, 0.72
7	respectively with overall Wald Test L-study= 17.04, p<0.01). This did not replicate in
8	ADNI (probability of agitation for No Symptoms, Combined Apathy/Depression,
9	Depression, and Apathy Class was 0.25, 0.4, 0.4 and 0.39 respectively with overall
10	Wald Test 5.53, p=0.13) however the direction of effect was similar.
11	
12	
13	
1.4	4. DISCUSSION
14	4. DISCUSSION
14 15	 DISCUSSION Here, we used LCA to delineate symptoms of apathy and depression in dementia.
14 15 16	4. DISCUSSIONHere, we used LCA to delineate symptoms of apathy and depression in dementia.The reproducible 4-class solution provides robust data-driven validation of an apathy
14 15 16 17	 4. DISCUSSION Here, we used LCA to delineate symptoms of apathy and depression in dementia. The reproducible 4-class solution provides robust data-driven validation of an apathy syndrome that is distinct from depression and a combined apathy/depression
14 15 16 17 18	4. DISCUSSION Here, we used LCA to delineate symptoms of apathy and depression in dementia. The reproducible 4-class solution provides robust data-driven validation of an apathy syndrome that is distinct from depression and a combined apathy/depression syndrome. This conclusion is supported by our analysis of neuropsychiatric
14 15 16 17 18 19	4. DISCUSSION Here, we used LCA to delineate symptoms of apathy and depression in dementia. The reproducible 4-class solution provides robust data-driven validation of an apathy syndrome that is distinct from depression and a combined apathy/depression syndrome. This conclusion is supported by our analysis of neuropsychiatric symptom associations with each of the four classes where we show that apathy is
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	4. DISCUSSION Here, we used LCA to delineate symptoms of apathy and depression in dementia. The reproducible 4-class solution provides robust data-driven validation of an apathy syndrome that is distinct from depression and a combined apathy/depression syndrome. This conclusion is supported by our analysis of neuropsychiatric symptom associations with each of the four classes where we show that apathy is generally only associated with a more severe NPS profile when co-morbid
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	4. DISCUSSION Here, we used LCA to delineate symptoms of apathy and depression in dementia. The reproducible 4-class solution provides robust data-driven validation of an apathy syndrome that is distinct from depression and a combined apathy/depression syndrome. This conclusion is supported by our analysis of neuropsychiatric symptom associations with each of the four classes where we show that apathy is generally only associated with a more severe NPS profile when co-morbid depressive symptoms are present.

22

The broad implication of these findings is that in apathy research, depression should also be routinely measured and individuals with comorbid symptoms may have to be considered a separate group to those with a distinct apathy syndrome. This could

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 explain some of the heterogeneity observed in NPS associations in other studies of 2 apathy. For example, one study observed that apathy was associated with higher 3 NPI scores across a range of NPS, including delusions, irritability and anxiety [24]. 4 In light of the findings from the present study, it is possible that the reported 5 associations in this previous study were being driven by the presence of comorbid 6 depressive symptoms in the apathy group. Future studies measuring clinical and 7 biological correlates should consider the possibility of comorbid depressive 8 symptoms as a confounder in order to produce reproducible research.

9

10 The latest diagnostic criteria for apathy stipulate that apathy cannot be due to 11 another illness, disability, or substance abuse but are silent on accompanying 12 neuropsychiatric features. The existence of the Combined Apathy/Depression class 13 suggests further consideration of depressive symptoms (which may not meet criteria 14 for clinical depression) as an accompanying feature of apathy.

In terms of other NPS burden, there was a striking consistency for a higher 15 16 probability of delusions, anxiety, and irritability in the two classes that captured 17 depressive symptoms (i.e., the Depression and Combined Apathy/Depression 18 This pattern of classes) relative to the No Symptoms and Apathy classes. 19 association points to an affective syndrome with psychotic features, validating both 20 the focus on the relationship between these syndromes in the new IPA and 21 ISTAART criteria for psychosis in neurocognitive disorders [25, 26], and results from 22 previous studies reporting the co-occurrence of both syndromes [27-30]. 23 Mechanistically, a recent genome wide association study observed a positive 24 association between genetic risk for depressive symptoms and Alzheimer's disease 25 with psychosis, while in younger-aged samples genetic correlations between

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

irritability and depressive symptoms have been observed [31, 32]. These
 observations, alongside the current findings, reflect current opinion that comorbid
 behavioural symptoms may impact response to treatments [33].

4

5 Another interesting observation is that there was a higher probability for agitation in 6 the Apathy class relative to the No Symptoms class in the L-study. Although only 7 present in one cohort, in which mean age was higher and median dementia severity 8 was slightly greater, this was the only instance where the Apathy class was 9 associated with a higher probability of another NPS. The lack of replication may be 10 due to the more advanced dementia seen in the L-study, which is a care home 11 study, where we would expect agitation to be more common [34]. Nonetheless, this 12 may be a clinically relevant finding. The association of apathy with comorbid 13 agitation is an important relationship to explore, as these individuals may require 14 additional support and are often referred for specialist consultation. We would argue 15 this is a relationship worth examining more closely in future research to determine 16 whether agitation should be considered an accompanying feature of apathy and 17 incorporated into later revision of the diagnostic criteria (which is currently silent on 18 comorbid NPS). A clear path to take these findings forward is to perform LCA on 19 apathy and depressive questionnaire responses and map the classes identified onto 20 independently rated apathy diagnostic criteria in the same individuals. This analysis 21 would provide the necessary data to evaluate the extent to which application of the 22 criteria captures individuals with depressive symptoms.

23

A key strength of this study is the replication in two independent cohorts which confers a high degree of confidence in our findings. This is important as caregiver

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 reports may be influenced by caregiver mood, cultural beliefs, and the educational 2 level of the caregiver [35], although also the carer information has the advantage of 3 not being influenced by anosognosia. However, differences in the dementia severity 4 and demographics between the ADNI and the L-study mean we must acknowledge 5 the possibility that non-replication of neuropsychiatric symptom associations is due 6 to these differences (as discussed above with respect to agitation). We also 7 acknowledge the inherent limitation of the NPI in measuring apathy, particularly the 8 relative weighting given to items capturing diminished interest (with a lesser focus on 9 the emotional and initiative dimensions). However, if the latent classes captured in 10 this study reflect true unobserved and mutually exclusive groupings, then these 11 should be stable across any measures of depression and apathy, provided 12 appropriate questionnaire items are measured. This is a hypothesis that can readily 13 be tested by future research in other samples with different NPS measurements.

14

15 In summary, this study supports the existence four latent classes (No Symptoms, 16 Combined Apathy/Depression, Depression and Apathy) replicated in two 17 independent cohorts. In analysis of comorbid NPS burden associated with these 18 classes, we show that the presence of depressive symptoms is the major driver. 19 These findings do not compete with the diagnostic criteria for apathy; rather they 20 should be considered supporting evidence for future iterations, potentially gualifying 21 comorbid NPS symptoms or syndromes. Specifically, we propose that future 22 consideration be given to depressive and agitation symptoms as accompanying 23 neuropsychiatric features of apathy.

24

25

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Statement

2 Clive Ballard has received grants and personal fees from Acadia pharmaceutical 3 company, grants and personal fees from Lundbeck, personal fees from Roche, 4 personal fees from Otsuka, personal fees from Biogen, personal fees from Eli Lilly, 5 personal fees from Novo Nordisk, personal fees from AARP, personal fees 6 from Addex, personal fees from Enterin, personal fees from GWPharm, personal 7 fees from Janssen, personal fees from Johnson and Johnson, personal fees from Orion, personal fees from Sunovion, personal fees from tauX pharmaceutical 8 9 company and from Synexus. Zahinoor Ismail has received honoraria/consulting fees 10 from Janssen, Lundbeck, and Otsuka, although not related to this work. All the other 11 authors have nothing to disclose.

12

13 Funding

14 This paper represents independent research part funded by the NIHR 15 Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS 16 Foundation Trust and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the 17 author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of 18 Health and Social Care.

19 Data collection and sharing for this project was funded by the Alzheimer's Disease 20 Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (National Institutes of Health Grant U01 AG024904) 21 and DOD ADNI (Department of Defense award number W81XWH-12-2-0012). ADNI 22 is funded by the National Institute on Aging, the National Institute of Biomedical 23 Imaging and Bioengineering, and through generous contributions from the following: 24 AbbVie, Alzheimer's Association; Alzheimer's Drug Discovery Foundation; Araclon 25 Biotech; BioClinica, Inc.; Biogen; Bristol-Myers Squibb Company; CereSpir, Inc.; 26 Cogstate; Eisai Inc.; Elan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Eli Lilly and Company; EuroImmun; 27 F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd and its affiliated company Genentech, Inc.; Fujirebio; GE 28 Healthcare; IXICO Ltd.; Janssen Alzheimer Immunotherapy Research & 29 Development, LLC.; Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceutical Research & Development 30 LLC.; Lumosity; Lundbeck; Merck & Co., Inc.; Meso Scale Diagnostics, LLC.; 31 NeuroRx Research; Neurotrack Technologies; Novartis Pharmaceuticals 32 Corporation; Pfizer Inc.; Piramal Imaging; Servier; Takeda Pharmaceutical 33 Company; and Transition Therapeutics. The Canadian Institutes of Health Research

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

is providing funds to support ADNI clinical sites in Canada. Private sector contributions 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 is coordinated by the Alzheimer's Therapeutic Research Institute at the University of Southern California. ADNI data are disseminated by the Laboratory for Neuro Imaging at the University of Southern California.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1

2 **REFERENCES**

- 3
- 4 [1] Tagariello P, Girardi P, Amore M. Depression and apathy in dementia: same syndrome or 5 different constructs? A critical review. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2009;49:246-9.
- [2] Leung DKY, Chan WC, Spector A, Wong GHY. Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and apathy
 symptoms across dementia stages: A systematic review and meta-analysis. International journal of
 geriatric psychiatry. 2021;36:1330-44.
- 8 geriatric psychiatry, 2021;36:1330-44.
- 9 [3] Lanctot KL, Amatniek J, Ancoli-Israel S, Arnold SE, Ballard C, Cohen-Mansfield J, et al.
- Neuropsychiatric signs and symptoms of Alzheimer's disease: New treatment paradigms. Alzheimers
 Dement (N Y). 2017;3:440-9.
- 12 [4] van Reekum R, Stuss DT, Ostrander LJTJon, neurosciences c. Apathy: why care? 2005;17:7-19.
- 13 [5] Marin RSJPA. Differential diagnosis of apathy and related disorders of diminished motivation.14 1997;27:30-3.
- 15 [6] Marin RSJTJon, neurosciences c. Apathy: a neuropsychiatric syndrome. 1991.
- 16 [7] Starkstein SE, Petracca G, Chemerinski E, Kremer J. Syndromic validity of apathy in Alzheimer's 17 disease. Am J Psychiatry. 2001;158:872-7.
- 18 [8] Rajkumar AP, Ballard C, Fossey J, Corbett A, Woods B, Orrell M, et al. Apathy and Its Response to
- 19 Antipsychotic Review and Nonpharmacological Interventions in People With Dementia Living in
- 20 Nursing Homes: WHELD, a Factorial Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. J Am Med Dir Assoc.
- 21 2016;17:741-7.
- [9] Ishii S, Weintraub N, Mervis JR. Apathy: a common psychiatric syndrome in the elderly. J Am Med
 Dir Assoc. 2009;10:381-93.
- 24 [10] Lanctot KL, Aguera-Ortiz L, Brodaty H, Francis PT, Geda YE, Ismail Z, et al. Apathy associated with
- neurocognitive disorders: Recent progress and future directions. Alzheimers Dement. 2017;13:84 100.
- [11] Benoit M, Berrut G, Doussaint J, Bakchine S, Bonin-Guillaume S, Fremont P, et al. Apathy and
 depression in mild Alzheimer's disease: a cross-sectional study using diagnostic criteria. J Alzheimers
 Dis. 2012;31:325-34.
- 30 [12] Selbaek G, Engedal K, Bergh S. The prevalence and course of neuropsychiatric symptoms in nursing home patients with dementia: a systematic review. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2013;14:161-9.
- 32 [13] Miller DS, Robert P, Ereshefsky L, Adler L, Bateman D, Cummings J, et al. Diagnostic criteria for 33 apathy in neurocognitive disorders. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2021;17:1892-904.
- 34 [14] Cummings J. The Neuropsychiatric Inventory: Development and Applications. Journal of 35 Geriatric Psychiatry and Neurology. 2020;33:73-84.
- 36 [15] Cummings JL. The Neuropsychiatric Inventory: assessing psychopathology in dementia patients.
 37 Neurology. 1997;48:S10-6.
- 38 [16] Wood S, Cummings JL, Hsu M-A, Barclay T, Wheatley MV, Yarema KT, et al. The Use of the
- 39 Neuropsychiatric Inventory in Nursing Home Residents: Characterization and Measurement. The 40 American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry. 2000;8:75-83.
- [17] Morris JC, McKeel Jr DW, Fulling K, Torack RM, Berg L. Validation of clinical diagnostic criteria for
 Alzheimer's disease. Annals of Neurology. 1988;24:17-22.
- 43 [18] Lanza ST, Dziak JJ, Huang L, Wagner AT, Collins LM. LCA Stata Plugin Users' Guide Version 1.2.1.
- 44 University Park: The Methodology Center, Penn State. 2018.
- 45 [19] Huang L, Dziak JJ, Wagner AT, Lanza ST. LCA Bootstrap Stata function users' guide (Version 1.0).
- 46 University park: the methodology center, Penn State. 2016.
- 47 [20] Nylund KL, Asparouhov T, Muthén BO. Deciding on the Number of Classes in Latent Class
- 48 Analysis and Growth Mixture Modeling: A Monte Carlo Simulation Study. Structural Equation
- 49 Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal. 2007;14:535-69.

- 1 [21] Huang L, Dziak JJ, Bray BC, Wagner AT. LCA Distal BCH Stata function Users' Guide (Version
- 2 1.1). 2017.
- 3 [22] Bolck A, Croon M, Hagenaars J. Estimating latent structure models with categorical variables:
- 4 One-step versus three-step estimators. Political analysis. 2004;12:3-27.
- 5 [23] Vermunt JK. Latent class modeling with covariates: Two improved three-step approaches. 6 Political analysis. 2010;18:450-69.
- 7 [24] Clarke DE, van Reekum R, Simard M, Streiner DL, Conn D, Cohen T, et al. Apathy in Dementia:
- 8 Clinical and Sociodemographic Correlates. The Journal of neuropsychiatry and clinical neurosciences.
- 9 2008;20:337-47.
- 10 [25] Fischer CE, Ismail Z, Youakim JM, Creese B, Kumar S, Nuñez N, et al. Revisiting Criteria for 11 Psychosis in Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias: Toward Better Phenotypic Classification 12 and Biomarker Research. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2020;73:1143-56.
- 13 [26] Cummings J, Pinto LC, Cruz M, Fischer CE, Gerritsen DL, Grossberg GT, et al. Criteria for
- 14 Psychosis in Major and Mild Neurocognitive Disorders: International Psychogeriatric Association 15 (IPA) Consensus Clinical and Research Definition. The American journal of geriatric psychiatry :
- 16 official journal of the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry. 2020;28:1256-69.
- 17 [27] Sweet RA, Bennett DA, Graff-Radford NR, Mayeux R. Assessment and familial aggregation of
- 18 psychosis in Alzheimer's disease from the National Institute on Aging Late Onset Alzheimer's Disease 19 Family Study. Brain. 2010;133:1155-62.
- 20 [28] Lyketsos CG, Sheppard JM, Steinberg M, Tschanz JA, Norton MC, Steffens DC, et al. 21 Neuropsychiatric disturbance in Alzheimer's disease clusters into three groups: the Cache County 22 study. International journal of geriatric psychiatry. 2001;16:1043-53.
- 23
- [29] Wilkosz PA, Miyahara S, Lopez OL, Dekosky ST, Sweet RA. Prediction of psychosis onset in 24 Alzheimer disease: The role of cognitive impairment, depressive symptoms, and further evidence for
- 25 psychosis subtypes. The American journal of geriatric psychiatry : official journal of the American
- 26 Association for Geriatric Psychiatry. 2006;14:352-60.
- 27 [30] Ismail Z, Creese B, Aarsland D, Kales HC, Lyketsos CG, Sweet RA, et al. Psychosis in Alzheimer 28 disease — mechanisms, genetics and therapeutic opportunities. Nature Reviews Neurology. 29 2022;18:131-44.
- 30 [31] DeMichele-Sweet MAA, Klei L, Creese B, Harwood JC, Weamer EA, McClain L, et al. Genome-31 wide association identifies the first risk loci for psychosis in Alzheimer disease. Molecular Psychiatry. 32 2021;26:5797-811.
- 33 [32] Stringaris A, Zavos H, Leibenluft E, Maughan B, Eley TC. Adolescent irritability: phenotypic 34 associations and genetic links with depressed mood. The American journal of psychiatry. 35 2012;169:47-54.
- 36 [33] Agüera-Ortiz L, Babulal GM, Bruneau M-A, Creese B, D'Antonio F, Fischer CE, et al. Psychosis as a
- 37 Treatment Target in Dementia: A Roadmap for Designing Interventions. Journal of Alzheimer's 38 Disease. 2022;Preprint: 1-26.
- 39 [34] Anatchkova M, Brooks A, Swett L, Hartry A, Duffy RA, Baker RA, et al. Agitation in patients with 40 dementia: a systematic review of epidemiology and association with severity and course.
- 41 International Psychogeriatrics. 2019;31:1305-18.
- 42 [35] de Medeiros K, Robert P, Gauthier S, Stella F, Politis A, Leoutsakos J, et al. The Neuropsychiatric 43 Inventory-Clinician rating scale (NPI-C): reliability and validity of a revised assessment of 44 neuropsychiatric symptoms in dementia. International Psychogeriatrics. 2010;22:984-94.
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1

2 APPENDIX

3 The following are the published list of collaborators associated with ADNI:

4

5 Michael Weiner, MD (UC San Francisco, Principal Investigator, Executive 6 Committee); Paul Aisen, MD (UC San Diego, ADCS PI and Director of Coordinating 7 Center Clinical Core, Executive Committee, Clinical Core Leaders); Ronald 8 Petersen, MD, PhD (Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Executive Committee, Clinical Core 9 Leader); Clifford R. Jack, Jr., MD (Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Executive Committee, 10 MRI Core Leader); William Jagust, MD (UC Berkeley, Executive Committee; PET 11 Core Leader); John Q. Trojanowki, MD, PhD (U Pennsylvania, Executive Committee, 12 Biomarkers Core Leader); Arthur W. Toga, PhD (USC, Executive Committee, 13 Informatics Core Leader); Laurel Beckett, PhD (UC Davis, Executive Committee, 14 Biostatistics Core Leader); Robert C. Green, MD, MPH (Brigham and Women's 15 Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Executive Committee and Chair of Data and 16 Publication Committee); Andrew J. Saykin, PsyD (Indiana University, Executive 17 Committee, Genetics Core Leader); John Morris, MD (Washington University St. 18 Louis, Executive Committee, Neuropathology Core Leader); Leslie M. Shaw 19 (University of Pennsylvania, Executive Committee, Biomarkers Core Leader); Enchi 20 Liu, PhD (Janssen Alzheimer Immunotherapy, ADNI 2 Private Partner Scientific 21 Board Chair); Tom Montine, MD, PhD (University of Washington); Ronald G. 22 Thomas, PhD (UC San Diego); Michael Donohue, PhD (UC San Diego); Sarah 23 Walter, MSc (UC San Diego); Devon Gessert (UC San Diego); Tamie

24 Sather, MS (UC San Diego,); Gus Jiminez, MBS (UC San Diego); Danielle Harvey, 25 PhD (UC Davis;); Michael Donohue, PhD (UC San Diego); Matthew Bernstein, PhD 26 (Mayo Clinic, Rochester); Nick Fox, MD (University of London); Paul Thompson, PhD (USC School of Medicine); Norbert Schuff, PhD (UCSF MRI); Charles DeCArli, 27 28 MD (UC Davis); Bret Borowski, RT (Mayo Clinic); Jeff Gunter, PhD (Mayo Clinic); 29 Matt Senjem, MS (Mayo Clinic); Prashanthi Vemuri, PhD (Mayo Clinic); David Jones, 30 MD (Mayo Clinic); Kejal Kantarci (Mayo Clinic); Chad Ward (Mayo Clinic); Robert A. 31 Koeppe, PhD (University of Michigan, PET Core Leader); Norm Foster, MD 32 (University of Utah); Eric M. Reiman, MD (Banner Alzheimer's Institute); Kewei 33 Chen, PhD (Banner Alzheimer's Institute); Chet Mathis, MD (University of 34 Pittsburgh); Susan Landau, PhD (UC Berkeley); Nigel J. Cairns, PhD, MRCPath

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 (Washington University St. Louis); Erin Householder (Washington University St. 2 Louis); Lisa Taylor Reinwald, BA, HTL (Washington University St. Louis); Virginia 3 Lee, PhD, MBA (UPenn School of Medicine); Magdalena Korecka, PhD (UPenn 4 School of Medicine); Michal Figurski, PhD (UPenn School of Medicine); Karen Crawford (USC); Scott Neu, PhD (USC); Tatiana M. Foroud, PhD (Indiana 5 6 University); Steven Potkin, MD UC (UC Irvine); Li Shen, PhD (Indiana University); 7 Faber Kelley, MS, CCRC (Indiana University); Sungeun Kim, PhD (Indiana 8 University); Kwangsik Nho, PhD (Indiana University); Zaven Kachaturian, PhD 9 (Khachaturian, Radebaugh & Associates, Inc and Alzheimer's Association's Ronald 10 and Nancy Reagan's Research Institute); Richard Frank, MD, PhD (General 11 Electric); Peter J. Snyder, PhD (Brown University); Susan Molchan, PhD (National 12 Institute on Aging/ National Institutes of Health); Jeffrey Kaye, MD (Oregon Health) 13 and Science University); Joseph Quinn, MD (Oregon Health and Science University); 14 Betty Lind, BS (Oregon Health and Science University); Raina Carter, BA (Oregon 15 Health and Science University); Sara Dolen, BS (Oregon Health and Science 16 University); Lon S. Schneider, MD (University of Southern CaliforGroups 17 Acknowledgements Journal Format nia); Sonia Pawluczyk, MD (University of 18 Southern California); Mauricio Beccera, BS University of Southern California); 19 Liberty Teodoro, RN (University of Southern California); Bryan M. Spann, DO, PhD 20 (University of Southern California); James Brewer, MD, PhD (University of California) 21 San Diego); Helen Vanderswag, RN (University of California San Diego); Adam 22 Fleisher, MD (University of California San Diego); Judith L. Heidebrink, MD, MS 23 (University of Michigan); Joanne L. Lord, LPN, BA, CCRC (University of Michigan); 24 Ronald Petersen, MD, PhD (Mayo Clinic, Rochester); Sara S. Mason, RN (Mayo 25 Clinic, Rochester); Colleen S. Albers, RN (Mayo Clinic, Rochester); David Knopman, 26 MD (Mayo Clinic, Rochester); Kris Johnson, RN (Mayo Clinic, Rochester); Rachelle 27 S. Doody, MD, PhD (Baylor College of Medicine); Javier Villanueva Meyer, MD 28 (Baylor College of Medicine); Munir Chowdhury, MBBS, MS (Baylor College of 29 Medicine); Susan Rountree, MD (Baylor College of Medicine); Mimi Dang, MD 30 (Baylor College of Medicine); Yaakov Stern, PhD (Columbia University Medical 31 Center); Lawrence S. Honig, MD, PhD (Columbia University Medical Center); Karen 32 L. Bell, MD (Columbia University Medical Center); Beau Ances, MD (Washington 33 University, St. Louis); John C. Morris, MD (Washington University, St. Louis); Maria 34 Carroll, RN, MSN (Washington University, St. Louis); Sue Leon, RN, MSN

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 (Washington University, St. Louis); Erin Householder, MS, CCRP (Washington 2 University, St. Louis); Mark A. Mintun, MD (Washington University, St. Louis); Stacy 3 Schneider, APRN, BC, GNP (Washington University, St. Louis); Angela Oliver, RN, 4 BSN, MSG; Daniel Marson, JD, PhD (University of Alabama Birmingham); Randall 5 Griffith, PhD, ABPP (University of Alabama Birmingham); David Clark, MD 6 (University of Alabama Birmingham); David Geldmacher, MD (University of Alabama 7 Birmingham); John Brockington, MD (University of Alabama Birmingham); Erik 8 Roberson, MD (University of Alabama Birmingham); Hillel Grossman, MD (Mount 9 Sinai School of Medicine); Effie Mitsis, PhD (Mount Sinai School of Medicine); Leyla 10 deToledoMorrell, PhD (Rush University Medical Center); Raj C. Shah, MD (Rush 11 University Medical Center); Ranjan Duara, MD (Wien Center); Daniel Varon, MD 12 (Wien Center); Maria T. Greig, HP (Wien Center); Peggy Roberts, CNA (Wien 13 Center); Marilyn Albert, PhD (Johns Hopkins University); Chiadi Onyike, MD (Johns 14 Hopkins University); Daniel

15 D'Agostino II, BS (Johns Hopkins University); Stephanie Kielb, BS (Johns Hopkins 16 University); James E. Galvin, MD, MPH (New York University); Dana M. Pogorelec 17 (New York University); Brittany Cerbone (New York University); Christina A. Michel 18 (New York University); Henry Rusinek, PhD (New York University); Mony J de Leon, 19 EdD (New York University); Lidia Glodzik, MD, PhD (New York University); Susan 20 De Santi, PhD (New York University); P. Murali Doraiswamy, MD (Duke University) 21 Medical Center); Jeffrey R. Petrella, MD (Duke University Medical Center); Terence 22 Z. Wong, MD (Duke University Medical Center); Steven E. Arnold, MD (University of 23 Pennsylvania); Jason H. Karlawish, MD (University of Pennsylvania); David Wolk, 24 MD (University of Pennsylvania); Charles D. Smith, MD (University of Kentucky); 25 Greg Jicha, MD (University of Kentucky); Peter Hardy, PhD (University of Kentucky); 26 Partha Sinha, PhD (University of Kentucky); Elizabeth Oates, MD (University of 27 Kentucky); Gary Conrad, MD (University of Kentucky); Oscar L. Lopez, MD 28 (University of Pittsburgh); MaryAnn Oakley, MA (University of Pittsburgh); Donna M. Simpson, CRNP, MPH (University of Pittsburgh); Anton P. Porsteinsson, MD 29 30 (University of Rochester Medical Center); Bonnie S. Goldstein, MS, NP (University of 31 Rochester Medical Center); Kim Martin, RN (University of Rochester Medical 32 Center); Kelly M. Makino, BS (University of Rochester Medical Center); M. Saleem 33 Ismail, MD (University of Rochester Medical Center); Connie Brand, RN (University 34 of Rochester Medical Center); Ruth A. Mulnard, DNSc, RN, FAAN (University of

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 California, Irvine); Gaby Thai, MD (University of California, Irvine); Catherine Mc 2 Adams Ortiz, MSN, RN, A/GNP (University of California, Irvine); Kyle Womack, MD 3 (University of Texas Southwestern Medical School); Dana Mathews, MD, PhD 4 (University of Texas Southwestern Medical School); Mary Quiceno, MD (University 5 of Texas Southwestern Medical School); Ramon Diaz Arrastia, MD, PhD (University 6 of Texas Southwestern Medical School); Richard King, MD (University of Texas 7 Southwestern Medical School); Myron Weiner, MD (University of Texas 8 Southwestern Medical School); Kristen Martin Cook, MA (University of Texas 9 Southwestern Medical School); Michael DeVous, PhD (University of Texas 10 Southwestern Medical School); Allan I. Levey, MD, PhD (Emory University); James J. Lah, MD, PhD (Emory University); Janet S. Cellar, DNP, PMHCNS BC (Emory 11 12 University); Jeffrey M. Burns, MD (University of Kansas, Medical Center); Heather S. 13 Anderson, MD (University of Kansas, Medical Center); Russell H. Swerdlow, MD 14 (University of Kansas, Medical Center); Liana Apostolova, MD (University of 15 California, Los Angeles); Kathleen Tingus, PhD (University of California, Los 16 Angeles); Ellen Woo, PhD (University of California, Los Angeles); Daniel H.S. 17 Silverman, MD, PhD (University of California, Los Angeles); Po H. Lu, PsyD 18 (University of California, Los Angeles); George Bartzokis, MD (University of 19 California, Los Angeles); Neill R Graff Radford, MBBCH, FRCP (London) (Mayo 20 Clinic, JacksonGroups Acknowledgements Journal Format 2 ville); Francine Parfitt, MSH, CCRC (Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville); Tracy Kendall, BA, CCRP (Mayo Clinic, 21 22 Jacksonville); Heather Johnson, MLS, CCRP (Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville); Martin R. 23 Farlow, MD (Indiana University); Ann Marie Hake, MD (Indiana University); Brandy 24 R. Matthews, MD (Indiana University); Scott Herring, RN, CCRC (Indiana University); 25 Cynthia Hunt, BS, CCRP (Indiana University); Christopher H. van Dyck, MD (Yale 26 University School of Medicine); Richard E. Carson, PhD (Yale University School of 27 Medicine); Martha G. MacAvoy, PhD (Yale University School of Medicine); Howard 28 Chertkow, MD (McGill Univ., Montreal Jewish General Hospital); Howard Bergman, 29 MD (McGill Univ., Montreal Jewish General Hospital); Chris Hosein, Med (McGill 30 Univ., Montreal Jewish General Hospital); Sandra Black, MD, FRCPC (Sunnybrook 31 Health Sciences, Ontario); Dr Bojana Stefanovic (Sunnybrook Health Sciences, 32 Ontario); Curtis Caldwell, PhD (Sunnybrook Health Sciences, Ontario); Ging Yuek 33 Robin Hsiung, MD, MHSc, FRCPC (U.B.C. Clinic for AD & Related Disorders); 34 Howard Feldman, MD, FRCPC (U.B.C. Clinic for AD & Related Disorders); Benita

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 Mudge, BS (U.B.C. Clinic for AD & Related Disorders); Michele Assaly, MA Past

2 (U.B.C. Clinic for

3 AD & Related Disorders); Andrew Kertesz, MD (Cognitive Neurology St. Joseph's, 4 Ontario); John Rogers, MD (Cognitive Neurology St. Joseph's, Ontario); Dick Trost, 5 PhD (Cognitive Neurology St. Joseph's, Ontario); Charles Bernick, MD (Cleveland 6 Clinic Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health); Donna Munic, PhD (Cleveland Clinic Lou 7 Ruvo Center for Brain Health); Diana Kerwin, MD (Northwestern University); Marek 8 Marsel Mesulam, MD (Northwestern University): Kristine Lipowski, BA (Northwestern 9 University); Chuang Kuo Wu, MD, PhD (Northwestern University); Nancy Johnson, 10 PhD (Northwestern University); Carl Sadowsky, MD (Premiere Research Inst (Palm Beach Neurology)); Walter Martinez, MD (Premiere Research Inst (Palm Beach 11 12 Neurology)); Teresa Villena, MD (Premiere Research Inst (Palm Beach Neurology)); 13 Raymond Scott Turner, MD, PhD (Georgetown 14 University Medical Center); Kathleen Johnson, NP (Georgetown University Medical 15 Center); Brigid Reynolds, NP (Georgetown University Medical Center); Reisa A. 16 Sperling, MD (Brigham and Women's Hospital); Keith A. Johnson, MD (Brigham and 17 Women's Hospital); Gad Marshall, MD (Brigham and Women's Hospital); Meghan

18 Frey (Brigham and Women's Hospital); Jerome Yesavage, MD (Stanford University);

Joy L. Taylor, PhD (Stanford University); Barton Lane, MD (Stanford University);
Allyson Rosen, PhD (Stanford University); Jared Tinklenberg, MD (Stanford
University); Marwan N. Sabbagh, MD (Banner Sun Health Research Institute);
Christine M. Belden, PsyD (Banner Sun Health Research Institute); Sandra A.
Jacobson, MD (Banner Sun Health Research Institute); Sherye A. Sirrel, MS (Banner
Sun Health Research Institute); Neil Kowall, MD (Boston University); Ronald

Killiany, PhD (Boston University); Andrew E. Budson, MD (Boston University);
Alexander Norbash, MD (Boston University); Patricia

27 Lynn Johnson, BA (Boston University); Thomas O. Obisesan, MD, MPH (Howard 28 University); Saba Wolday, MSc (Howard University); Joanne Allard, PhD (Howard University); Alan Lerner, MD (Case Western Reserve University); Paula Ogrocki, 29 30 PhD (Case Western Reserve University); Leon Hudson, MPH (Case Western 31 Reserve University); Evan Fletcher, PhD (University of California, Davis 32 Sacramento); Owen Carmichael, PhD (University of California, Davis Sacramento); 33 John Olichney, MD (University of California, Davis Sacramento); Charles DeCarli, 34 MD (University of California, Davis Sacramento); Smita Kittur, MD (Neurological

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Care of CNY); Michael Borrie, MB ChB (Parkwood Hospital); T Y Lee, PhD
 (Parkwood Hospital); Dr Rob Bartha, PhD (Parkwood Hospital); Sterling Johnson,
 PhD (University of Wisconsin); Sanjay Asthana, MD (University of Wisconsin);
 Cynthia M. Carlsson,

5 MD (University of Wisconsin); Steven G. Potkin, MD (University of California, Irvine 6 BIC); Adrian Preda, MD (University of California, Irvine BIC); Dana Nguyen, PhD 7 (University of California, Irvine BIC); Pierre Tariot, MD (Banner Alzheimer's Institute); 8 Adam Fleisher, MD (Banner Alzheimer's Institute); Stephanie Reeder, BA (Banner 9 Alzheimer's Institute); Vernice Bates, MD (Dent Neurologic Institute); Horacio 10 Capote, MD (Dent Neurologic Institute); Michelle Rainka, PharmD, CCRP (Dent 11 Neurologic Institute); Douglas W. Scharre, MD (Ohio State University); Maria Kataki, 12 MD, PhD (Ohio State University); Anahita Adeli, MD (Ohio State University); Earl A. 13 Zimmerman, MD (Albany Medical College); Dzintra Celmins, MD (Albany Medical 14 College); Alice D. Brown, FNP (Albany Medical College); Godfrey D. Pearlson, MD 15 (Hartford Hosp, Olin Neuropsychiatry Research Center); Karen Blank, MD (Hartford 16 Hosp, Olin Neuropsychiatry Research Center); Karen Anderson, RN (Hartford Hosp, 17 Olin Neuropsychiatry Research Center); Robert B. Santulli, MD (Dartmouth 18 Hitchcock Medical Center); Tamar J. Kitzmiller (Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical 19 Center); Eben S. Schwartz, PhD (Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center); Kaycee M. 20 Sink, MD, MAS (Wake Forest University Health Sciences); Jeff D. Williamson, MD, 21 MHS (Wake Forest University Health Sciences); Pradeep Garg, PhD (Wake Forest 22 University Health Sciences); Franklin Watkins, MD (Wake Forest University Health 23 Sciences); Brian R. Ott, MD (Rhode Island Hospital); Henry Querfurth, MD (Rhode 24 Island Hospital); Geoffrey Tremont, PhD (Rhode Island Groups Acknowledgements 25 Journal Format 3 Hospital); Stephen Salloway, MD, MS (Butler Hospital); Paul 26 Malloy, PhD (Butler Hospital); Stephen Correia, PhD (Butler Hospital); Howard J. 27 Rosen, MD (UC San Francisco); Bruce L. Miller, MD (UC San Francisco); Jacobo 28 Mintzer, MD, MBA (Medical University South Carolina); Kenneth Spicer, MD, PhD 29 (Medical University South Carolina); David Bachman, MD (Medical University South 30 Carolina); Elizabether Finger, MD (St. Joseph's Health Care); Stephen Pasternak, 31 MD (St. Joseph's Health Care); Irina Rachinsky, MD (St. Joseph's Health Care); 32 John Rogers, MD (St. Joseph's Health Care); Andrew Kertesz, MD (St. Joseph's 33 Health

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 Care); Dick Drost, MD (St. Joseph's Health Care); Nunzio Pomara, MD (Nathan

2 Kline Institute); Raymundo Hernando, MD (Nathan

3 Kline Institute); Antero Sarrael, MD (Nathan Kline Institute); Susan K. Schultz, MD 4 (University of Iowa College of Medicine, Iowa City); Laura L. Boles Ponto, PhD 5 (University of Iowa College of Medicine, Iowa City); Hyungsub Shim, MD (University 6 of Iowa College of Medicine, Iowa City); Karen Elizabeth Smith, RN (University of 7 Iowa College of Medicine, Iowa City); Norman Relkin, MD, PhD (Cornell University); 8 Gloria Chaing, MD (Cornell University); Lisa Raudin, PhD (Cornell University); 9 Amanda Smith, MD (University of South Floriday: USF Health Byrd Alzheimer's 10 Institute); Kristin Fargher, MD (University of South Floriday: USF Health Byrd 11 Alzheimer's Institute); Balebail Ashok Raj, MD (University of South Floriday: USF 12 Health Byrd Alzheimer's Institute)

	L-Study N=326	ADNI N=271
	Care home setting	Community/academic setting
Female	73% (n=240)	42% (n=114)
Male	27% (n=86)	57% (n=157)
Mean Age	86.88 (SD 6.99)	74.22 (SD 7.4)
CDR (Median)	2 (IQR: 2-3)	1 (IQR: 1-1)

L-study	BLRT			
Number of	p-value	BIC	r(EntropyRsqd)	r(loglikelihood)
classes		(adjusted)		
2 classes	0.01	1119.49	0.96	-1711.13
3 classes	0.01	977.01	0.91	-1618.97
4 classes	0.01	928.52	0.92	-1573.81
5 classes	0.01	898.05	0.91	-1537.65
6 classes	0.01	907.52	0.91	-1521.46
ADNI	BLRT			
Number of	p-value	BIC	r(EntropyRsqd)	r(loglikelihood)
classes		(adjusted)		
2 classes	0.01	1064.73	0.97	-1472.78
3 classes	0.01	941.22	0.94	-1390.36
4 classes	0.01	852.10	0.94	-1325.13
5 classes	0.01	845.19	0.92	-1301.01
6 classes	0.15	852.19	0.93	-1283.84

	Delusions (symptom probabilities)			Omnibus test (Wald, p)	Pairwise comparisons (Wald, p)						
	No Symptoms	Combined	Apathy	Depression		Combined vs No Symptoms	Depression vs No Symptoms	Apathy vs No Symptoms	Combined vs Depression	Combined vs Apathy	Depression vs Apathy
CHRN	0.39	0.56	0.23	0.54	16.49; p<0.001	4.43; p=0.04	2.08; p= 0.15	6.02; p=0.01	0.02; p=0.89	13.55; p<0.01	8.87; p<0.01
ADNI	0.14	0.25	0.2	0.04	8.30; p=0.04	2.95; p=0.09	0.73; p=0.39	3.24, p=0.07	0.33; p=0.57	7.27; p=0.01	4.97; p=0.03
	Anxiety (symptom probabilities)				Omnibus test (Wald, p)		Pairwise comparisons (Wald, p)				
	No Symptoms	Combined	Apathy	Depression		Combined vs No Symptoms	Depression vs No Symptoms	Apathy vs No Symptoms	Combined vs Depression	Combined vs Apathy	Depression vs Apathy
CHRN	0.22	0.70	0.41	0.27	33.81; p<0.01	32.40; p<0.01	3.95; p=0.05	0.86; p=0.035	5.80; p=0.02	20.00; p<0.01	1.72;p=0.19
ADNI	0.16	0.59	0.30	0.29	25.74; p<0.01	25.40; p<0.01	2.83; p=0.09	3.48; p=0.06	6.67; p=0.01	9.16; p<0.01	0.01; p=0.92
Irritability (symptom probabilities)			Omnibus test (Wald, p)	Pairwise comparisons (Wald, p)							
	No Symptoms	Combined	Apathy	Depression		Combined vs No Symptoms	Depression vs No Symptoms	Apathy vs No Symptoms	Combined vs Depression	Combined vs Apathy	Depression vs Apathy
CHRN	0.38	0.69	0.68	0.47	16.92; p<0.01	12.97; p<0.01	6.96; p=0.01	1.43; p=0.23	0.00; p=0.96	5.84; p=0.02	3.61; p=0.06
ADNI	0.25	0.51	0.45	0.29	13.27; p<0.01	10.92; p<0.01	4.92; p=0.03	0.30; p=0.58	0.43; p=0.51	6.01; p=0.01	2.68; p=0.10



