

Phenotypic effect of *GBA1* variants in individuals with and without Parkinson disease: the RAPSODI study

Toffoli M^{1, 2}, Chohan H³, Mullin S^{1, 4}, Jesuthasan A⁵, Yalkic S^{1, 2}, Koletsi S^{1, 2}, Menozzi E^{1, 2}, Rahall S¹, Limbachiya N¹, Loefflad N^{1, 2}, Higgins A¹, Bestwick J³, Lucas-Del-Pozo S^{1, 2}, Fierli F^{1, 2}, Farbos A⁶, Mezabrovski R^{1, 2}, Lee-Yin C^{1, 2}, Schrag A¹, Moreno-Martinez D⁷, Hughes D⁷, Noyce A³, Colclough K⁸, Jeffries AR⁶, Proukakis C^{1, 2}, Schapira AHV^{1, 2}

¹Department of Clinical and Movement Neurosciences, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London, UK.

²Aligning Science Across Parkinson's (ASAP) Collaborative Research Network, Chevy Chase, Maryland, USA.

³Preventive Neurology Unit, Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London.

⁴Faculty of Health, University of Plymouth, Plymouth PL4 8AA, UK.

⁵Charing Cross Hospital, Fulham Palace Road, London, W6 8RF.

⁶Biosciences, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

⁷Lysosomal Storage Disorders Unit, Royal Free Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and University College London, London, UK.

⁸Exeter Genomics Laboratory, Royal Devon University Healthcare NHS Trust, Exeter, United Kingdom.

Corresponding author:

Professor Anthony H V Schapira, MD, DSc, FRCP, FMedSci
Department of Clinical and Movement Neurosciences, University College London Institute of Neurology, London, UK
Rowland Hill St., London NW3 2PF, UK
Email: a.schapira@ucl.ac.uk

Word count (abstract): 250

Word count (main text): 2470

Running title: *GBA1* variants and Parkinson disease: RAPSODI study

Key words: Parkinson, *GBA1*, *GBA*, prodromal, genetics

Financial disclosure: This research was funded in part by Aligning Science Across Parkinson's [ASAP-000420] through the Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research (MJFF). For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright license to all Author Accepted Manuscripts arising from this submission.

The work was supported by the EU Joint Programme–Neurodegenerative Disease Research (JPND) project (GBA-PaCTS, 01ED2005B) and MR/T046007/1. The PREDICT-PD study was funded by Parkinson's UK.

ABSTRACT

Background: Variants in the *GBA1* gene cause the lysosomal storage disorder Gaucher disease (GD). They are also risk factors for Parkinson disease (PD), and modify the expression of the PD phenotype.

The penetrance of *GBA1* variants in PD is incomplete, and the ability to determine who amongst *GBA1* variant carriers are at higher risk of developing PD, would represent an advantage for prognostic and trial design purposes.

Objectives: To compare the motor and non-motor phenotype of *GBA1* carriers and non-carriers.

Methods: We present the cross-sectional results of the baseline assessment from the RAPSODI study, an online assessment tool for PD patients and *GBA1* variant carriers. The assessment includes clinically validated questionnaires, a tap-test, the University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test and cognitive tests. Additional, homogeneous data from the PREDICT-PD cohort were included.

Results: A total of 379 participants completed all parts of the RAPSODI assessment (89 *GBA1*-negative controls, 169 *GBA1*-negative PD, 47 *GBA1*-positive PD, 47 non-affected *GBA1* carriers, 27 GD). Eighty-six participants were recruited through PREDICT-PD (43 non-affected *GBA1* carriers and 43 *GBA1*-negative controls). *GBA1*-positive PD showed worse performance in visual cognitive tasks and olfaction compared to *GBA1*-negative PD patients. No differences were detected between non-affected *GBA1* carriers and *GBA1*-negative controls. No phenotypic differences were observed between any of the non-PD groups.

Conclusions: Our results support previous evidence that *GBA1*-positive PD has a specific phenotype with more severe non-motor symptoms. However, we did not reproduce previous findings of more frequent prodromal PD signs in non-affected *GBA1* carriers.

INTRODUCTION

The *GBA1* gene encodes the lysosomal enzyme glucocerebrosidase. Variants in *GBA1* are a risk factor for Parkinson disease (PD)(1), with a penetrance that is variable and ranges according to the severity of the variant(2).

The clinical phenotype of PD seems to be significantly worse in patients that carry *GBA1* variants compared to non-carriers, although how domains differ and to what extent are matters of debate(3–5). *GBA1* variant carriers have an earlier age of PD onset, with poorer overall cognitive function(3), more frequent non-motor symptoms, visual hallucinations and motor complications(6,7). Some data also suggests a higher prevalence of pre-clinical symptoms in healthy *GBA1* variants carriers compared to non-carriers(8–11), although this has not been replicated in independent cohorts(12).

Understanding the role of *GBA1* variants in determining phenotypic characteristics is important for prognostic purposes, and to guide the design of clinical trials.

Here, we report baseline data from the homogenous cohorts RAPSODI (rapsodistudy.com)(13) and PREDICT-PD (predictpd.com), online cohorts for remote assessment of motor and non-motor signs of parkinsonism. We compare characteristics of PD patients with and without *GBA1* variants, healthy *GBA1* carriers, Gaucher disease (GD) patients and controls. We hope to provide further insight into the phenotype-genotype correlation of *GBA1* variants in the pathogenesis of PD.

METHODOLOGY

Recruitment of participants

Participants were recruited through RAPSODI (rapsodistudy.com)(13). The study commenced active recruitment in January 2018 and participants are asked to repeat the assessment every year for up to 25 years. In this paper, we report data from the baseline (year 1) assessment. Participants were allowed to join the study if they were between the age of 18 and 90 and if they: had a diagnosis of GD, a diagnosis of PD, if they knew they carried a *GBA1* variant or if they were relatives of a PD patient, GD patient or *GBA1* variant carrier. Exclusion criteria were the presence of dementia or any other conditions known to cause parkinsonism. Upon enrollment, all participants were required to give informed consent to be included in the study. The work was approved by the London – Queen Square Research Ethics Committee (REC reference: 15/LO/1155).

Assessment

A detailed description of the study design can be found in a previous publication(13). Participants were asked to complete the the REM Sleep Behavior Disorder Questionnaire (RBDsq)(14), the Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale part 2 (MDS-UPDRS2)(15) and the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS)(16). The RBDsq has been validated in the general population with a cut-off of 5. However, in this study a cut-off of 6 was used, as it is considered more appropriate for people with PD(17). Established cut-offs for the HADS scale (0-7 Normal, 8-10 Borderline and 11-21 Abnormal) were used for the sub-scores of depression and anxiety(16).

Additionally, participants were asked 3 questions about constipation: “Does opening your bowels require a lot of effort?”, “Do you suffer from hard stools?”, “Do you ever use laxatives?”. These had multiple choice answers “Yes”, “Sometimes” and “No”. Cognitive Tests were delivered through the ‘CogTrack™’ platform(18), investigating different aspects of cognition, including pattern separation ability, simple reaction time, choice reaction time, digit vigilance, spatial working memory and numeric working memory. A summary of the tests and outcomes used can be found in table 1. The BRadykinesia Akinesia INcoordination (BRAIN) test(19,20) was used to evaluate hand dexterity and bradykinesia, in which participants were asked to press the “S” and “;” keys on their keyboard in succession as fast as they could. Each hand was assessed separately for 30 seconds and all participants were given a preceding 5 second practice trial before data was collected. The kinesia score (KS30), corresponding to the number of taps in 30 seconds, as well as the akinesia time (AT30), which was the mean dwell time on each key in milliseconds (msec) were calculated. Olfactory function was measured using the University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test (UPSIT)(21). The cut-offs provided by the UPSIT manual identified different degrees of deficit: anosmia (0-18), severe microsmia (19-25), moderate microsmia (26-29 for males, 26-30 for females), mild microsmia (30-33 for males, 31-34 for females), and normosmia (34-40 for males, 35-40 for females).

Collection of saliva samples and sequencing

Saliva samples were collected with the DNA OG-500 kit from DNA genotek, posted to participants upon completion of the online part of the assessment. Sequencing of the *GBA1* gene was carried out at the University of Exeter Sequencing Facility with a long read, nanopore technology method previously described(22). The *LRKK2* G2019S variant was genotyped with KBiosciences Competitive AlleleSpecific PCR SNP genotyping system by an external laboratory (LGC Genomics, Hoddesdon, Herts).

PREDICT-PD

To seek further validation, additional non-affected *GBA1* carriers and age and sex matched *GBA1*-negative controls were included from the PREDICT-PD study. PREDICT-PD is a web-based cohort study to identify individuals at higher risk of PD (ref Noyce et al JNNP 2014). *GBA1* variants were identified through Sanger sequencing of exons 8-11, rather than full gene sequencing (Noyce et al, Movement Disorders 2017). Questions about constipation, RBDsq, HADS, UPSIT and tap-test were collected similarly to RAPSODI. For these, results show the combined data from the two cohorts. CogTrack testing was not available for PREDICT-PD and are thus only reported for the RAPSODI cohort.

Statistical analysis

R version 4.2.2 was used for statistical analyses. All outcome measures were compared between the 5 groups. Additional sub-analysis were carried out comparing carriers of risk, mild and severe *GBA1* variants(23). ANOVA was used to assess differences in age, disease duration, age at diagnosis, years of education, with Tukey multiple comparison test for *post hoc* analysis. Ordinal logistic regression was used to analyse questions about constipation, MDS-UPDRS2 (after dividing the values in equal deciles), anxiety and depression subscores of HADS, and UPSIT. Logistic regression was used to analyse outcomes of the RBDsq. Linear regression

was used to assess differences in KS30, AT30, SRT, CRT, VIGRT, SPMRT, NWMRT. The cognitive scores for accuracy (DPICOACC, DPICNACC, CRTACC, VIGACC, SPMOACC, SPMNACC, NWMOACC, NWMNACC) represent proportions of correct answers, so they were analysed with quasibinomial regression. Age and sex were used as covariate in all analysis, and education was used as covariate in the cognitive tests. Outliers, defined as observations more than 3 standard deviations from the mean, were removed from the tap test and cognitive test scores.

RESULTS

Anonymised participant-level data are reported as supplementary material.

Size, demographics and genotype

Size and demographics of the cohort of participants that completed the whole assessment are reported in table 2. One participant had both GD and PD and was excluded from the analysis. Two PD participants were found to carry the *LRRK2* p.G2019S variant and were also excluded from the analysis. Not all participants completed all steps of the assessment, so numbers vary for each test.

Age at recruitment for *GBA1*-negative PD patients was significantly higher than for *GBA1*-negative controls, GD patients and non-affected *GBA1* carriers (all p-values <0.01). No other significant differences in age at recruitment were observed. Sex was significantly different between the groups (p-value <0.001).

There were no significant differences in disease duration or age at diagnosis among the PD groups. Years of education were similar between the groups.

Genotypes of *GBA1* positive participants are reported in table 3 and in more details in supplementary table 1.

Questionnaires and UPSIT

Questionnaire results are reported in Supplementary Table 2 and in Figure 1.

The two PD groups performed worse than all the non-PD groups in the questions about constipation (all p-values < 0.05), in the MDS-UPDRS2 (all p-values < 0.001), anxiety subscores of HADS (all p-values < 0.05), RBDsq (all p-values < 0.05), UPSIT (all p-values < 0.001).

The depression sub-score of HADS showed worse outcomes for the two PD groups compared to non-affected *GBA1* carriers and *GBA1*-negative controls (p-values all < 0.05), but no differences between the PD groups and GD patients.

GBA1-positive PD patients scored worse than *GBA1*-negative PD patients in UPSIT (p-value 0.015, OR 0.47, CI 0.25-0.86).

No differences were observed between any of the non-PD groups for any of the questionnaires or UPSIT.

No differences were observed between risk, mild and severe variant carriers among *GBA1*-positive PD and non-affected *GBA1*-carriers.

Results did not change when analysing the RAPSODI cohort separately.

Tap test

Tap test results are reported in supplementary table 3 and in Figure 2.

KS30 for both dominant and non-dominant hands were worse in the two PD groups compared to all the non-PD groups (all p-values < 0.001).

AT30 scores for dominant and non-dominant hands were lower in the two PD groups compared to non-affected *GBA1* carriers and *GBA1*-negative controls (all p-values < 0.01) but were not significantly different from those of GD patients.

KS30 scores were marginally worse in *GBA1*-positive PD patients compared to *GBA1*-negative PD patients for the dominant hand ($\beta = -3.34$, p-value = 0.12) and non-dominant hand ($\beta = -3.79$, p-value = 0.05).

AT30 score for the non-dominant hand was marginally worse in *GBA1*-positive PD patients compared to *GBA1*-negative PD patients ($\beta = 21.8$, p-value = 0.09).

No differences were observed between any of the non-PD groups for KS30 or AT30.

No differences were observed between risk, mild and severe variant carriers among *GBA1*-positive PD and non-affected *GBA1*-carriers.

Results did not change when analysing the RAPSODI cohort separately.

Cognitive tests

Results of the cognitive tests are reported in supplementary table 4, Figure 3 and supplementary figure 1.

The scores of the pictures recognition test (DPICOACC and DPICNACC) and reaction time (SRT, CRT, SPMRT, NWMRT, VIGRT) were worse in the two PD groups compared to the non-PD groups (all p-values < 0.05).

When comparing *GBA1*-positive and *GBA1*-negative PD patients only, *GBA1*-positive PD patients showed a significantly worse performance for DPICOACC, DPICNACC and CRTM (p-values 0.015, 0.039 and 0.0246, respectively – shown in figure 3).

There were no statistically significant differences between the two PD groups for CRTACC, VIGACC, SPMOACC, SPMNACC, NWMOACC, NWMNACC.

Moreover, no significant differences were observed between the non-PD groups for any of the tests.

No differences were observed between risk, mild and severe variant carriers among *GBA1*-positive PD and non-affected *GBA1*-carriers.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we analysed baseline data from the RAPSODI portal, comparing characteristics between 5 groups: *GBA1*-positive PD patients, *GBA1*-negative PD patients, non-affected *GBA1* carriers, *GBA1*-negative controls, GD patients. We sought further validation of the data by including participants to the PREDICT-PD cohort.

For most of the captured outcomes, both groups of PD patients performed significantly worse compared to people without PD, suggesting that the assessment tools are appropriate for capturing differences between these two populations. Analysis of longitudinal data will clarify whether the assessment is also able to detect subtle changes in currently unaffected individuals that might then develop PD.

We showed a difference in the PD phenotype of *GBA1* carriers compared to non-carriers in UPSIT, tap test and cognitive tests for pattern recognition and reaction time. For some of the other scores, even when not statistically significant, the data suggested a trend toward a worse performance of *GBA1*-positive PD patients compared to *GBA1*-negative PD patients (constipation, anxiety and depression, RBD, working memory).

A previous study similarly showed a worse cognitive profile in 26 *GBA1*-positive PD compared to 39 *GBA1*-negative PD, but no differences in UPSIT(3), and another study showed a more pronounced progression of cognitive dysfunction in 59 *GBA1*-positive PD compared to 684 *GBA1*-negative PD (24). On the other hand, a recent study showed no differences in the cognitive profile in PD patients with or without *GBA1* variants and duration of disease <3.5 years (193 *GBA1*-PD vs 1700 *GBA1*-negative PD)(5). Recent analysis of the large Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI) cohort showed no difference in olfaction between *GBA1* positive and *GBA1* negative PD patients.

Our findings support the notion that cognition is more affected in *GBA1*-positive PD patients and suggest that olfaction is also worse in *GBA1*-positive PD patients, calling for additional confirmation in independent cohorts.

Of interest is the difference between the two PD groups in the pattern recognition test, which involves visual memory and visuospatial skills, supporting previous evidence that visual functions are more affected in *GBA1*-positive PD(3,25,26).

We did not observe a significantly different age at onset of PD or a different prevalence of males and females, as has been reported in other studies(5).

Moreover, we did not detect a phenotypical effect of *GBA1* variants severity when stratifying them as risk, mild and severe(23). Given the small sample size, the analysis was likely underpowered for this type of analysis.

It remains uncertain as to whether non-affected *GBA1* variant carriers show a higher prevalence of prodromal PD features than the general population.

A previous cohort study from our group showed worse olfaction, cognition and motor signs of PD at baseline, and a steeper progression, in *GBA1* variant carriers compared to non-carrier controls. This cohort had a smaller sample size, and most of the differences between the groups were already present at baseline. A recent study showed no significant deterioration of UPSIT scores in 117 unaffected *GBA1* variants carriers compared to controls(12).

The cross-sectional analysis presented in our paper did not highlight any significant differences between heterozygous and biallelic *GBA1* variant carriers and *GBA1*-negative controls. The longitudinal assessment will clarify whether the two groups show a different rate of progression of prodromal PD symptoms or conversion to PD. Whether this hypothetical difference in prodromal symptoms simply reflects the *GBA1* genotype status or truly represents an early manifestation of PD, will also remain an open question that longitudinal studies will address.

Our studies use an online approach to assess participants. This enables us to reach a larger audience and facilitates participation.

However, this process has limitations. First, there might be a selection bias toward more computer literate individuals, as participants that do not own a computer, or that do not know how to use one, are automatically excluded from the trial. Moreover, most of the assessment is unsupervised, with an intrinsic risk of introducing unreliable observations (participants might ask for help to complete some tasks, there might be connectivity issues hindering the assessment, some instructions on how to carry out the tests might be misunderstood). We addressed these issues by using the median response times in the cognitive tests, a parameter that is less affected by extreme outliers.

Another potential limitation of this study is the selection of *GBA1*-negative controls among relatives (especially partners and spouses) of *GBA1* carriers and PD and GD patients. This has the advantage of including controls that are exposed to similar environmental factors, but the disadvantage of creating a group that is inherently mismatched for sex. In conclusion, we were able to show a different phenotype in *GBA1* positive PD patients compared to *GBA1* negative PD patients, with the former having worse olfaction and cognitive performance (visual function and reaction time). We did not show any meaningful differences between *GBA1*-negative controls and non-affected *GBA1* carriers. The analysis of the longitudinal data will provide additional insight into differences in progression between these groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank AH software for their support in designing and maintaining the RAPSODI online portal.

We would like to thank Professor Keith Andrew Wesnes for his support with collecting and interpreting the CogTrack data.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Participant level data are reported as supplementary material in the file named “participant-level data”.

All other data produced in the present study are available upon reasonable request to the authors.

AUTHORS ROLES

Toffoli M Study conception, bioinformatic & Statistical Analysis, Writing of the first draft

Chohan H Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Mullin S Study conception, Manuscript Review

Jesuthasan A Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Yalkic S Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Koletsis S Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Menozi E Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Rahall S Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Limbachiya N Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Loefflad N Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Higgins A Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Bestwick J Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Lucas-Del-Pozo S Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Fierli F Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Farbos A Genetic analysis

Mezabrowschi R Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Lee-Yin C Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Schrag A Study conception, Manuscript Review

Moreno-Martinez D Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Hughes D Study conception, Data Collection, Manuscript Review

Noyce A Study conception, data collection, Manuscript Review

Colclough K Genetic analysis, Manuscript Review

Jeffries AR Genetic analysis, Manuscript Review
Proukakis C Study conception, Manuscript Review
Schapira AHV Study conception and supervision, Manuscript Review

DISCLOSURES

Toffoli M Employee of NHS and UCL
Chohan H Employee of UCL
Mullin S Employee of NHS
Jesuthasan A Nothing to disclose
Yalkic S Employee of UCL
Koletsi S Employee of UCL
Menozzi E was supported by a Royal Free Charity Fellowship
Rahall S Nothing to disclose
Limbachiya N Nothing to disclose
Loefflad N Employee of UCL
Higgins A Nothing to disclose
Bestwick J Nothing to disclose
Lucas-Del-Pozo S was supported by a UCL fellowship.
Fierli F Employee of UCL
Farbos A Employee of University of Exeter
Mezabrowschi R Employee of UCL
Lee-Yin C Nothing to disclose
Schrag A Nothing to disclose
Moreno-Martinez D received travel grants from Sanofi, Takeda and Amicus.
Hughes D received honoraria for speaking and consulting and travel arrangements from Sanofi and Takeda
Noyce A grants from Parkinson's UK, Barts Charity, Cure Parkinson's, National Institute for Health and Care Research, Innovate UK, Virginia Keiley benefaction, Solvemed, the Medical College of Saint Bartholomew's Hospital Trust, Alchemab, Aligning Science Across Parkinson's Global Parkinson's Genetics Program (ASAP-GP2) and the Michael J Fox Foundation. Prof Noyce reports consultancy and personal fees from AstraZeneca, AbbVie, Profile, Roche, Biogen, UCB, Bial, Charco Neurotech, uMedeor, Alchemab, Sosei Heptares and Britannia, outside the submitted work. Prof Noyce is an Associate Editor for the Journal of Parkinson's Disease
Colclough K Employee of NHS
Jeffries AR Employee of University of Exeter
Proukakis C Employee of NHS and UCL.
Schapira AHV Employee of NHS and UCL. Medical Research Council, Michael J. Fox Foundation (MJFF), Aligning Science Across Parkinson's, and Cure Parkinson's (research support); AvroBio, Auxilius, Coave, Destin, Enterin, Escape Bio, Genilac, and Sanofi (consulting fees); and Prada Foundation (speaking fees).

ETHICAL COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

All participants gave informed consent to be included in the study. The work was approved by the London – Queen Square Research Ethics Committee (REC reference: 15/LO/1155). We confirm that we have read the Journal’s position on issues involved in ethical publication and affirm that this work is consistent with those guidelines. Ethical approval for the PREDICT-PD study was granted by Central London Research Ethics Committee 3 (reference number 10/H0716/85).

REFERENCES

1. Sidransky E, Nalls MAA, Aasly JOO, Aharon-Peretz J, Annesi G, Barbosa ERR, et al. Multicenter analysis of glucocerebrosidase mutations in Parkinson’s disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361(17):1651–61.
2. Gan-Or Z, Amshalom I, Kilarski LL, Bar-Shira A, Gana-Weisz M, Mirelman A, et al. Differential effects of severe vs mild GBA mutations on Parkinson disease. *Neurology*. 2015 Mar 3;84(9):880–7.
3. Alcalay RN, Caccappolo E, Mejia-Santana H, Tang MX, Rosado L, Orbe Reilly M, et al. Cognitive performance of GBA mutation carriers with early-onset PD: the CORE-PD study. *Neurology*. 2012 May 1;78(18):1434–40.
4. Simuni T, Uribe L, Cho HR, Caspell-Garcia C, Coffey CS, Siderowf A, et al. Clinical and dopamine transporter imaging characteristics of non-manifest LRRK2 and GBA mutation carriers in the Parkinson’s Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI): a cross-sectional study. *Lancet Neurol*. 2020 Jan 1;19(1):71–80.
5. Malek N, Weil RS, Bresner C, Lawton MA, Grosset KA, Tan M, et al. Features of GBA-associated Parkinson’s disease at presentation in the UK Tracking Parkinson’s study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2018 Jul 1;89(7):702–9.
6. Cilia R, Tunesi S, Marotta G, Cereda E, Siri C, Tesi S, et al. Survival and dementia in GBA-associated Parkinson’s disease: The mutation matters. *Ann Neurol*. 2016 Nov 1;80(5):662–73.
7. Jesús S, Huertas I, Bernal-Bernal I, Bonilla-Toribio M, Cáceres-Redondo MT, Vargas-González L, et al. GBA Variants Influence Motor and Non-Motor Features of Parkinson’s Disease. Toft M, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2016 Dec 28;11(12):e0167749.
8. McNeill A, Duran R, Proukakis C, Bras J, Hughes D, Mehta A, et al. Hyposmia and cognitive impairment in Gaucher disease patients and carriers. *Mov Disord*. 2012 Apr;27(4):526–32.
9. Beavan M, McNeill A, Proukakis C, Hughes DA, Mehta A, Schapira AHV. Evolution of prodromal clinical markers of Parkinson disease in a glucocerebrosidase mutation positive cohort. *JAMA Neurol*. 2015 Feb 1;72(2):201–8.

10. Mullin S, Beavan M, Bestwick J, McNeill A, Proukakis C, Cox T, et al. Evolution and clustering of prodromal parkinsonian features in GBA1 carriers. *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc*. 2019 Sep;34(9):1365–73.
11. Avenali M, Toffoli M, Mullin S, McNeil A, Hughes DA, Mehta A, et al. Evolution of prodromal parkinsonian features in a cohort of GBA mutation-positive individuals: a 6-year longitudinal study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2019 Oct;90(10):1091–7.
12. Lopez GJ, Lichtenberg J, Tayebi N, Ryan E, Lecker AL, Sidransky E. Longitudinal evaluation of olfactory function in individuals with Gaucher disease and GBA1 mutation carriers with and without Parkinson’s disease. *Front Neurol*. 2022;13:1039214.
13. Higgins AL, Toffoli M, Mullin S, Lee CY, Koletsi S, Avenali M, et al. The remote assessment of parkinsonism supporting the ongoing development of interventions in Gaucher disease. *Neurodegener Dis Manag*. 2021 Dec 1;11(6):451–8.
14. Stiasny-Kolster K, Mayer G, Schäfer S, Möller JC, Heinzl-Gutenbrunner M, Oertel WH. The REM sleep behavior disorder screening questionnaire-A new diagnostic instrument. *Mov Disord*. 2007 Sep 25;22(16):2386–93.
15. Martinez-Martin P, Rodriguez-Blazquez C, Alvarez-Sanchez M, Arakaki T, Bergareche-Yarza A, Chade A, et al. Expanded and independent validation of the Movement Disorder Society–Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS). *J Neurol*. 2013 Jan 5;260(1):228–36.
16. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 1983 Jun;67(6):361–70.
17. Nomura T, Inoue Y, Kagimura T, Uemura Y, Nakashima K. Utility of the REM sleep behavior disorder screening questionnaire (RBDSQ) in Parkinson’s disease patients. *Sleep Med*. 2011;12(7):711–3.
18. Wesnes KA, Brooker H, Ballard C, McCambridge L, Stenton R, Corbett A. Utility, reliability, sensitivity and validity of an online test system designed to monitor changes in cognitive function in clinical trials. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2017 Dec 1;32(12):e83–92.
19. Noyce AJ, Nagy A, Acharya S, Hadavi S, Bestwick JP, Fearnley J, et al. Bradykinesia-Akinesia Incoordination Test: Validating an Online Keyboard Test of Upper Limb Function. Vrana KE, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2014 Apr 29;9(4):e96260.
20. Hasan H, Burrows M, Athauda DS, Hellman B, James B, Warner T, et al. The BRadykinesia Akinesia INcoordination (BRAIN) Tap Test: Capturing the Sequence Effect. *Mov Disord Clin Pract*. 2019 Jul 25;6(6):462–9.
21. Doty RL. Office procedures for quantitative assessment of olfactory function. *Am J Rhinol*. 2007 Jul 1;21(4):460–73.
22. Toffoli M, Chen X, Sedlazeck FJ, Lee CY, Mullin S, Higgins A, et al. Comprehensive analysis of GBA using a novel algorithm for Illumina whole-genome sequence data or

targeted Nanopore sequencing [Internet]. 2021 Nov [cited 2021 Nov 15] p. 2021.11.12.21266253. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.11.12.21266253v1>

23. Parlar SC, Grenn FP, Kim JJ, Baluwendraat C, Gan-Or Z. Classification of GBA1 Variants in Parkinson's Disease: The GBA1-PD Browser. *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc*. 2023 Mar;38(3):489–95.
24. Davis MY, Johnson CO, Leverenz JB, Weintraub D, Trojanowski JQ, Chen-Plotkin A, et al. Association of GBA Mutations and the E326K Polymorphism With Motor and Cognitive Progression in Parkinson Disease. *JAMA Neurol*. 2016 Oct 1;73(10):1217–24.
25. Weil RS, Schrag AE, Warren JD, Crutch SJ, Lees AJ, Morris HR. Visual dysfunction in Parkinson's disease. *Brain*. 2016 Nov 1;139(11):2827–43.
26. Mata IF, Leverenz JB, Weintraub D, Trojanowski JQ, Chen-Plotkin A, Van Deerlin VM, et al. GBA Variants are associated with a distinct pattern of cognitive deficits in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2016 Jan 1;31(1):95–102.

Figure 1 – Clinical questionnaires and UPSIT

For constipation, HADS, RBDsq and UPSIT scores, data are reported as percentage of participants per group.

MDS-UPDRS 2 scores are reported as mean (central bar), 25th and 75th percentiles (hinges) and the smallest value at most 1.5 * interquartile range of the hinge (whiskers).

MDS-UPRS: Movement Disorder Society – Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale. HADS: Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. RBDsq: REM Sleep Behaviour Disorder screening questionnaire. UPSIT: University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test.

Figure 2 – Tap-test data

KS30 is reported as number of taps in 30 seconds, AT30 shows the mean dwell time on each key in milliseconds. Data are reported separately for dominant and non-dominant hands.

Data are reported as mean (central bar), 25th and 75th percentiles (hinges) and the smallest value at most 1.5 * interquartile range of the hinge (whiskers).

KS30: Kinesia Score 30 Seconds, AT30: Akinesia Time 30 seconds.

Figure 3 – Pattern separation test, differences between *GBA1*-positive and *GBA1*-negative PD

Data are reported as mean (central bar), 25th and 75th percentiles (hinges) and the smallest value at most 1.5 * interquartile range of the hinge (whiskers).

DPICOACC: Percentage of correct answers recognising original pictures, DPICNACC: Percentage of correct answers recognising new pictures.

Table 1 – Cognitive Tests

Test	Description of test	Outcome measure	Description of outcome
Pattern separation test	Participants are shown 20 pictures. After 10 minutes, they are re-presented with the images alongside 20 similarly looking images, to determine if they could detect the original ones.	DPICOACC	Percentage of correct answers recognising original pictures
		DPICNACC	Percentage of correct answers recognising new pictures
Simple reaction time	measures the speed of participants to elicit a simple motor response to an expected stimulus, which occurred repeatedly but at unpredictable intervals.	SRT	Median reaction time (ms)
Choice reaction time	Participants are asked to monitor a screen for one of two possible stimuli, which occurred at unpredictable intervals. They must press a key dependent on which of the two stimuli was shown.	CRT	Median reaction time (ms)
		CRTACC	Percentage of correct answer
Digit vigilance	Participants monitor a series of digits presented individually and rapidly in the centre of the screen and press the right arrow when the digit matches the target digit displayed constantly on the right of the screen.	VIGRT	Median reaction time (ms)
		VIGACC	percentage of targets detected
Spatial working memory	Participants are shown three rows of 3 light bulbs, of which 4 of the bulbs were lit. They are then presented with the 3 rows of bulbs, each time with only one of them lit. They must respond as to whether the lit bulb is one of the original 4 that were lit up.	SPMRT	Median reaction time (ms)
		SPMOACC	Percentage of correct 'yes' answers
		SPMNACC	Percentage of correct 'no' answers
Numeric working memory	Participants are shown a series of 5 different digits, one digit at a time, and then a series of single digits to which they must answer as quickly as possible as to whether the digit was in the original series.	NWMRT	Median reaction time (ms)
		NWMOACC	Percentage of correct 'yes' answers
		NWMNACC	Percentage of correct 'no' answers

Table 2 – Demographics of participants that completed the every part of the assessment

Study	status	N	Age (mean \pm SD)	PD duration in years (mean \pm SD)	Age at onset of PD (mean \pm SD)	Males (percentage)	Females (percentage)	Years of education (mean \pm SD)
<i>RAPSODI</i>	<i>GBA1</i> -negative controls	89	55.9 \pm 13.6	NA	NA	24 (27.0%)	65 (73.0%)	14.9 \pm 13.6
	<i>GBA1</i> -negative PD patients	169	64.3 \pm 8.7	3.1 \pm 8.7	61.4 \pm 8.7	89 (52.7%)	80 (47.3%)	14.5 \pm 8.7
	<i>GBA1</i> -positive PD patients	47	60.1 \pm 9.8	4.5 \pm 9.8	58.0 \pm 9.8	30 (63.8%)	17 (36.2%)	14.4 \pm 9.8
	GD Patients	27	54.4 \pm 15.2	NA	NA	16 (59.2%)	11 (40.7%)	13.8 \pm 15.2
	Non-affected <i>GBA1</i> carriers	47	51.9 \pm 15.5	NA	NA	18 (38.3%)	29 (61.7%)	14.6 \pm 15.5
PREDICT-PD	<i>GBA1</i> -negative controls	43	67.5 \pm 5.0	NA	NA	20 (46.5%)	23 (53.5%)	NA
	Non-affected <i>GBA1</i> carriers	43	67.5 \pm 5.0	NA	NA	20 (46.5%)	23 (53.5%)	NA
<i>Unified cohorts</i>	<i>GBA1</i> -negative controls	132	59.7 \pm 12.7	NA	NA	44 (33.3%)	88 (66.7%)	NA
	<i>GBA1</i> -negative PD patients	169	64.3 \pm 8.7	3.1 \pm 8.7	61.4 \pm 8.7	89 (52.7%)	80 (47.3%)	NA
	<i>GBA1</i> -positive PD patients	47	60.1 \pm 9.8	4.5 \pm 9.8	58.0 \pm 9.8	30 (63.8%)	17 (36.2%)	NA
	GD Patients	27	54.4 \pm 15.2	NA	NA	16 (59.2%)	11 (40.7%)	NA
	Non-affected <i>GBA1</i> carriers	90	59.4 \pm 14.0	NA	NA	38 (42.2%)	52 (57.8%)	NA


Table 3 - Genotype of *GBA1* variants carriers

Study		N409S	L483P	E365K	T408M	Others	Mild	Severe	Risk variants	Unknown
RAPSODI	Non-affected <i>GBA1</i> carriers	16	6	7	2	16	17	16	9	5
	<i>GBA1</i> -positive PD patients	5	3	20	7	12	6	10	27	4
PREDICT-PD	Non-affected <i>GBA1</i> carriers	8	0	21 ^a	12 ^b	2	8	2	33	0
	<i>GBA1</i> -positive PD patients	24	6	28	14	18	25	18	42	5
Unified cohorts	Non-affected <i>GBA1</i> carriers	5	3	20	7	12	6	10	27	4
	<i>GBA1</i> -positive PD patients									


^a one individual is a homozygous carrier for E365K

^b one individual is a homozygous carrier for T408M


Does opening your bowels require a lot of effort?




Do you suffer from hard stools?




Do you ever use laxatives?




MDS-UPDRS Part 2




HADS - Depression




HADS - Anxiety








RBDsq



UPSIT



KS30 – Dominant hand**KS30 – Non-dominant hand****AT30 – Dominant hand****AT30 – Non-dominant hand**

DPICOACC**DPICNACC**