

Combined detrimental effect of male sex and GBA1 variants on cognitive decline in Parkinson's Disease

Short title: Combined damaging effect of male sex and GBA1 genotype on PD cognitive decline

Silvia Paola Caminiti^{1*}, PhD; Micol Avenali^{1,2}, MD, PhD; Alice Galli³, MSc; Rachele Malito⁵, MSc; Giada Cuconato⁵, MSc; Andrea Pilotto^{3,6}, MD, PhD; Alessandro Padovani^{3,6}, MD, PhD; Fabio Blandini^{1,7}, MD, PhD; Daniela Perani⁸, MD; Cristina Tassorelli^{1,2}, MD, PhD; Enza Maria Valente^{2,5}, MD, PhD; for Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI)

1 Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

2 IRCCS C. Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy

3 Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Italy

4 Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, Milan, Italy

5 Department of Molecular Medicine, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

6 Department of continuity of care and frailty, Neurology Unit, ASST Spedali Civili of Brescia, Brescia, Italy

7 Ca' Granda Foundation, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy

8 IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy

*Correspondence to:

Silvia Paola Caminiti

Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences

University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

Via Agostino Bassi, 21, 27100 Pavia PV

silviapaola.caminiti@unipv.it

Abstract

Background and Objective: Heterozygous variants in the glucocerebrosidase gene (*GBA1*) are the major genetic risk factor for Parkinson's Disease (PD). *GBA*-PD has been associated with worse progression and higher risk of cognitive decline. Here we took advantage of the Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI) to investigate whether sex could interact with *GBA1* carrier status in determining the clinical phenotype, with a special focus on cognitive decline.

Methods: We evaluated 118 PD subjects carrying *GBA1* variants (*GBA*-PD) and 450 with wild-type alleles (non*GBA*-PD) included in the PPMI. Dopaminergic activity was assessed in a subset of 248 subjects (65%) with available ^{123}I -FP-CIT SPECT scans. Clinical features and dopaminergic activity were investigated in *GBA*-PD vs. non*GBA*-PD groups, upon stratification by sex. PD subjects were followed for up to 6.5 years (median 6 years). Cox regression was used to model the hazard ratio (HR) of (1) *GBA1* genotype, (2) sex, (3) gene-by-sex interaction on cognitive decline at follow-up.

Results: Regardless of genotype, men suffering from PD exhibited higher motor disability while women showed more autonomic dysfunction. At baseline, *GBA*-PD showed more severe motor and non-motor features, and reduced dopamine uptake in the bilateral ventral putamen compared to non*GBA*-PD. Within the *GBA*-PD group, males had higher occurrence of REM sleep behavior disorder and memory deficits. Of note, *GBA*-PD females showed a greater striatal dopaminergic deficit compared to males, despite presenting similar motor impairment. In longitudinal assessment, Cox Regression revealed that male sex (HR = 1.7), *GBA1* carrier status (HR = 1.6) and, most importantly, *GBA*-by-male sex interaction (HR = 2.3) were significantly associated with a steeper cognitive decline. Upon stratification for *GBA1* variant class, both "severe" and "mild" variants were associated with increased risk of cognitive decline, again more relevant in males (HR = 2.3).

Discussion: We show, for the first time, that male sex and *GBA1* carrier status have an additive value in increasing the risk of cognitive decline in PD, despite the heightened dopaminergic vulnerability observed in *GBA*-PD females. The effect of sex on *GBA1*-related pathology warrants further examination and should be considered in future trials design and patients' selection.

1. Introduction

Parkinson's disease (PD) is a neurodegenerative condition characterized by a heterogeneous range of motor and non-motor symptoms¹. Among these, the occurrence of cognitive impairment is one of the main causes of a poorer quality of life². The different clinical trajectories observed in PD, especially as regards to non-motor symptoms, pose considerable challenges in identifying appropriate participants for clinical trials. As a result, there is a pressing need to a more accurate identification of factors that may increase the risk of PD subjects to develop cognitive impairment.

Genetic factors are known to contribute to the susceptibility to cognitive decline and dementia in PD³. Heterozygous variants in the glucocerebrosidase gene (*GBA1*), occurring in about 8-12% of PD subjects worldwide, seem to accelerate the neurodegenerative process already in the earlier stages of the disease⁴, leading to a significant dopaminergic damage and a more severe clinical phenotype. Indeed, *GBA*-PD subjects have generally an earlier disease onset, a higher prevalence of non-motor symptoms and a greater risk of progression to dementia compared to non-mutated subjects⁵.

Sex is another established factor that affects incidence, natural history, and phenotype of the disease, as suggested by a recent meta-analysis showing a clear male preponderance over females (59% vs 41%)⁶. Furthermore, men manifest on average an earlier age at disease onset, more severe motor symptoms, and faster disease progression than women⁷. From a pathogenetic perspective, genetic, hormonal, neuroendocrinal and molecular players all contribute towards these sex-related differences⁸. In particular, steroid sex hormones, and especially oestrogens, seem to play a crucial neuroprotective role and anti-inflammatory function in PD⁴.

Notably, *GBA1* pathogenic variants are equally detected in PD subjects of both sexes, surpassing the potential impact of environmental exposures and hormonal influences that likely result in the higher male prevalence characterizing idiopathic PD⁴. In this context, it becomes crucial to investigate the potential interactions between *GBA1* genotype and sex, and their combined influence on clinical trajectories in PD.

In this study, we embarked in a comprehensive exploration of the mutual role of sex and *GBA1* mutations in modulating dopaminergic vulnerability as well as the risk to develop dementia in PD subjects. By shedding light on these multifaceted dimensions, we aim to deepen our understanding of PD cognitive manifestations and pave the way for more targeted and effective interventions.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Subjects

This analysis used data openly available from Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI) database (www.ppmi-info.org/data), a multicentre, prospective, longitudinal study that aims to identify genetic, blood, cerebral spinal fluid, and imaging biomarkers of PD progression. Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained [between Jul 1, 2010, and Jun 1, 2019] from the Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI) database (www.ppmi-info.org/access-data-specimens/download-data), RRID:SCR_006431. For up-to-date information on the study, visit www.ppmi-info.org.

The enrolment criteria for PD participants in the PPMI included the following conditions: age older than 30 years, a diagnosis of PD within 2 years prior to the screening visit, the presence of asymmetric resting tremor or asymmetric bradykinesia, or meeting two of the following criteria: bradykinesia, rigidity, and resting tremor. Additionally, participants were required to be untreated for PD at the baseline visit, to be in Hoehn and Yahr stage 1 or 2, and to exhibit a dopamine transporter deficit on imaging.

We included 568 PD subjects (mean age in years \pm SD: 60.18 \pm 10.1; sex [F/M]: 232/336) and with a clinical follow-up \geq 12 months (mean \pm SD: 77 \pm 3.2 months; [min/max: 1/12 years]. Among them, 118 (20.8%) carried a GBA1 variant (GBA-PD), while the remaining 487 (79.2%) were GBA-negative (nonGBA-PD). Moreover, 133 subjects (23.4%) carried the ApoE ϵ 4 allele, of whom 10 (1.8%) in homozygosity. Of the 118 GBA-PD subjects, 23 (19.5%) had at least one ApoE ϵ 4 allele, of which 4 (3.4%) were ApoE ϵ 4/ ϵ 4 homozygotes.

From this included sample, 248 subjects (GBA-PD/non-GBA-PD: 43/205) were acquired at baseline with ^{123}I -FP-CIT-SPECT to image dopamine transporter (DAT) binding.

The institutional review board approved the study at each site, and the participants provided written informed consent.

2.2 Genotyping

DNA was extracted from whole blood according to the study protocol described in the PPMI Biological Products Manual (<http://ppmi-info.org/study-design>). Exons 1-11 of the *GBA1* gene were Sanger sequenced. Variants were subdivided in the following classes¹¹: "risk" (E365K, T408M), "mild" (E365K/N409S, N409S, N409S/N409S, R535H), "severe" (E365K/N431S/L483P, E427K/L483P, IVS2+1G>A, L29Afs*18, L483P, R502C, T408M/R159W) and "unknown" (A495P, G154R/G232E, I528L, K13R, R78C, R83C, R83C/N409S).

ApoE genotypes (ϵ 2, ϵ 3 and ϵ 4 alleles) were obtained by genotyping two single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) (rs429358 and rs7412) by TaqMan assay on the NeuroX genotyping platform¹². According to the presence/absence of the ApoE ϵ 4 allele, participants were divided into

ApoE ϵ 4 Het (heterozygous for the ϵ 4 allele), ApoE ϵ 4 Hom (homozygous for the ϵ 4 allele), and ApoE ϵ 4 negative (carrying ϵ 2/ ϵ 2, ϵ 2/ ϵ 3 or ϵ 3/ ϵ 3 genotypes).

2.3 Clinical assessment

We included the Movement Disorders Society-Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale-Part III (MDS-UPDRS-III)¹³ to assess motor function. Non-motor clinical assessments included the Rapid Eye Movement (REM) Sleep Behaviour Disorder Questionnaire (RBDSQ)¹⁵ to evaluate sleep behaviour, the Scale for Outcomes in PD-Autonomic (SCOPA-AUT)¹⁶ to explore autonomic dysfunction and the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) for the assessment of depressive symptoms. Global cognition was tested with the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA)¹⁷, adjusted for age and education. We obtained measures of MoCA deflection, namely the number of MoCA points lost per year, by considering both baseline and last follow-up MoCA score available. Moreover, subjects with a MoCA score \leq 26 at last follow-up were classified as affected by cognitive impairment¹⁸.

We also collected neuropsychological measures evaluating cognitive domains usually considered particularly impaired in PD, including t-score of Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (HLVT-R)¹⁹ [for total recall, delayed recall, and recognition-discrimination] to assess memory; scores corrected for age and education of the Benton Judgment of Line Orientation (BJLO) 15-item version to assess visuospatial function²⁰; and the scaled scores of Letter-Number Sequencing (LNS)²¹ and t-score of semantic fluency²² to assess executive skills and working memory.

2.4 ¹²³I-FP-CIT-SPECT acquisition and preprocessing

We retrieved reconstructed imaging data related to ¹²³I-FP-CIT-SPECT from the PPMI website. Images were acquired using Siemens or General Electric SPECT tomographs, approximately 3-4 hours after administration of the ¹²³I-FP-CIT tracer. The imaging protocol used for PPMI scans has been previously described^{9,10}.

Preprocessing of SPECT brain images was conducted using Statistical Parametric Mapping software (SPM12, Wellcome Trust Centre for Neuroimaging, London, UK, available at: <https://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/>), run with MATLAB R2022b (MathWorks Inc., Sherborn, MA, USA). First, each image was spatially normalized to a high-resolution ¹⁸F-DOPA template (<http://www.nitrc.org/projects/spmtemplates>)¹⁰ using the old normalize function in SPM12. Parametric binding potential were generated for each subject and voxel-wise using the Image Calculator (ImCalc) function in SPM12. The superior lateral occipital cortex was considered as the reference background region²³.

Calculation of the asymmetry index (AI) was conducted following the standard formula, as described²³.

2.5 Brain Dopaminergic Activity

A Voxel-wise multiple linear regression model was employed in SPM12 to compare GBA-PD and nonGBA-PD. The model included age at acquisition, AI and MDS-UPDRS-III as covariates. We set our voxel-wise significance threshold at $p < 0.05$ (uncorrected) and a minimum cluster extent of 100 voxels. Cluster-corrected statistical maps were saved as NifTI files. The resulting cluster obtained in the previous step was, then, transformed into a binary mask and used to extract parametric binding potentials from each group. We compared the distributions of binding potentials across the four clinical groups through non-parametric ANCOVA with post-hoc Bonferroni correction, including age at acquisition, AI and MDS-UPDRS-III as covariates.

2.6 Statistical Analysis

Demographic and clinical features were first compared between GBA-PD and nonGBA-PD, and then in subgroups stratified by sex, by means of ANOVA for continuous variables and Chi-squared tests for categorical variables. The effect of *GBA1* variants on cognitive deflection was tested via ANOVA. Differences in sex distribution in subjects stratified by *GBA1* variant type were determined using one-sample tests of equality of proportions.

Cox regression models were used to model the effect of (1) genetics, (2) sex, and (3) interaction between the considered variables on cognitive decline at follow-up. The Cox Regression Models were adjusted for disease duration and education. When we evaluated the effect of *GBA1* and ApoE $\epsilon 4$ mutations on the risk of cognitive decline we added sex as confounding variable.

We tested a model including only confounders; if the output was statistically significant, the Cox proportional hazards models were adjusted for confounders by time-dependent on sex and genetics variables.

Hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated, respectively. Significance threshold $p < 0.05$ was established for all tests.

All statistical analyses were performed by means of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28 and Python packages.

2.7 Standard Protocol Approvals, Registrations, and Patient Consents

Each PPMI participating site received approval from their local ethic committee before study initiation, and written informed consent was obtained from all participants before enrolment. We

have obtained permission for publishing our research from the Data and Publication Committee of the PPMI study.

2.8 Data Availability

All the data used in this study are publicly available in the PPMI repository (www.ppmi-info.org/access-data-specimens/download-data).

3. Results

3.1 Baseline features

The demographic and clinical characteristics of the whole GBA-PD (M/F: 59/59) and nonGBA-PD (M/F: 277/173) groups are shown in **Table 1**. Upon *GBA1* variant classification, 23.7% subjects carried “risk” variants, 55.9% “mild”, 11.9% “severe”, and 8.5% “unknown”. The p.N409S (N370S) mild variant emerged as predominant, being present in 50% of mutated individuals (**Supplementary Table 1**).

At baseline, the two groups were comparable for age and educational level. GBA-PD showed longer disease duration, a significantly more severe motor profile and more prevalent REM sleep disorders than nonGBA-PD. On the cognitive side, MoCA scores were comparable in the two groups, although GBA-PD showed lower performance on visuospatial function (BJLO).

When assessing sex-related differences, regardless of *GBA1* carrier status, PD males showed more severe RBD and motor symptoms, while females showed greater autonomic dysfunction. PD males also showed lower memory performance than females, while the opposite was observed for visuospatial scores, with no differences in MoCA scores between sexes.

Demographic and clinical data upon stratification by sex and genotype are shown in **Table 2**. GBA-PD males had significantly more severe REM sleep disturbances than all other groups, and also the worst motor scores (albeit significant only vs nonGBA-PD females). Other inter-group comparisons at baseline confirmed the former observations of worse autonomic dysfunction, worse visuospatial performance and better memory performance in females compared to males.

There was no difference in sex-specific distribution of *GBA1* carriers (59 men, 50%) and of variants subgroups (“Risk” = 13 men, 46.4%; “Mild” 34 men, 51.5%; “Severe” 6 men, 42.8%) (**Supplementary Figure 1**), but selected variants prevailed in either sex (e.g. T408M in males and E365K in females). The different subgroups defined by the genetic variants were again similar in terms of MoCA scores at baseline. Heterozygous and homozygous ApoE ϵ 4 genotypes were significantly more frequent in GBA-PD males than females (**Supplementary Table 1**).

3.2 Dopamine Transporter Imaging at baseline

In accordance with our previous report^{23,24}, GBA-PD showed reduced dopamine uptake in bilateral ventral putamen ($p < 0.05$ at cluster level and $p = 0.01$ at peak level) as compared to nonGBA-PD.

Despite comparable motor clinical profiles among subgroups (**Table 3**), GBA-PD females showed the greatest dopaminergic impairment, which was significantly worse than both males and females nonGBA-PD subjects (**Figure 1**).

3.3 Cognitive trajectories at follow-up

During the follow-up period (6.5 ± 3.2 years), 289 out of 568 PD patients (50.9%) experienced cognitive deterioration, with MoCA scores ≤ 26 at follow-up assessment; this subgroup included 70 GBA-PD patients (out of 118 = 59.3%). *GBA1* carrier status produced a significant risk of cognitive decline over time (HR = 1.594, 95% CI = 1.208 – 2.105, $p = 0.001$), which did not change when the model was adjusted for sex (HR = 1.705, 95% CI = 1.288 – 2.258, $p < 0.001$). Consistent with these predictions, the levels of MoCA deflection were significantly higher in GBA-PD (-0.51 point/year) compared to nonGBA-PD (-0.33 point/year).

Among GBA-PD subjects manifesting cognitive decline at follow-up, 12 (17.1%, 9/3 M/F) showed at least one ApoE $\epsilon 4$ allele, and 2 (2.8%, 2 M) had a homozygous ApoE $\epsilon 4$ genotype (**Supplementary Table 1**). While the interaction between *GBA1* carrier status and the presence of at least one ApoE $\epsilon 4$ allele did not reach statistical significance, the lack of both *GBA1* and ApoE $\epsilon 4$ mutations resulted in a protective effect on cognitive decline (HR = 0.791, 95% CI = 0.624 – 1.003, $p = 0.05$).

Both “severe” and “mild” *GBA1* variants were significantly associated with conversion to cognitive decline, with a frequency of 71.4% and 62.1%, respectively, while subjects carrying “risk” (53.7%) and “unknown” (40%) variants had lower percentage of subjects manifesting cognitive decline (**Supplementary Table 1**). Consistently, Cox regression showed that GBA-PD subjects carrying either “severe” or “mild” variants had an increased risk of cognitive decline (HR = 1.865, 95% CI = 1.351 – 2.575, $p < 0.001$), while “risk” and “unknown” variants showed no significant effect on the PD cognitive trajectory.

Notably, when assessing the combined effect of *GBA1* genotype and sex, GBA-PD males showed a significantly steeper MoCA deflection (-0.90 point/year) not only when compared to GBA-PD females (-0.13 point/year), but also when compared to nonGBA-PD subjects, both males (-0.34 point/year) and females (-0.31 point/year) (**Supplementary Figure 2**). Accordingly, the interaction between male sex and *GBA1* carrier status significantly impacted on the risk of cognitive decline (HR=2.286, 95% CI = 1.623 - 3.222, $p < 0.001$).

When further stratifying for variant categories, an effect of sex on the risk of cognitive decline was found in carriers of both “severe” and “mild” variants, again with males showing significant higher risk of conversion than females (HR = 2.300, CI 95% = 1.218 – 4.341, $p=0.010$). All results are summarized in Survival Plots depicted in **Figure 2**.

4. Discussion

The interaction between sex and genetics is complex and poorly understood in the context of PD⁷. Sex-related frequency differences have been reported in genetic forms of PD, with observed variation depending on the specific gene²⁵. As regards *GBA1*, the sex distribution remains controversial^{26–28}, with discrepancies depending on the *GBA1* variants under investigation^{4,25}. For instance, a previous report indicated a preponderance of women among carriers of "severe" variants, while men were more likely to harbour "mild" and "risk" variants²⁵. Here, in a large cohort of PD subjects extracted from the PPMI dataset, we failed to detect relevant differences in the prevalence of *GBA1* heterozygous carriers between men and women. Moreover, a comparable sex distribution was observed across the majority of *GBA1* variants, suggesting that observed differences are merely related to the different distribution of common *GBA1* variants across different populations and ethnicities.

The main aim of this study was to investigate the combined role of sex and *GBA1* carrier status in the risk of progression toward a cognitive decline, to address the key question whether *GBA1* mutations and sex have an independent or cumulative effect on cognitive outcomes. Our results highlighted, for the first time, that the combination of *GBA1* mutations and male sex is associated with a higher risk of cognitive impairment and a steeper cognitive decline along the disease course. This novel finding is in keeping with previous research reporting male sex as predictor of higher risk of developing cognitive decline²⁹ or even dementia³⁰, as well as with the known association of *GBA1* variants with cognitive impairment^{24,31–33}. To the best of our knowledge, only a previous study reported similar evidence in a large cohort of 4,923 subjects with primary degenerative parkinsonism, finding that *GBA1* variants and male sex were associated with a higher proportion of subjects with PD-dementia and dementia with Lewy bodies than idiopathic PD⁴.

On the other hand, female biological sex seems to exert a protective effect also on GBA-PD condition. Indeed, we found no association between female sex and risk of cognitive decline in GBA-PD subjects, also supported by a slower cognitive decline in GBA-PD females than males. Taken together, these findings suggest the existence of relevant sex-related discrepancies in the manifestation of cognitive dysfunction in GBA-PD. Interestingly, despite a more benign clinical phenotype, GBA-PD females showed greater dopaminergic deficit as compared to GBA-PD males, suggesting that, in the course of the disease, GBA-PD females can counteract pathological brain changes through mechanisms of neural reserve and neural compensation³⁴. In the general population, women tend to exhibit higher physiological levels of dopamine in the striatum, reflecting differences in basal dopamine system organization and/or neuroanatomy³⁵. The dopamine system contains a high density of oestrogen receptors, through which hormones exert their protective role on dopaminergic functions³⁵. Such protective effects of oestrogens are achieved by reducing oxidative stress and mitochondrial dysfunction, limiting neuroinflammation, and preventing the

deposition of α -synuclein and neural injury³⁶. Another aspect under investigation is related to the detrimental role of *GBA1* mutations on sphingolipid homeostasis, the latter found to be modulated by means of oestrogen receptor³⁷. Thus, both environmental and hormonal factors may counteract PD-related pathology over the lifetime of pre-menopausal women, contributing to build a neural reserve through relevant neurobiological effects, even in *GBA1* carriers³⁸. Overall, it is tempting to speculate that a more advanced stage of neurodegeneration is needed in females to reach the same clinical severity observed in GBA-PD males. Future prospective studies - focusing on the influence of hormones on *GBA1*-related pathology - could lead to a better understanding of the wide motor and cognitive between-sex variability in PD, as well as reveal new therapeutic avenues or preventive strategies.

Besides cognitive impairment, GBA-PD males showed higher occurrence of RBD disorders compared to all other groups. This finding is of particular interest as it is in line with the male predominance of RBD³⁹, but also with the strong association between the presence of RBD and *GBA1* carrier status^{24,40}. RBD in PD subjects is considered a marker of a more malignant phenotype, with more rapid progression of motor and non-motor symptoms⁴¹, as well as being related to more severe spreading of α -synuclein pathology at post-mortem assessment⁴².

The augmented risk of cognitive impairment may be also driven by the co-occurrence of *GBA1* mutations with the ApoE ϵ 4 allele, which is by itself a strong risk factor for cognitive deterioration in Alzheimer's disease⁴³. A single study has so far demonstrated that carriers of both *GBA1* variants and ApoE ϵ 4 alleles were at increased risk of a more severe course of PD³². Here, we do not find any significant risk, possibly due to the low statistical power – only 23 out of 118 PD bearing both mutations. Consistently, we found that the absence of both genetic mutations is protective against the development of cognitive decline in PD.

Another aspect emerging from our analysis is related to the differential effects of *GBA1* classes of variants on cognitive decline. Previous evidence showed conflicting results on the relationship between classes of *GBA1* mutations and PD phenotype as well as the risk for dementia^{4,33,44,45}. Indeed, Cilia et al. (2016) found that carriers of “severe” mutations had greater risk for dementia compared to “mild” mutations, even if the latter showed a 2-fold higher risk of dementia than nonGBA-PD subjects⁴⁴. Our former study on a large Italian cohort also showed that patients with “severe” GBA-PD exhibited greater risk of non-motor symptoms (e.g. cognitive impairment) compared to “mild” mutations¹¹. Later on, Lunde et al. (2018) reported that “severe” variants are associated with a faster progression to dementia than carriers of “risk” polymorphisms (e.g. E365K)³³, a finding not confirmed by Straniero et al. (2020), who found a higher risk of dementia not only in association with “severe” mutations but also with the E326K “risk” variant⁴.

The present study on the PPMI cohort confirms that *GBA1* “severe” variants are generally correlated with a more severe clinical phenotype, but it shows that “mild” variants also increase the risk of cognitive decline in PD. Conversely, a much lower proportion of “risk” variant carriers

eventually converted to dementia at follow-up, suggesting that this category is characterized by a more benign outcome, especially on the cognitive side. The higher risk of conversion found in carriers of both “mild” and “severe” mutations may partially explain the considerable clinical variability reported among *GBA*-PD subjects in terms of cognitive dysfunction and motor disability⁴⁴. However, we found that 38% of “mild” and 29% of “severe” variant carriers showed stable cognitive profiles at follow-up, suggesting that other risk factors, in combination with genetic risk factors, should be considered to shed light on PD heterogeneity. Overall, this still controversial evidence suggests that the current classification of *GBA1* variants, which is based on their role in Gaucher's disease, may not adequately reflect their pathogenic role in PD, and new classification approaches should be investigated. Given these premises, future studies further addressing the issue of heterogeneity within the spectrum of *GBA1* genotypes and its relationship with sex should be implemented, also considering the effect on PD motor and non-motor phenotype and clinical trajectories. Moreover, our data should be confirmed in large population-based studies to limit bias in the ascertainment.

In conclusion, our results provide supporting evidence of the interplay between *GBA1* carrier status and sex in the progression of cognitive decline in a PD population. We confirm that *GBA1* variants are the major risk factor associated with cognitive impairment, however, this effect is particularly evident in association with the male sex. Indeed, we found that, among *GBA1* carriers (mainly of “severe” and “mild” variants), PD males showed the greatest risk of develop cognitive impairment over time. These elements should be considered when interpreting the current literature and planning future studies. Understanding the role of genetic variants on the course of cognitive decline over PD progression will foster a more accurate disease prognosis and may help to a better future clinical trials design and patients' selection. In particular, the effect of sex on *GBA1* mutation should be considered in the emerging therapeutic strategies targeting *GBA1*-regulated pathways⁴⁶.

Acknowledgment

Funding: PPMI – a public-private partnership – is funded by the Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research and funding partners, including 4D Pharma, Abbvie, AcureX, Allergan, Amathus Therapeutics, Aligning Science Across Parkinson's, AskBio, Avid Radiopharmaceuticals, BIAL, Biogen, Biohaven, BioLegend, BlueRock Therapeutics, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Calico Labs, Celgene, Cerevel Therapeutics, Coave Therapeutics, DaCapo Brainscience, Denali, Edmond J. Safra Foundation, Eli Lilly, Gain Therapeutics, GE HealthCare, Genentech, GSK, Golub Capital, Handl Therapeutics, Insitro, Janssen Neuroscience, Lundbeck, Merck, Meso Scale Discovery, Mission Therapeutics, Neurocrine Biosciences, Pfizer, Piramal, Prevail Therapeutics, Roche,

Sanofi, Servier, Sun Pharma Advanced Research Company, Takeda, Teva, UCB, Vanqua Bio, Verily, Voyager Therapeutics, the Weston Family Foundation and Yumanity Therapeutics.

Disclosure

The authors report no disclosures relevant to the manuscript.

Outside the submitted work, SPC is supported by #NEXTGENERATIONEU (NGEU) and funded by the Ministry of University and Research (MUR), National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), project MNESYS (PE0000006) – A multiscale integrated approach to the study of the nervous system in health and disease (DN. 1553 11.10.2022).

CT has received personal fees for participating in advisory boards for Eli Lilly.

Appendix Authors		
Name	Location	Contribution
Silvia Paola Caminiti	Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy	Design and conceptualization of the study; acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the data; drafting of the manuscript
Micol Avenali	Parkinson and Movement Disorders Unit, IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy	Interpretation of the data; drafting of the manuscript
Alice Galli	Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Italy	Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the data; drafting of the manuscript
Rachele Malito	Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, Milan, Italy	Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the data; drafting of the manuscript
Giada Cuconato	Department of Molecular Medicine, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy	Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the data; critical revision
Andrea Pilotto	Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Italy	Interpretation of the data; critical revision of the manuscript
Alessandro Padovani	Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Italy	Interpretation of the data; critical revision of the manuscript
Fabio Blandini	IRCCS Ca' Granda Foundation, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy	Interpretation of the data; critical revision of the manuscript
Daniela Perani	IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy; Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, Milan, Italy	Interpretation of the data; critical revision of the manuscript
Cristina Tassorelli	Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy	Interpretation of the data; critical revision of the manuscript

Enza Maria Valente	Neurogenetics Research Unit, IRCCS Mondino Foundation, Pavia, Italy	Design and conceptualization of the study; interpretation of the data; drafting of the manuscript
--------------------	---	---

Bibliography

1. Obeso JA, Stamelou M, Goetz CG, et al. Past, present, and future of Parkinson's disease: A special essay on the 200th Anniversary of the Shaking Palsy. *Mov Disord*. 2017;32:1264–1310.
2. Leroi I, Ahearn DJ, Andrews M, McDonald KR, Byrne EJ, Burns A. Behavioural disorders, disability and quality of life in Parkinson's disease. *Age Ageing*. 2011;40:614–621.
3. Halliday GM, Leverenz JB, Schneider JS, Adler CH. The neurobiological basis of cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. *Movement Disorders*. 2014;29:634–650.
4. Straniero L, Asselta R, Bonvegna S, et al. The SPID-GBA study: Sex distribution, Penetrance, Incidence, and Dementia in GBA-PD. *Neurol Genet*. 2020;6.
5. Brockmann K, Srullijes K, Pflederer S, et al. GBA-associated Parkinson's disease: Reduced survival and more rapid progression in a prospective longitudinal study. *Movement Disorders*. 2015;30:407–411.
6. Georgiev D, Hamberg K, Hariz M, Forsgren L, Hariz G-M. Gender differences in Parkinson's disease: A clinical perspective. *Acta Neurol Scand*. 2017;136:570–584.
7. Cerri S, Mus L, Blandini F. Parkinson's Disease in Women and Men: What's the Difference? *J Parkinsons Dis*. 2019;9:501–515.
8. Vaidya B, Dhamija K, Guru P, Sharma SS. Parkinson's disease in women: Mechanisms underlying sex differences. *Eur J Pharmacol*. 2021;895:173862.
9. Parkinson Progression Marker Initiative. The Parkinson Progression Marker Initiative (PPMI). *Prog Neurobiol*. 2011;95:629–635.
10. Marek K, Chowdhury S, Siderowf A, et al. The Parkinson's progression markers initiative (PPMI) – establishing a PD biomarker cohort. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol*. 2018;5:1460–1477.
11. Petrucci S, Ginevrino M, Trezzi I, et al. GBA-Related Parkinson's Disease: Dissection of Genotype-Phenotype Correlates in a Large Italian Cohort. *Movement Disorders*. 2020;35:2106–2111.
12. Nalls MA, Keller MF, Hernandez DG, et al. Baseline genetic associations in the Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI). *Mov Disord*. 2016;31:79–85.
13. Goetz CG, Tilley BC, Shaftman SR, et al. Movement Disorder Society-sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS): Scale presentation and clinimetric testing results. *Movement Disorders*. 2008;23:2129–2170.
14. Hoehn MM YM. Parkinsonism: onset, progression, and mortality. *Neurology*. Epub 1967.;17:427-42.
15. Stiasny-Kolster K, Mayer G, Schäfer S, Möller JC, Heinzel-Gutenbrunner M, Oertel WH. The REM sleep behavior disorder screening questionnaire--a new diagnostic instrument. *Mov Disord*. 2007;22:2386–2393.
16. Visser M, Marinus J, Stiggelbout AM, Van Hilten JJ. Assessment of autonomic dysfunction in Parkinson's disease: the SCOPA-AUT. *Mov Disord*. 2004;19:1306–1312.
17. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2005;53:695–699.
18. Litvan I, Goldman JG, Tröster AI, et al. Diagnostic criteria for mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: Movement Disorder Society Task Force guidelines. *Movement Disorders*. 2012;27:349–356.
19. Benedict RHB, Schretlen D, Groninger L, Brandt J. Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised: Normative Data and Analysis of Inter-Form and Test-Retest Reliability. *Clin Neuropsychol*. 1998;12:43–55.

20. Qualls CE, Bliwise NG, Stringer AY. Short forms of the Benton Judgment of Line Orientation Test: development and psychometric properties. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*. 2000;15:159–163.
21. Crowe SF. Does the letter number sequencing task measure anything more than digit span? *Assessment*. 2000;7:113–117.
22. Gladsjo JA, Schuman CC, Evans JD, Peavy GM, Miller SW, Heaton RK. Norms for letter and category fluency: demographic corrections for age, education, and ethnicity. *Assessment*. 1999;6:147–178.
23. Caminiti SP, Pilotto A, Premi E, et al. Dopaminergic connectivity reconfiguration in the dementia with Lewy bodies continuum. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2023;108:105288.
24. Caminiti SP, Carli G, Avenali M, Blandini F, Perani D. Clinical and Dopamine Transporter Imaging Trajectories in a Cohort of Parkinson’s Disease Patients with GBA Mutations. *Mov Disord*. 2022;37:106–118.
25. Ortega RA, Bressman SB, Raymond D, et al. Differences in Sex-Specific Frequency of Glucocerebrosidase Variant Carriers and Familial Parkinsonism. *Movement Disorders*. 2022;37:2217–2225.
26. Simuni T, Brumm MC, Uribe L, et al. Clinical and Dopamine Transporter Imaging Characteristics of Leucine Rich Repeat Kinase 2 (LRRK2) and Glucosylceramidase Beta (GBA) Parkinson’s Disease Participants in the Parkinson’s Progression Markers Initiative: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Movement Disorders*. 2020;35:833–844.
27. Setó-Salvia N, Pagonabarraga J, Houlden H, et al. Glucocerebrosidase mutations confer a greater risk of dementia during Parkinson’s disease course. *Movement Disorders*. 2012;27:393–399.
28. Malek N, Weil RS, Bresner C, et al. Features of GBA-associated Parkinson’s disease at presentation in the UK Tracking Parkinson’s study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2018;89:702–709.
29. Reekes TH, Higginson CI, Ledbetter CR, Sathivadivel N, Zweig RM, Disbrow EA. Sex specific cognitive differences in Parkinson disease. *NPJ Parkinsons Dis*. 2020;6:7.
30. Cholerton B, Johnson CO, Fish B, et al. Sex differences in progression to mild cognitive impairment and dementia in Parkinson’s disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2018;50:29–36.
31. Stoker TB, Camacho M, Winder-Rhodes S, et al. Impact of GBA1 variants on long-term clinical progression and mortality in incident Parkinson’s disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2020;91:695–702.
32. Szwedo AA, Dalen I, Pedersen KF, et al. GBA and APOE Impact Cognitive Decline in Parkinson’s Disease: A 10-Year Population-Based Study. *Movement Disorders*. 2022;37:1016–1027.
33. Lunde KA, Chung J, Dalen I, et al. Association of glucocerebrosidase polymorphisms and mutations with dementia in incident Parkinson’s disease. *Alzheimer’s & Dementia*. 2018;14:1293–1301.
34. Barulli D, Stern Y. Efficiency, capacity, compensation, maintenance, plasticity: emerging concepts in cognitive reserve. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2013;17:502–509.
35. Zachry JE, Nolan SO, Brady LJ, Kelly SJ, Siciliano CA, Calipari ES. Sex differences in dopamine release regulation in the striatum. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2021;46:491–499.
36. Bovenzi R, Sancesario GM, Conti M, et al. Sex hormones differentially contribute to Parkinson disease in males: A multimodal biomarker study. *Eur J Neurol*. 2023;30:1983–1990.
37. Marin R, Diaz M. Estrogen Interactions With Lipid Rafts Related to Neuroprotection. Impact of Brain Ageing and Menopause. *Front Neurosci*. 2018;12:128.
38. Subramaniapillai S, Almey A, Natasha Rajah M, Einstein G. Sex and gender differences in cognitive and brain reserve: Implications for Alzheimer’s disease in women. *Front Neuroendocrinol*. 2021;60:100879.
39. Dauvilliers Y, Schenck CH, Postuma RB, et al. REM sleep behaviour disorder. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2018;4:19.
40. Gan-Or Z, Mirelman A, Postuma RB, et al. GBA mutations are associated with Rapid Eye Movement Sleep Behavior Disorder. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol*. 2015;2:941–945.

41. Fereshtehnejad S-M, Zeighami Y, Dagher A, Postuma RB. Clinical criteria for subtyping Parkinson's disease: biomarkers and longitudinal progression. *Brain*. 2017;140:1959–1976.
42. Postuma RB, Adler CH, Dugger BN, et al. REM sleep behavior disorder and neuropathology in Parkinson's disease. *Movement Disorders*. 2015;30:1413–1417.
43. Bunce D, Fratiglioni L, Small BJ, Winblad B, Backman L. APOE and cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer disease and non-demented aging. *Neurology*. 2004;63:816–821.
44. Cilia R, Tunesi S, Marotta G, et al. Survival and dementia in GBA-associated Parkinson's disease: The mutation matters. *Ann Neurol*. 2016;80:662–673.
45. Liu G, Peng J, Liao Z, et al. Genome-wide survival study identifies a novel synaptic locus and polygenic score for cognitive progression in Parkinson's disease. *Nat Genet*. 2021;53:787–793.
46. Huh YE, Usnich T, Scherzer CR, Klein C, Chung SJ. GBA1 Variants and Parkinson's Disease: Paving the Way for Targeted Therapy. *J Mov Disord*. 2023;16:261–278.

LEGENDS

Figure 1 – Dopaminergic uptake differences between groups. (Top) Significantly reduced dopamine binding in GBA-PD subjects compared to nonGBA-PD subjects, resulting from the voxel-wise regression model. (Bottom) Violin plots representing significant differences in dopaminergic binding potentials in bilateral ventral putamen among the four clinical groups.

Figure 2 - Survival plots for PD patients. Plots showing the association between the probability of conversion to cognitive deficits and the effect of (A) *GBA1* carrier status, (B) biological sex, (C) interaction between *GBA1* genotype and biological sex, (D) interaction between *GBA1* and ApoE ϵ 4 carrier status, (E) *GBA* variants, (F) sex in carriers of mild and severe *GBA1* variants.

TABLES

Table 1 Demographic and clinical features of GBA-PD and nonGBA-PD groups.

	GBA-PD	nonGBA-PD	p-value ^a	F	M	p-value ^b
N (%)	118 (20.8%)	450 (79.2%)	0.000	232 (40.8%)	336 (59.2%)	0.066
Age at baseline	60.3±10.5	61.4±10.1	0.290	61.3±9.8	61.1±10.5	0.812
Age at onset	58.2±10.4	60.1±10.3	0.075	59.4±9.9	59.9±10.6	0.608
Education (years)	15.8±3.6	15.4±3.7	0.250	14.7±4.1	16.1±3.4	0.000
Disease Duration (months)	25.9±25.2	15.9±19.9	0.000	22.4±23.9	14.9±19	0.000
Clinical assessment at baseline						
MDS-UPDRS III	22.7±10.6	19.8±9.2	0.003	19.4±9.1	21.1±9.9	0.032
SCOPA-AUT	16.5±11.2	14.5±10	0.058	18.4±11.5	12.5±8.6	0.000
RBDSQ	5.5±3.5	4.3±2.7	0.000	4.2±2.8	4.8±3.1	0.023
GDS	5.7±1.7	5.5±1.6	0.199	5.7±1.7	5.4±1.5	0.056
Cognitive assesment at baseline						
MoCA at baseline	26.5±2.8	26.6±3.1	0.733	26.7±3.2	26.5±2.8	0.539
BJLO	11.0±3.3	11.8±3.0	0.015	10.7±3.0	12.3±2.9	0.000
LNS	11.3±3.0	11.2±2.9	0.555	11.4±2.8	10.9±3.2	0.081
Semantic fluency	49.9±11.2	50.4±10.9	0.624	51.1±10.8	49.8±11.1	0.164
HVLT, immediate recall	46.1±10.8	45.3±11.3	0.450	47.1±11.2	44.3±10.9	0.003
HVLT, delayed recall	45.8±10.8	44.4±11.9	0.242	46.4±11.8	43.5±11.4	0.003
HVLT, recognition	47.2±11.2	45.1±11.3	0.069	47.2±11.7	44.3±11.0	0.003
Cognitive assessment at follow-up						
MoCA deflection	-0.5±1.3	-0.3±1.1	0.118	-0.3±1.1	-0.4±1.2	0.083
Cognitive decline	70 (59.3%)	219 (48.6%)	0.303	112 (48.3%)	177 (52.7%)	0.662

Abbreviations: Benton Judgment of Line Orientation (BJLO); Glucocerebrosidase (GBA); Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS); Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (HVLT); Letter-Number Sequencing (LNS); Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA); Movement Disorders Society-Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS); Number (N); Parkinson's disease (PD); Scales for Outcomes in PD-Autonomic (SCOPA-AUT); REM Sleep Behavior Disorder Screening Questionnaire (RBDSQ).

^a= comparison between GBA-PD and nonGBA-PD patients, regardless of sex.

^b= comparison between all PD males and all PD females, regardless of genotype.

Significant p-values ($p < 0.05$) are reported in bold.

Table 2 Demographic and clinical features of GBA-PD and nonGBA-PD groups divided by sex.

	GBA-PD F	GBA-PD M	nonGBA-PD F	nonGBA-PD M	p- value	Post hoc
N (%)	59 (10.4%)	59 (10.4%)	173 (30.4%)	277 (48.8%)	0.000	
Age at baseline	60.8±10.3	59.7±10.5	61.5±9.6	61.4±10.4	0.690	
Age at onset	58.0±10.6	58.0±11.2	59.7±9.8	60.1±10.5	0.299	
Education (years)	15.3±4.1	16.3±2.9	14.4±4	16.0±3.5	0.000	nonGBA-PD F < GBA-PD M nonGBA-PD F < nonGBA-PD M
Disease Duration (months)	28.1±24.2	23.7±25.2	20.5±23.2	13.1±16.9	0.000	nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD F nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD M nonGBA-PD M < nonGBA-PD F
Clinical assessment at baseline						
MDS-UPDRS III	21.5±9.6	24.0±11.4	18.6±8.8	20.5±9.4	0.002	GBA-PD M > nonGBA-PD F
SCOPA-AUT	18.8±11.1	14.2±10.7	18.3±11.5	12.1±8.0	0.000	GBA-PD F > nonGBA-PD M nonGBA-PD F > GBA-PD M nonGBA-PD F > nonGBA-PD M
RBDSQ	4.5±3	6.5±3.7	4.1±2.7	4.4±2.8	0.000	GBA-PD M > GBA-PD F GBA-PD M > nonGBA-PD F GBA-PD M > nonGBA-PD M
GDS	5.9±1.9	5.5±1.4	5.6±1.7	5.4±1.58	0.146	-
Cognitive assesment at baseline						
MoCA (at baseline)	26.9±2.9	26.2±2.6	26.6±3.8	26.6±2.8	0.638	-
BJLO	10.2±3.1	10.9±2.2	10.9±3.0	12.4±2.9	0.000	GBA-PD F < GBA-PD M GBA-PD F < nonGBA-PD M nonGBA-PD F < GBA-PD M nonGBA-PD F < nonGBA-PD M
LNS	11.3±3.0	11.4±3.0	10.8±3.2	11.4±2.8	0.234	-
Semantic Fluency	49.5±11.5	50.2±11.0	51.6±10.5	49.7±11.0	0.286	-
HVLT, immediate recall	47.9±11.3	44.4±10.1	46.8±11.1	44.3±11.2	0.026	-
HVLT, delayed recall	48.6±10.4	43.0±10.4	45.7±12.2	43.6±11.6	0.009	GBA-PD M < GBA-PD F nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD F
HVLT, recognition	50.0±10.1	44.4±11.6	46.3±12.1	44.3±10.9	0.003	GBA-PD M < GBA-PD F nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD F
Cognitive assessment at follow-up						
MoCA deflection	-0.1±0.8	-0.9±1.5	-0.3±1.1	-0.3±1.1	0.001	GBA-PD M < GBA-PD F GBA-PD M < nonGBA-PD F GBA-PD M < nonGBA-PD M
Cognitive decline	30 (50.8%)	40 (66.8%)	82 (47.4%)	137 (49.5%)	0.219	

Abbreviations: Beck Depression Inventory (BDI); Benton Judgment of Line Orientation (BJLO); Glucocerebrosidase (GBA); Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (HVLT); Letter-Number Sequencing (LNS); Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA); Movement Disorders Society-Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS); Number (N); Parkinson's disease (PD); Scales for Outcomes in PD-Autonomic (SCOPA-AUT); REM Sleep Behavior Disorder Screening Questionnaire (RBDSQ).

~ (Post Hoc) = Significance did not withstand Bonferroni's correction. Significant p-values ($p < 0.05$) are reported in bold.

Table 3 Demographic and clinical features of GBA-PD and nonGBA-PD subgroups with ¹²³I-FP-CIT-SPECT data available, divided by sex.

	GBA-PD F	GBA-PD M	nonGBA-PD F	nonGBA-PD M	p- value	Post hoc
N (%)	20 (33.9%)	23 (39%)	63 (36.4%)	142 (51.3%)	0.217	
Age at SPECT	63.6±9.7	63.7±11.2	61.5±7.3	64.7±7.4	0.277	
Education (years)	15.4±5.1	16.7±3.0	15.2±2.7	15.6±3.0	0.263	-
Disease Duration (months)	33.5±26.8	27.7±28.1	8.0±8.7	6.6±6.3	0.000	nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD F nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD M nonGBA-PD M < nonGBA-PD F nonGBA-PD F < GBA-PD F
AI	5.0±3.4	4.9±3.4	7.1±3.9	5.2±3.5	0.003	nonGBA-PD M < nonGBA-PD F
Clinical assesment at baseline						
MDS-UPDRS III	20.9±10.7	23.8±11.4	20.3±8.4	21.4±8.9	0.469	-
SCOPA-AUT	17.3±10.5	13.9±8.2	17.3±10.1	12.8±8.0	0.004	nonGBA-PD F > nonGBA-PD M
RBDSQ	3.5±2.1	7.2±3.9	3.8±2.6	4.7±3.0	0.000	GBA-PD M > GBA-PD F GBA-PD M > nonGBA-PD F GBA-PD M > nonGBA-PD M
GDS	5.9±1.7	5.6±1.4	5.3±1.3	5.2±1.5	0.115	-
Cognitive assesment at baseline						
MoCA (at baseline)	27.4±2.2	26.0±2.6	27.5±1.9	26.6±2.6	0.016	GBA-PD M < nonGBA-PD F
BJLO	10.6±2.8	12.9±2.2	11.8±2.5	12.4±2.8	0.016	GBA-PD F < GBA-PD M GBA-PD F < nonGBA-PD M
LNS	11.6±3.2	11.3±2.9	11.8±2.8	11.4±2.7	0.825	-
Semantic Fluency	50.4±10.7	53.2±8.3	51.2±9.7	50.6±9.0	0.646	-
HVLT, immediate recall	50.8±12.4	46.7±8.8	49.4±9.5	42.2±11.1	0.000	nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD F nonGBA-PD M < nonGBA-PD F
HVLT, delayed recall	49.4±11.6	43.7±11.0	47.6±10.5	42.0±11.9	0.002	nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD F nonGBA-PD M < nonGBA-PD F
HVLT, recognition	52.4±7.3	46.0±8.2	47.1±11.6	42.8±11.2	0.001	nonGBA-PD M < GBA-PD F
Cognitive assesment at follow-up						
MoCA deflection	-0.2±1.1	-0.7±1.4	-0.4±1.3	-0.4±0.9	0.490	-
Cognitive decline	9 (45%)	15 (65.2%)	27 (43%)	86 (60.6%)	0.075	

Abbreviations: Asymmetry Index (AI); Beck Depression Inventory (BDI); Benton Judgment of Line Orientation (BJLO); Glucocerebrosidase (GBA); Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (HVLT); Letter-Number Sequencing (LNS); Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA); Movement Disorders Society-Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS); Number (N); Parkinson's disease (PD); Scales for Outcomes in PD-Autonomic (SCOPA-AUT); REM Sleep Behavior Disorder Screening Questionnaire (RBDSQ).

ˆ (Post Hoc) = Significance did not withstand Bonferroni's correction. Significant p-values (p < 0.05) are reported in bold.

GBA-PD < nonGBA-PD



