

## **Title**

Voice of the patient: Emergence of new motor and non-motor symptoms in early Parkinson's Disease?

## **Authors**

<sup>1,2</sup> Michelle H.S. Tosin, PhD, <sup>3</sup>Tanya Simuni, MD, <sup>2</sup>Glenn T. Stebbins, PhD, <sup>4,5</sup>Jesse M. Cedarbaum, MD

## **Word count**

Abstract: 250 (max. 250)

Main Text: 2532 (max. 3700)

## **Running title**

Motor and non-motor symptoms in early PD

## **Keywords**

Parkinson's Disease, Clinimetrics, Activities of Daily Living, Patient Outcome Assessment, Severity of Illness Index

**Financial Disclosure/Conflict of Interest concerning the research related to the manuscript and Funding sources for study: none**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Nursing, Fluminense Federal University, Niterói, RJ, BRA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Neurological Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL, USA

<sup>3</sup> Department of Neurology, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

<sup>4</sup> Coeruleus Clinical Sciences LLC, Woodbridge CT, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Neurology, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, US

1 **Abstract**

2 Objective: To explore the utility of using patient reported emergence of new symptoms (ES) as  
3 an outcome measure during the early phase of the disease.

4 Methods: We analyzed data from MDS-UPDRS Part IB and Part II from the Safety, Tolerability,  
5 and Efficacy Assessment of Isradipine for PD (STEADY-PD3) study, with at least one annual  
6 follow-up over two years. We divided the sample into categories of follow-up visit (between 0  
7 and 12-months, and 13 and 24-months) and the number of ES for each part of the scale  
8 between participants who started symptomatic treatment and those who did not (STx=yes/no).  
9 We assessed ES differences between participants STx in each follow-up visit using Mann-  
10 Whitney U test, and the Kaplan-Meier analyses.

11 Results: Of 331 participants observed for months 0 to 12, 288 (87%) developed ES, and 182  
12 (55%) started STx. For Part IB, the median number of ES did not significantly differ between the  
13 STx groups ( $Z=-0.86$ ,  $p = 0.39$ ), while for Part 2, the number of ES was significantly higher for the  
14 STx=yes group ( $Z=-2.38$ ,  $p=0.02$ ). Of 148 participants who continued to be observed for months  
15 13 to 24, 114 (77%) developed ES, and 62 (42%) started STx. For Part IB, the median number of  
16 ES did not significantly differ between the STx groups ( $Z=-0.33$ ,  $p = 0.74$ ), while for Part 2, the  
17 number of ES was significantly higher for the STx=yes group ( $Z=-2.25$ ,  $p=0.02$ ).

18 Conclusions: Assessing ES among patient-reported experiences of daily living may provide a  
19 useful marker for tracking PD progression.

## 20 Introduction

21 The Braak hypothesis holds that as Parkinson’s disease (PD) progresses, different areas of the  
22 brain become progressively invaded by the neurodegenerative process which manifests in  
23 behavioral changes <sup>1</sup>. Although the clinical impact of PD is physically and visually obvious to  
24 most patients in the early stages of the disease, we do not have sensitive tools to assess disease  
25 progression specifically in early PD <sup>2-4</sup>. Currently, to assess progression we rely mainly on  
26 observations of symptoms and functionality, measured with clinician completed scales and  
27 patient self-report measures <sup>5,6</sup>. The progression of functional impairment over the course of  
28 the disease, especially in its earliest stages, seems almost imperceptible as measured by the  
29 current scales. However, in daily practice, clinicians and researchers are commonly struck by  
30 patient statements such as: “Last time I saw you I could do “X”, but now I can’t (or I need help,  
31 or it takes me longer)”. Disease progression, as viewed through this patient-centric lens of ever-  
32 accumulating milestones of difficulty to the point of failure, is not a linear process, but a  
33 stepwise, saltatory decline, with emerging symptoms (ES) or impairments piling on the old, one  
34 after another <sup>7,8</sup>.

35 Measuring the impact of therapies designed to slow disease progression is thus rendered  
36 extremely challenging, with attempts from clinical trials to assess the clinical meaningfulness  
37 and statistical significance of interventions that might reduce by 30-50% an average disease  
38 progression rate of 5% per year. In this sense, determining how the measurement ES can  
39 outline the course of the disease, especially in patients with PD at an early stage, will contribute  
40 to the development of new health technologies based on patient centered outcomes <sup>9,10</sup>.

41 A similar initiative in patients with early Alzheimer's disease tracked the appearance of new  
42 neuropsychiatric symptoms, suggesting clinical relevance when associated with increased  
43 morbidity<sup>11</sup>. In our study, we aimed to explore the utility of assessing ES impacting the daily  
44 experiences of patients with early PD, as measured by the Movement Disorder Society-  
45 sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS) Part IB and II  
46 in relation to the initiation of antiparkinson therapy (STx), as a potentially novel patient  
47 relevant outcome measure during the early phase of the disease.

48

## 49 **Methods**

50 We analyzed data from the Safety, Tolerability, and Efficacy Assessment of Isradipine for PD  
51 (STEADY-PD) study, a multicenter, randomized, parallel-group, double-blind, placebo-controlled  
52 trial (ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT02168842). The aims and methods of the STEADY-PD study have  
53 been published elsewhere<sup>12</sup>, as well as results<sup>13</sup>.

## 54 Data and Sample

55 From the enrolled cohort of 336 participants of the STEADY-PD dataset, we limited the sample  
56 to PD participants with complete data from MDS-UPDRS Part IB (Non-motor Aspects of  
57 Experiences of Daily Living) and Part II (Motor Aspects of Experiences of Daily Living), and with  
58 at least one annual follow-up for two years, totaling 331 participants.

59 Because the outcome of the STEADY-PD study showed no effect of the investigative agent, in  
60 our analysis we combined participants receiving both placebo and active treatment.

## 61 Outcomes

62 Our primary outcome was ES for participants during the course of the study. To perform this  
63 analysis, we divided the sample into categories according to the period of the follow-up visit,  
64 initiation of antiparkinson treatment or not (STx=yes or STx=no) during the observation period,  
65 and the presence of ES. We used STx as a proxy of patient- and clinician-perceived disease  
66 progression. We analyzed these outcomes for each part of the scale.

67 We separated the follow-up visits in two distinct periods: the first observation period was when  
68 the participants were evaluated between baseline and 12 months, and the second observation  
69 period was when the participants were evaluated between 13 months and 24 months.

70 To assign STx categories, we used the date when antiparkinson therapy was initiated (the visit  
71 day) and analyzed it according to the time interval between follow-up visits. For example, if the  
72 subject started antiparkinson therapy on day 105 of the study, he was allocated to the first  
73 observation period between baseline and 12 months to the “STx=yes” group for the entire  
74 interval. If a participant started antiparkinson therapy on day 400 of the study, he was  
75 allocated to the second treatment period between 13 and 24 months.

76 We defined ES as the occurrence of a new symptom between the beginning of each period and  
77 the follow-up visit. For example, participants who were scored as zero on any given item on the  
78 MDS-UPDRS at the baseline and had any score other than zero at 12 months, were classified as  
79 having an ES. Those who were scored zero at the baseline, zero at 13 months and any score  
80 different from zero at 24 months were classified as having ES in the period between 13 months  
81 and 24 months.

82 Statistical Analyses

83 We used tables and histograms with distribution of frequencies, medians, and percentages to  
84 summarize the descriptive statistics. Comparison ES between participant starting  
85 antiparksonian therapy (STx=yes) and those not on antiparksonian therapy (STx=no) were  
86 conducted as binomial tests. Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare differences between  
87 the two groups of participants with or without ES, regardless of STx status. Survival  
88 distributions for ES vs non-ES groups were analyzed using Kaplan-Meier curves. Statistical  
89 significance was set at  $\alpha < 0.05$  and analyses were corrected for multiple comparisons,  
90 where appropriate, using a Bonferroni correction. Finally, we estimated required sample size to  
91 detect at least a 30% change in ES over a 12-month period. All statistical analyses were  
92 performed using SPSS<sup>®</sup> Statistics version 26 (IBM reference)

93

## 94 **Results**

95 At baseline, the 331 STEADY-PD participants included in this study had a mean age of 62.4 years  
96 ( $\pm 9.0$ ), with a preponderance of males (72%). The mean disease duration from diagnosis was  
97 10 months ( $\pm 8.8$ ), and the Hoehn and Yahr stage median score was 2 (ranging from 0 to 3). The  
98 mean total for the Motor Examination (Part III) of the MDS-UPDRS was 25.4 (SD 10.4). For the  
99 MDS-UPDRS Parts that were analyzed for this study (Parts IB and II) the means were 4.1 (SD  
100 3.02) and 5.24 (SD 3.95).

101 Of 331 participants observed in the first treatment period, 288 (87%) developed ES and 182  
102 (55.0%) were STx=yes ( $p=0.078$ ). Of 149 participants in the second treatment period one patient  
103 had missing values. Of the 148 remaining participants in the second treatment period 114 (77%)  
104 developed ES, and 62 (42%) were STx=yes ( $p=0.058$ ) (Table 1).

105 Based on the period treatment subsamples, we assessed the number of ES reported per  
106 participant separately for MDS-UPDRS Parts IB, II and for Parts 1B and II combined.  
107 Of the seven symptoms assessed by Part IB of the MDS-UPDRS there was a median ES of 1  
108 (range = 0 – 4) in the STx-yes subsample in first period with an average of ES per participant of  
109 0.98. In the second period, the median remained at 1 for the STx-yes subsample, but the range  
110 of ES increased to 0 – 5 with an average of ES per participant of 0.60. There was no significant  
111 difference between the number of participants with ES on Part IB in the STx-yes and STx-no  
112 groups in both periods ( $p=0.069$  on the first treatment period and  $p=0.162$  on the second  
113 treatment period). Also, ES of the Part IB were not significantly different between the STx-yes  
114 and STx-no groups for either treatment period ( $Z=-0.86$ ,  $p=0.39$  on the first treatment period  
115 and  $Z=-0.33$ ,  $p=0.74$  on the second treatment period) (Table 1), (see Supplemental 1 A and D).  
116 Of the thirteen symptoms assessed by Part II of the MDS-UPDRS, we found a median ES of 2  
117 (range 0 - 7) in the STx-yes subsample for both follow-up periods, with an average of ES per  
118 participant of 2.12 in the first treatment period and 1.94 in the second treatment period. There  
119 was a significant difference between the number of participants with ES in the STx-yes and STx-  
120 no groups in the first treatment period year ( $p=0.037$ ) but not in the second treatment period  
121 ( $p=0.547$ ). Most participants had 0 or 1 ES in both the STx-yes and STx-no groups. However,  
122 there was a significant difference in the prevalence of ES when the therapeutic groups were  
123 compared in the two periods ( $Z=-2.38$ ,  $p=0.02$  for the first treatment period and  $Z=-2.25$ ,  $p=0.02$   
124 for the second treatment period) (Table 1), (see Supplemental 1 B and E).  
125 When we considered all 20 items of Parts IB and II of the MDS-UPDRS combined, we found a  
126 median of 3 ES (range 0-11) in the STx-yes subsample in first period with an average of ES per

127 participant of 3.1, and a median of 3 (range 0-12) in the second treatment period with an  
128 average of ES per participant of 2.53. There was significant difference between the number of  
129 ES in the STx-yes and STx-no groups only in the first treatment period ( $Z=-2.19$ ,  $p=0.039$ ). There  
130 was a significant preponderance of participants in the STx-no subsample with two ES in the first  
131 period (26.8%,  $Z=-1.53$   $p=0.028$ ). In the second treatment period, participants with one ES  
132 prevailed and no significance was found between the therapeutic groups (Table 1), (see  
133 Supplemental 1 C and F).

134 Next, we analyzed the pattern of individual symptoms experienced by the groups of  
135 participants at baseline and in the two treatment periods (Figure 1), (see Supplemental 2). Part  
136 IB (Figure 1, A) and Part II (Figures 1, B and C) item-analyses demonstrated that participants in  
137 the STx-yes group had significantly more ES related to Freezing ( $p=0.014$ ), Eating Tasks  
138 ( $p=0.019$ ), Walking and Balance ( $p=0.045$ ) and Doing Hobbies ( $p=0.028$ ) compared to the STx-no  
139 group in the first treatment period. In the second treatment period participants in the STx-yes  
140 group had significantly more ES related to Speech ( $p=0.002$ ), Hygiene ( $p=0.007$ ), Saliva and  
141 Drooling ( $p=0.043$ ) and Eating Tasks ( $p=0.045$ ) compared to the STx-no group. It should be  
142 noted, however that since MDS-UPDRS was performed only at the beginning and end of each  
143 interval, we cannot relate occurrence of ES to need for medication in this analysis.

144 Given these results, we were interested to see how ES might perform as a clinical trial outcome  
145 measure. We estimate that a sample size of 98 would provide 0.80 power ( $1-\beta$ ) to detect a 30%  
146 reduction in ES from baseline to 12-month follow-up, given an alpha of 0.05 and with equal  
147 assignment to treatment group and continuity correction when using Part IB alone. A sample  
148 size of 96 would be required for the same parameters when considering Part II alone. However,



149 when both Parts IB and II are combined, a sample size of 82 would provide 0.80 power ( $1-\beta$ ) to  
150 detect a 30% reduction in ES given the same parameters for alpha and subject assignment.

151

## 152 **Discussion**

153 Kiebertz et al. recently suggested that tracking milestones of disease progression could provide  
154 a useful outcome measure for clinical trials of potential disease modifying therapies<sup>14</sup>.

155 However, milestones previously proposed, such as need for symptomatic medication,  
156 significant falls, or recognizable cognitive impairment, either represent changes in participant  
157 status relevant to more advanced disease or represent subjective and/or socially determined  
158 states. In early disease a milestone-based assessment of disease progression would of  
159 necessity need to be much more fine-grained.

160 In this exploratory analysis we asked whether, like the Braak progression of engagement of new  
161 brain areas concurrent with worsening of severity of pathology, the clinical progression of PD  
162 can be characterized by progressive appearance of ES, independent of the worsening severity  
163 of symptoms already present<sup>1,15</sup>. Using data from Parts IB and 2 of the MDS-UPDRS in the  
164 STEADY-PD clinical trial<sup>12</sup>, we found that the number of both motor and non-motor symptoms  
165 reported by participants increased over time in a clinical trial population, and that 87% of the  
166 study population reported at least one ES over the first 12 months of the study. Emergence of  
167 new motor symptoms was slightly more frequent than the emergence of non-motor symptoms,  
168 and the incidence, particular of motor ES was reduced in the group of participants who began  
169 STx during the first 12 months of the study. Thus, tracking self-reported ES may provide a novel  
170 means of assessing the progression of PD.

171 The results of our study demonstrated that Parts IB and II of the MDS-UPDRS, taken together as  
172 a single Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO) measure, can function as a record of milestone  
173 attainment in the form of appearance of new disease manifestations<sup>16</sup>. Arguably, especially  
174 early in disease, appearance of a new symptom, as occurred in 87% of our participants within  
175 the first year of observation, could be interpreted to represent a significant milestone for most  
176 persons suffering from PD. The sensitivity of tracking ES as an outcome measure is reflected by  
177 the sample size estimates that less than 100 participants/arm would be required to observe a  
178 statistically significant effect in a 1-year clinical trial.

179 Our work does have limitations. First, our observation is based on a study in which the MDS-  
180 UPDRS was administered only at yearly intervals. At this point in time, data are not available in  
181 the public domain from other clinical studies that have administered the MDS-UPDRS more  
182 frequently than once every 6 or 12 months. Thus, we were unable, for example to assess the  
183 stability of ES once recorded. For ES to constitute a truly useful outcome measure, one would  
184 like to be able to verify stability of ES with observations at consecutive timepoints at least a  
185 month apart. Thus, it would be highly desirable to replicate our observations in a database with  
186 more-frequent MDS-UPDRS administration. Secondly, the clinical meaningfulness for  
187 participants of ES based on the MDS-UPDRS item inventory, while an attractive concept, has yet  
188 to be verified. Such verification could come either via the traditional scale validation and  
189 clinimetric methodology- use of Delphi panels, cognitive debriefing, and revalidation, or via  
190 correlation with patient self-reported experiences using approaches, such as the Patient Report  
191 of Problems (PROP) proposed by Vinikoor-Ilmer et al. based on data in the Fox Insight  
192 database<sup>17</sup>.

193 Finally, we found it interesting to note that the appearance of ES was slightly less frequent in  
194 study participants, all of whom were naïve to dopaminergic medications at enrollment, who  
195 began to receive STx during the study. Based on the available data it cannot be determined  
196 whether either a) STx delayed the onset of ES; b) Participants who started EX paradoxically had  
197 less ES during the time interval or c) STx masked the severity of ES that were present  
198 sufficiently to render them unremarkable using the MDS-UPDRS definitions. This topic could be  
199 a subject for further study. However, as has been reported, initiation of STx is the result of a  
200 complex medical and often social and economic calculus for individual participants, and factors  
201 like social circumstances, continuation of employment etc., may be more powerful  
202 determinants of STx initiation than emergence of any one or combination of symptoms<sup>18</sup>.

203

## 204 **Conclusions**

205 New symptoms continue to appear in most PD participants in the first 2 years of PD. Motor ES  
206 (Part II) were more frequent than non-motor ES (Part IB) among participants initiating  
207 antiparkinsonian treatment in both 0-12 and 13-24 months of the study. Assessing ES among  
208 patient-reported experiences of daily living may provide a useful marker for tracking PD  
209 progression. The concept of tracking ES as a clinical trial outcome measure is worthy of  
210 exploration in future studies and alternative datasets.

211

## Author Roles

1. Research project: A. Conception, B. Organization, C. Execution.
2. Statistical Analysis: A. Design, B. Execution, C. Review and Critique.
3. Manuscript Preparation: A. Writing of the first draft, B. Review and Critique.

M.H.S. Tosin: 1A, 1B, 1C, 2A, 2B, 2C, 3A.

T. Simuni: 3B.

G.T. Stebbins: 1A, 1B, 2A, 2C, 3B.

J.M. Cedarbaum: 1A, 1B, 2C, 3B.

## Disclosures

**1. Funding Sources and Conflict of Interest:** No specific funding was received for this work and the authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest relevant to this work.

**2. Financial Disclosures for the previous 12 months:**

**MHST** received grants and research from: Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), International Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society. MHST Reports consulting with honoraria from Rush University Medical Center.

**TS** in the last 12 months has served as a consultant for Acadia, Caraway Therapeutics, Critical Path for Parkinson's Consortium (CPP), Denali, General Electric (GE), Neuroderm, Sanofi, Sinopia, Sunovion, Roche, Takeda, MJFF and Voyager. Dr. Simuni served on the ad board for Acadia, Denali, General Electric (GE), Sunovion, Roche. Dr. Simuni has served as a member of the scientific advisory board of Caraway Therapeutics, Neuroderm and Sanofi. Dr. Simuni has

received research funding from Biogen, Roche, Neuroderm, Sanofi, Sun Pharma, Amneal, Prevail, UCB, NINDS, MJFF, Parkinson's Foundation

**GTS** reports consulting and advisory board membership with honoraria from: Acadia, Pharmaceuticals, Adamas Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Biogen, Inc., Ceregene, Inc., CHDI Management, Inc., Cleveland Clinic Foundation, Ingenix Pharmaceutical Services (i3 Research), MedGenesis Therapeutix, Inc., Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc., Pfizer, Inc., Tools-4-Patients, Ultragenyx, Inc., and the Sunshine Care Foundation. GTS received grants and research from: National Institutes of Health, Department of Defense, Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research, Dystonia Coalition, CHDI, Cleveland Clinic Foundation, International Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society, and CBD Solutions. GTS reports honoraria from: International Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society, American Academy of Neurology, Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research, Food and Drug Administration, National Institutes of Health, and the Alzheimer's Association. GTS received salary from Rush University Medical Center.

**JMC** receives salary support from Coeruleus Clinical Sciences LLC and Yale Medical School. He has received honoraria from the Charcot Marie Tooth Research Foundation, the Michael J Fox Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health.

### **Ethical Compliance Statement**

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. This is a study of secondary data analysis and therefore did not need ethical approval.

## References

1. Braak H, Del Tredici K, Rüb U, De Vos RAI, Jansen Steur ENH, Braak E. Staging of brain pathology related to sporadic Parkinson's disease. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2003;24(2):197–211.
2. Holden SK, Finseth T, Sillau SH, Berman BD. Progression of MDS-UPDRS Scores Over Five Years in De Novo Parkinson Disease from the Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative Cohort. *Mov Disord Clin Pract*. 2018;5(1):47–53.
3. Regnault A, Boroojerdi B, Meunier J, Bani M, Morel T, Cano S. Does the MDS-UPDRS provide the precision to assess progression in early Parkinson's disease? Learnings from the Parkinson's progression marker initiative cohort. *J Neurol*. 2019;266(8):1927–36.
4. Vu TC, Nutt JG, Holford NHG. Progression of motor and nonmotor features of Parkinson's disease and their response to treatment. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2012;74(2):267–83.
5. McCann H, Cartwright H, Halliday GM. Neuropathology of  $\alpha$ -synuclein propagation and braak hypothesis. *Mov Disord*. 2016;31(2):152–60.
6. Lawrence BJ, Gasson N, Kane R, Bucks RS, Loftus AM. Activities of daily living, depression, and quality of life in Parkinson's disease. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(7):e102294.
7. Strupp J, Kunde A, Galushko M, Voltz R, Golla H. Severely Affected by Parkinson Disease: The Patient's View and Implications for Palliative Care. *Am J Hosp Palliat Med*. 2018;35(4):579–85.
8. Fox S, Cashell A, Kernohan WG, Lynch M, McGlade C, O'Brien T, et al. Palliative care for Parkinson's disease: Patient and carer's perspectives explored through qualitative interview. *Palliat Med*. 2017 Jul 28;31(7):634–41.
9. Pires AO, Teixeira FG, Mendes-Pinheiro B, Serra SC, Sousa N, Salgado AJ. Old and new

- challenges in Parkinson's disease therapeutics. *Prog Neurobiol.* 2017;156:69–89.
10. van Uem JMT, Marinus J, Canning C, van Lummel R, Dodel R, Liepelt-Scarfone I, et al. Health-Related Quality of Life in patients with Parkinson's disease-A systematic review based on the ICF model. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2016;61(5):26–34.
  11. Tariot P, Lyketsos C, Crans G, Cedarbaum J, Hernandez C, Abushakra S. The Effects of ELND005 (Scyllo-Inositol) on Emergence of Neuropsychiatric Symptoms (NPS) in Mild/Moderate Alzheimers Disease: Results from a 78-Week Phase 2 Study (P04.215). *Neurology.* 2012;78(1 Supplement):P04.215 LP-P04.215.
  12. Biglan KM, Oakes D, Lang AE, Hauser RA, Hodgeman K, Greco B, et al. A novel design of a Phase III trial of isradipine in early Parkinson disease (STEADY-PD III). *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.* 2017;4(6):360–8.
  13. Simuni T. Isradipine versus placebo in early Parkinson disease a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;172(9):591–8.
  14. Kieburtz K, Katz R, McGarry A, Olanow CW. A New Approach to the Development of Disease-Modifying Therapies for PD; Fighting Another Pandemic. *Mov Disord.* 2021;36(1):59–63.
  15. Jellinger KA. Is Braak staging valid for all types of Parkinson's disease? *J Neural Transm.* 2018;0(0):1–9.
  16. Kane PB, Benjamin DM, Barker RA, Lang AE, Sherer T, Kimmelman J. Comparison of Patient and Expert Perceptions of the Attainment of Research Milestones in Parkinson's Disease. *Mov Disord.* 2021 Jan;36(1):171–7.
  17. Vinikoor-Imler L, Arbatti L, Hosamath A, Sapir I, Shirvan J, Maserejian N, et al. Cross-

Sectional Profile of Most Bothersome Problems as Reported Directly by Individuals with Parkinson's Disease. In: 2697. Neurology; 2021. p. 15 Supplement.

18. LeWitt P, Oakes D, Cui L. The need for levodopa as an end point of Parkinson's disease progression in a clinical trial of selegiline and  $\alpha$ -tocopherol. *Mov Disord.* 1997;12(2):183-9.



Table 1. Emergent symptoms in participants with or without antiparkinsonian therapy measured by MDS-UPDRS Parts IB and II according to the follow-up visit

0 to 12 Months (n of patients=331, 100%)													
MDS-UPDRS	STx-Yes (n of patients=182, 55.0%)				STx-No (n of patients=149, 45.0%)				Total of patients with ES (%)	Total of ES (%)	Binomial Test for Patients STx Yes vs. No	Mann-Whitney Z-score (Patients)	p-value (Patients)
	N of Patients (%)	N of ES	ES Median (Min-Max)	Average of ES per patient	N of Patients (%)	N of ES	ES Median (Min-Max)	Average of ES per patient					
ES-Part IB	108 (56.8)	179 (56.3)	1 (0-4)	0.98	82 (43.2)	139 (43.7)	1 (0-6)	0.93	190 (57.4)	318 (100.0)	0.069	-0.86	0.389
ES-Part II	142 (56.8)	386 (61.8)	2 (0-7)	2.12	108 (43.2)	239 (38.2)	2 (0-9)	1.6	250 (75.5)	625 (100.0)	0.037	-2.38	0.017
ES-Parts IB and II	162 (56.3)	565 (59.9)	3 (0-11)	3.1	126 (43.8)	378 (40.0)	2 (0-12)	2.54	288 (87.0)	943 (100.0)	0.039	-2.19	0.028
13 to 24 Months (n of patients=148, 100%)													
MDS-UPDRS	STx-Yes (n=62, 41.9%)				STx-No (n=86, 58.1%)				Total of Patients with ES	Total of ES (%)	Binomial Test	Mann-Whitney Z-score (Patients)	p-value (Patients)
	N of Patients (%)	N of ES	ES Median (Min-Max)	Average of ES per patient	N of Patients (%)	N of ES	ES Median (Min-Max)	Average of ES per patient					
ES-Part IB	25 (40.3)	37 (41.1)	1 (0-5)	0.60	37 (59.7)	53 (58.9)	1 (0-3)	0.62	62 (41.9)	90 (100.0)	0.162	-0.33	0.738
ES-Part II	46 (46.5)	120 (53.3)	2 (0-7)	1.94	53 (53.5)	105 (46.6)	2 (0-6)	1.22	99 (29.9)	225 (100.0)	0.547	-2.25	0.024
ES-Parts IB and II	49 (43.0)	157 (49.8)	3 (0-12)	2.53	65 (57.0)	158 (50.2)	2 (0-8)	1.84	114 (77.0)	315 (100.0)	0.16	-1.529	0.126

STx: Symptomatic treatment starting during the interval | ES: Emergent symptoms

Figure 1. Proportion of participants endorsing individual MDS-UPDRS Part IB and II scale items at baseline and at follow-up study visits. Emergent symptoms (ES) reported at the follow-up timepoints are divided according to use of antiparkinson therapy (STx-yes and STx-no).



