

## Supplementary Material

### Linear Mixed Effects Model for FBP Reference Regions

Model Term	$\beta$ [95% C.I.]	P	Cohen's f
<b>Intercept</b>	1.357 [1.306, 1.408]	N/A	N/A
<b>Time</b>	0.017 [0.010, 0.024]	<0.001***	0.27 (M)
<b>Reference Region</b>	-0.589 [-0.606, -0.572]	<0.001***	3.88 (L)
<b>Scanner</b>			
Scanner 1	0.0301 [-0.046, 0.106]	0.792	0.06
Scanner 2	-0.045 [-0.233, 0.143]		
Scanner 3	-0.065 [-0.127, -0.003]		

Table S1 – LME for SUVR calculated using EWM and WC reference regions.

## Centiloid Calibration

### Level 1: Replication Analysis

All Level 1 calibration results are within tolerance (see Table S1), so a Level 2 calibration can be performed.




Figure S1 – Level 1 Centiloid replication analysis using published Pittsburgh calibration data.

Reference VOI	Slope (0.98 to 1.02)	Intercept (-2 to 2 CL)	$R^2$ (> 0.98)	% Difference YC (-2 to 2%) with SD $\pm$ 2%
Whole Cerebellum	1.001	-0.057 CL	0.999	-0.3 $\pm$ 0.4 %

Table S2 – Regression information for Level 1 Centiloid replication analysis. All results are within tolerance as listed in column titles.

For PiB, the calibration used the published Pittsburgh data included with the Centiloid Project. For FBP, the calibration used published Avid data, which included 33 elder AD subjects and 13 young cognitively normal controls. The  $R^2$  for both calibrations is within tolerance ( $> 0.7$ ). The ratio of standard deviations between methods in the PiB control group is  $5.30/4.33 = 1.22$ . The ratio of standard deviations between methods in the FBP control group is  $10.57/2.68 = 3.94$ .

## Level 2: PiB Calibration using Pittsburgh Data




Figure S2 – Level 2 Centiloid calibration analysis for PiB using published Pittsburgh calibration data. The regression equation is substituted into the published Level 1 Centiloid equation to find:

$$CL = 100 * (PiB\ SUVR_{Non-Std} - 1.047) / 0.971$$

## Level 2: FBP Calibration using Avid Data




Figure S3 – Level 2 Centiloid calibration analysis for FBP using published Avid calibration data. The regression equation is substituted into the published Level 1 Centiloid equation to find:

$$CL = 100 * (FBP\ SUVR_{Non-Std} - 0.626) / 0.258$$

## Matched Pair Demographics

	PiB	FBP	P
Sample Size (n)	66	66	N/A
Age (yrs)	44.8 (SD = 8.9)	49.3 (SD = 6.9)	0.002**
Female (%)	35 (53%)	22 (33.3%)	0.022*
A $\beta$ + (%)	45 (68.2%)	46 (69.7%)	0.852
APOE e4 Carriers (%)	13 (19.7%)	15 (22.7%)	0.673

Table S3 – Demographics for CL-matched participants used in multivariate linear model.

## SUVR and Gaussian Mixture Model Cutoffs

PiB	Mean SUVR (A $\beta$ - group)	Mean SUVR (A $\beta$ + group)	GMM-derived SUVR Cutoff
<b>Global Cortex</b>	1.07 (SD=0.06)	1.58 (SD=0.29)	1.18
<b>PET-based Striatum</b>	1.09 (SD=0.18)	1.98 (SD=0.37)	1.12
<b>MRI-based Striatum</b>	1.04 (SD=0.14)	1.64 (SD=0.27)	1.11
<b>Caudate</b>	0.96 (SD=0.16)	1.29 (SD=0.28)	1.16
<b>Putamen</b>	1.13 (SD=0.12)	1.80 (SD=0.32)	1.22
<b>Accumbens</b>	1.00 (SD=0.15)	1.69 (SD=0.30)	1.08

FBP	Mean SUVR (A $\beta$ - group)	Mean SUVR (A $\beta$ + group)	GMM-derived SUVR Cutoff
<b>Global Cortex</b>	0.63 (SD=0.03)	0.83 (SD=0.10)	0.75
<b>PET-based Striatum</b>	0.60 (SD=0.06)	0.84 (SD=0.11)	0.80
<b>MRI-based Striatum</b>	0.58 (SD=0.06)	0.75 (SD=0.08)	0.81
<b>Caudate</b>	0.55 (SD=0.08)	0.64 (SD=0.09)	0.79
<b>Putamen</b>	0.63 (SD=0.05)	0.83 (SD=0.09)	0.77
<b>Accumbens</b>	0.57 (SD=0.06)	0.77 (SD=0.10)	0.76

Table S4 – Average SUVR and Gaussian mixture model-derived cutoffs for PiB (top) and FBP (bottom).