Distinct Interplay Between Atrophy and Hypometabolism in Alzheimer’s Versus Semantic Dementia
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Abstract
Multimodal neuroimaging analyses offer additional information beyond that provided by each neuroimaging modality. Thus, direct comparisons and correlations between neuroimaging modalities allow revealing disease-specific topographic relationships. Here, we compared the topographic discrepancies between atrophy and hypometabolism in two neurodegenerative diseases characterized by distinct pathological processes, namely Alzheimer’s disease (AD) versus semantic dementia (SD), to unravel their specific influence on local and global brain structure-function relationships. We found that intermodality topographic discrepancies clearly distinguished the two patient groups: AD showed marked discrepancies between both alterations, with greater hypometabolism than atrophy in large posterior associative neocortical regions, while SD showed more topographic consistency between atrophy and hypometabolism across brain regions. These findings likely reflect the multiple pathologies versus the relatively unitary pathological process underlying AD versus SD respectively. Our results evidence that multimodal neuroimaging-derived indexes can provide clinically relevant information to discriminate the two diseases, and potentially reveal distinct neuropathological processes.
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Introduction
Neurodegenerative disorders, such as Alzheimer’s or semantic dementia, are characterized by the presence of disease-specific protein aggregates in and around neuronal cells. Growing evidence supports the idea that these protein aggregates develop in a topographic pattern (e.g., Braak and Braak 1991; Thal et al. 2002) and spread within pre-existing networks (Seeley et al. 2009). Despite the fact that different disease-specific protein abnormalities might spread in distinct brain networks, they may also overlap in certain brain regions. Thus, the neuropathology associated with semantic dementia, which consists of intraneuronal aggregates of TDP-43 Type C in most cases (Hodges et al. 2010), overlaps with the tau pathology observed in Alzheimer’s disease in different brain regions, such as
medial and anterior temporal lobe regions (Braak and Braak 1991; Davies et al. 2005, 2009). These lesions are associated with neurodegeneration, which is at least partly reflected in gray matter atrophy and glucose hypometabolism measured with structural MRI and positron emission tomography with 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose (18FDG-PET), respectively. The overlapping alterations in Alzheimer’s disease and semantic dementia have been highlighted in previous neuroimaging studies showing common gray matter atrophy to both disorders in medial temporal lobe structures (e.g., hippocampus, amygdala, entorhinal, and parahippocampal cortex), lateral temporal and orbitofrontal regions (Chan et al. 2001; Galton et al. 2001; Nestor et al. 2006; Schroeter and Neumann 2011; La Joie et al. 2013, 2014; Bejanin et al. 2017). Similarly, both Alzheimer’s disease and semantic dementia harbored decreased metabolism in medial and lateral temporal regions (Nestor et al. 2006; Drzezga et al. 2008).

Despite these common regional injuries, there are striking differences between both diseases in the respective relationships between atrophy and hypometabolism patterns. Indeed, Alzheimer’s disease is characterized by strong pattern discrepancies, with predominant atrophy in medial and lateral temporal areas versus predominant hypometabolism in posterior cingulate, precuneus, and temporoparietal areas (Chételat et al. 2008; La Joie et al. 2012; Kijacic et al. 2014; Grothe et al. 2016). By contrast, the few studies that examined both structural MRI and 18FDG-PET in semantic dementia revealed similar patterns of atrophy and hypometabolism in the temporal lobe and orbitofrontal regions, even though decreased metabolism might be slightly more extended than gray matter loss (Desgranges et al. 2007; Acosta-Cabronero et al. 2011; Moodley et al. 2013). However, to our knowledge, no study to date compared these alterations statistically and/or explored their relationships across the whole gray matter in semantic dementia. Yet, direct comparisons between these modalities have allowed unraveling topographic discrepancies in Alzheimer’s disease (e.g., brain regions maintaining neuronal activity despite structural alterations versus regions presenting with excessive hypometabolism relative to atrophy) that pointed to specific pathological processes (Alsop et al. 2008; Chételat et al. 2008; La Joie et al. 2012). This includes potential synaptic compensatory mechanisms, hypometabolism-inducing factors, but also the differential sensitivity of neuroimaging modalities to pathological processes.

Here, we applied multimodal neuroimaging techniques specifically designed for between-modality comparisons and correlations to assess the effects of distinct pathological processes on the brain structure-function relationship. Specifically, we aimed at comparing the topographic discrepancies and relationships between gray matter atrophy and hypometabolism in patients with Alzheimer’s disease versus semantic dementia. We expected more pronounced regional discrepancy and weaker relationships between atrophy and hypometabolism in Alzheimer’s disease compared to semantic dementia, as a reflection of their distinct underlying pathological processes (i.e., less unitary in Alzheimer’s disease than semantic dementia).

To address this question, we first computed age-adjusted Z-scores maps of atrophy and hypometabolism for each patient and performed voxelwise between-modality comparisons to identify regions showing atrophy–hypometabolism discrepancy in each group. We then carried out between-group comparisons and statistical conjunctions to assess respectively differences and similarities between both disorders in their pattern of discrepancy. Finally, we used voxel-to-voxel correlations at the group and individual levels to test differences between Alzheimer’s disease and semantic dementia in the topographic consistency between atrophy and hypometabolism.

**Materials and Methods**

**Participants**

Twenty-one patients with amnestic Alzheimer’s disease, 16 patients with semantic dementia and 39 healthy controls matched for age, sex, and years of education were included in the present study (for details about demographic data, see Table 1). All participants were enrolled in the *Imagerie Multimodale de la Maladie d’Alzheimer à un stade Précoces* (IMAP+) or in the *Troubles cognitifs et émotionnels dans la Sclérose Latérale*

| Table 1 Demographic data and neuropsychological features of patients with Alzheimer’s disease, patients with semantic dementia and normal controls |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| N                               | Patients with AD | Patients with SD | Normal controls | Group comparison (P values) | Post hoc test (P values) |
| Gender (Male/Female)            | 21              | 16              | 39               | AD vs. NC                     | SD vs. NC                     | SD vs. AD                     |
| Age (years)                     | 69.9 ± 9.1      | 67.3 ± 6        | 68.9 ± 7         | 0.6 [0.01]                     | <0.001 <0.001 1              |
| Education (years)               | 10.5 ± 3.7      | 11.5 ± 4.1      | 11.9 ± 3.9       | 0.4 [0.02]                     | <0.001 <0.001 0.1            |
| MDRS (/144)                     | 115.8 ± 12.1^c | 117.7 ± 9.9     | 141.9 ± 2.7      | <0.001 [0.73]                  | <0.001 <0.001 <0.001         |
| MDRS episodic memory subscale (/25) | 14.8 ± 3.2^c  | 16.4 ± 4.2      | 24.5 ± 0.9       | <0.001 [0.73]                  | <0.001 <0.001 <0.001         |
| MDRS concept subscale (/39)     | 33 ± 6.4^c      | 32 ± 3.5        | 38 ± 1.5         | <0.001 [0.36]                  | <0.001 <0.001 1              |
| Picture naming (/80)            | 74.5 ± 7^b      | 34.1 ± 18.2     | 79.9 ± 0.3       | <0.001 [0.81]                  | 0.1 <0.001 <0.001            |
| Categorical fluency (animals – 2 min) | 14.3 ± 7.6      | 8.9 ± 4.3^a      | 33.1 ± 8.4       | <0.001 [0.67]                  | <0.001 <0.001 0.1            |
| Phonemic fluency ("P" – 2 min)  | 13.1 ± 6.6      | 11 ± 4.3^a       | 22.4 ± 6.8       | <0.001 [0.41]                  | <0.001 <0.001 1              |
| Copy of Rey-Ostersieri complex figure (/36) | 25.5 ± 11.8^a | 35.1 ± 1.9      | 35.4 ± 1.2       | <0.001 [0.35]                  | <0.001 1 <0.001              |

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, values are mean ± standard deviation. Except for sex ratio (for which Fisher exact test was used), P values [Eta squared] refer to analysis of variance models, followed by post hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction. AD, Alzheimer’s disease; MDRS, Mattis dementia rating scale; NC, normal controls; ns, nonsignificant; SD, semantic dementia.

^aData missing for one subject.

^bData missing for two subjects.

^cData missing for three subjects.
Amyotrophique: Étude neuropsychologique, en imagerie et neuro-pathologique (SLAMEM) studies (Caen, France). Both studies were approved by a regional ethics committee (Comité de Protection des Personnes Nord-Ouest III) and are registered with http://clinicaltrials.gov (number NCT01638949 for IMAP). Arenaza-Urquijo et al. 2013; La Joie et al. 2013; Duval, Desgranges, 2014. 1

cortical atrophy and logopenic variant primary progressive aphasia (LVD-PAP, LVD-PA) and the clinical diagnostic criteria for semantic variant primary progressive aphasia (Gorno-Tempini et al. 2011) and the clinical diagnostic criteria for semantic variant of primary progressive aphasia (Gorno-Tempini et al. 2011) and the clinical diagnostic criteria for semantic variant of primary progressive aphasia (Gorno-Tempini et al. 2011). In order to maximize the homogeneity of the Alzheimer’s disease group, only patients with an amnestic presentation were selected in this study. Thus, patients with visual or language-predominant phenotypes of Alzheimer’s disease (Mckhann et al. 1984) and the clinical diagnostic criteria for semantic variant of primary progressive aphasia (Gorno-Tempini et al. 2011) were not included. Moreover, all Alzheimer’s disease patients had a Florbetapir-PET scan and were found to be amyloid-β-positive using previously published methods (La Joie et al. 2012), increasing the likelihood of Alzheimer’s disease etiology (Mckhann et al. 2011).

All subjects underwent both a neuroimaging session and a standard neuropsychological battery (see Table 1). Between-group comparisons of neuropsychological performances revealed that both patient groups had a similar degree of global cognitive deficits (assessed with the Mattis Dementia Rating Scale, MDRS) but distinct profiles of cognitive impairment. Alzheimer’s disease patients showed more impairment than semantic dementia at the MDRS episodic memory subtest and Copy of Rey-Osterrieth complex figure. In contrast, patients with semantic dementia had significantly worse performance than Alzheimer’s disease in the naming task and tended to have lower performance in the categorical fluency task.

Neuroimaging Data Acquisition

All participants were scanned on the same MRI (Philips Achieva 3.0T scanner) and PET (Discovery RX VCT 64 PET-CT device, General Electric Healthcare) cameras at the CYCERON Centre (Caen, France). The interval time between the two acquisitions was on average of 17 ± 30 days. Further details on the acquisition procedures are provided in the Supplemental Material.

Neuroimaging Data Handling and Transformation

Preprocessing

Neuroimaging data processing was performed using the Statistical Parametric Mapping Version 8 (SPM8) software (Wellcome Department of Imaging Neuroscience, Institute of Neurology, London, England) implemented in MATLAB 7.4 (The MathWorks, Sherborn, MA). T1-MRI were segmented using the VBM8 toolbox and spatially normalized to a population template generated from the complete image set using a diffeomorphic registration algorithm (DARTEL, Ashburner 2007). 18FDG-PET data were corrected for partial volume effects (FMODE Technologies), coregistered onto their corresponding MNI, and normalized using the deformation parameters defined from the MNI procedure. Resultant images were quantitatively normalized using the cerebellar gray matter as the reference region. As 18FDG-PET and T1-weighted anatomical images did not have the same original spatial resolution, a differential Gaussian kernel smoothing was applied to obtain an equivalent data effective smoothing of 10 mm FWHM (Chételat et al. 2006; Villain et al. 2008; La Joie et al. 2012). Resultant images were finally masked to exclude nongray matter voxels as well as the cerebellum from the analyses.

Generation of W-score Maps

To obtain measurements of atrophy and hypometabolism in the same unit, we computed W-score maps for each patient and each imaging modality following a previously published method from our laboratory (La Joie et al. 2012). W-scores correspond to Z-scores adjusted for specific covariates; age (and TIV for MRI) in the present case. Briefly, to generate W-score maps, we first performed voxelwise regressions in SPM8 to estimate the effects of age (and TIV for MRI) on each imaging data in the control group. These analyses resulted in beta maps for age (and TIV for MRI), and residual maps for each control. These maps were then used to compute voxelwise maps of W-scores for each patient, using the following formula: W-score = (patient’s raw value – (patient’s expected value)/standard deviation of the residuals in controls, where patient’s expected value corresponded to the predicted value in the control group for the patient’s age (and TIV for MRI).

Statistical Analyses

Comparing Local Atrophy and Hypometabolism

Individual W-score maps of atrophy and hypometabolism were entered into a voxelwise repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) in SPM8 (flexible factorial design). First, comparisons between the two alterations were performed within each patient group. Between-group comparisons and statistical conjunctions were then carried out to highlight differences and similarities between both disorders in their pattern of atrophy-hypometabolism mismatch. The family-wise error (FWE) corrected threshold was set at P = 0.05 and the cluster extent at 1500 mm3.

Relationships Between Atrophy and Hypometabolism

The topographic consistency between patterns of atrophy and hypometabolism was assessed within each group using voxel-based correlation analyses (for a similar approach, see Buckner et al. 2009). To do so, individual W-score maps of atrophy and hypometabolism were averaged across patients for each imaging modality and each patient group. Then, Pearson correlations were computed across all gray matter voxels between the group average atrophy map and the group average hypometabolism map (for illustration, see Fig. 1A). The Pearson correlation coefficients of the two patient groups were then compared using the Fisher r-to-z transformation. The same Pearson correlation analyses between all gray matter voxels of atrophy and hypometabolism were performed within each patient group and atrophy-hypometabolism mismatch within each patient group.
hypometabolism were also performed individually (i.e., using the W-score maps of each participant) in order to obtain one Pearson correlation coefficient per subject, reflecting individual consistency in the local degree of atrophy and hypometabolism (for illustration, see Fig. 1B). Fisher r-to-z-transformed values of the two patient groups were then compared using a Student’s T-test. Finally, to assess the consistency in the local degree of atrophy and hypometabolism across different brain regions, the same procedure was repeated in each brain region of the Loni Atlas (Shattuck et al. 2008) separately, i.e., we computed one Pearson correlation coefficient per subject per region and compared the regional Fisher r-to-z-transformed values between the two patient groups with Student’s T-tests (for illustration, see Fig. 1C).

Results

Patterns of Gray Matter Atrophy and Hypometabolism

Averaged W-score maps for each imaging modality and each group are shown in Figure 2 (see also Supplementary Fig. S1 for voxelwise one sample t-test results). Briefly, patients with Alzheimer’s disease showed atrophy in the medial and lateral temporal and inferior parietal cortices, and hypometabolism in the medial and lateral parietal, lateral tempo-occipital and dorsal prefrontal cortices. Patients with semantic dementia showed bilateral, albeit left-predominant, atrophy and hypometabolism in lateral and medial anterior temporal lobe, insula and orbitofrontal cortex.

Voxelwise Comparison Between Atrophy and Hypometabolism

The degree of atrophy and hypometabolism were then directly compared voxelwise within each clinical group. The results are displayed in Figure 3A. Atrophy significantly exceeded hypometabolism in the anterior part of the left medial temporal region including the amygdala in Alzheimer’s disease, and in ventral temporal poles, amygdala, left hippocampus, insula, and putamen in semantic dementia. The direct comparison between groups showed no difference in the regions of higher atrophy than hypometabolism, while the statistical conjunction indicated that atrophy exceeded hypometabolism in both patient groups in the left medial temporal region (and more specifically in the amygdala; Fig. 3B).

The contrast assessing greater hypometabolism than atrophy revealed extended areas in Alzheimer’s disease mainly in the medial and lateral parietal, lateral temporal and dorsolateral prefrontal cortices (Fig. 3A). The same comparison revealed less extended differences in semantic dementia, with only the left dorsal temporal pole and inferior frontal gyrus showing greater hypometabolism than atrophy. The between-group comparison indicated that the discrepancy was more pronounced...
Figure 2. Patterns of brain alteration in patients with Alzheimer’s disease and semantic dementia. Regional degrees of alteration are expressed as mean W-score (as compared with the control group) in each gray matter voxel. For clarity, only the left hemisphere is represented here as results were sensibly similar on the contralateral hemisphere (with however less pronounced alterations in semantic dementia patients in the right than left hemisphere).

Figure 3. Within- and between-group results of voxelwise comparisons between the local degree of atrophy and hypometabolism. (A) Voxelwise comparisons between the local degree of atrophy and hypometabolism in patients with Alzheimer’s disease (top panel) and patients with semantic dementia (bottom panel). (B) Voxelwise statistical conjunction showing regions with significantly more atrophy than hypometabolism in both patients with Alzheimer’s disease and patients with semantic dementia. (C) Voxelwise comparison showing brain regions where hypometabolism is higher than atrophy in patients with Alzheimer’s disease as compared to patients with semantic dementia. The boxplot illustrates the voxelwise result and represents the difference, in each group, between the mean W-scores of atrophy and hypometabolism within the significant clusters; the box represents the interquartile range, the band represents the median value, dots represent patient values and the dotted line represents an equal degree of atrophy and hypometabolism.
in Alzheimer’s disease than semantic dementia in medial and lateral parietal cortices (Fig. 3C). No region showed more hypometabolism than atrophy in semantic dementia as compared to Alzheimer’s disease. The statistical conjunction did not show any common areas of greater hypometabolism than atrophy in both Alzheimer’s and semantic dementia.

### Relationship Between Gray Matter Atrophy and Hypometabolism

We then aimed at computing an index that would reflect, for each disease, the degree of topographical consistency between atrophy and hypometabolism, i.e., how much both patterns are similar and tend to co-occur in the same place and with the same degree. To do so, we averaged, for each group separately, patients’ W-score maps of atrophy on the one hand, and patients’ W-score maps of hypometabolism on the other. Then, we computed Pearson correlations across all gray matter voxels between the average value of atrophy and the average value of hypometabolism within each clinical group (for illustration of the method, see Fig. 1A). The correlation coefficient was significantly lower ($P < 0.001$) in Alzheimer’s disease ($r = 0.50$) than in semantic dementia ($r = 0.81$), and the scatterplots (Fig. 4) showed distinct patterns in the two diseases. The cloud of points was sparser, and the regression line was farther from the identity line (representing an equal degree of atrophy and hypometabolism; line in red in Fig. 4) for Alzheimer’s disease than semantic dementia. More specifically, while the points are relatively homogeneously distributed along the regression line in semantic dementia, two distinct clusters could be identified in Alzheimer’s disease: one above the identity line (i.e., including voxels where hypometabolism exceeded atrophy), and one below the identity line (with voxels where atrophy exceeded hypometabolism). Tracking back the location of these voxels, we found out that the former mainly included temporoparietal areas while the latter was essentially located in the medial temporal region (see Fig. 4).

### Individual Relationship Between Gray Matter Atrophy and Hypometabolism

Because the previous correlations were computed from averaged atrophy and hypometabolism W-score maps across patients, the weaker topographic relationships found in Alzheimer’s disease might reflect the fact that this group is more heterogeneous than semantic dementia. We thus computed the same analyses but using individual W-score maps of atrophy and hypometabolism instead of group averaged maps (for illustration, see Fig. 1B). This way, we obtained one Pearson correlation coefficient per patient, which reflected the individual relationship between atrophy and hypometabolism across all gray matter voxels. As shown in Figure 5A, the weaker relationship in Alzheimer’s disease was recovered at the individual level with most Alzheimer’s disease patients showing lower correlation coefficients than most semantic dementia patients. Between-group comparison of Fisher r-to-z-transformed correlation coefficients indicated that patients with Alzheimer’s disease ($Z(r) = 0.50 \pm 0.12$) had a significantly lower correlation coefficient ($t(35) = 7.31, P < 0.001$) than patients with semantic dementia ($Z(r) = 0.81 \pm 0.14$).

### Regional Relationship Between Gray Matter Atrophy and Hypometabolism

To further understand our findings, we computed the same individual correlation analyses but within separate brain regions instead of across all gray matter voxels (for illustration, see Fig. 1C). We thus obtained one Pearson correlation coefficient per patient and per brain region. For both semantic dementia and Alzheimer’s disease, although to a lower extent in the latter, the relationship between the two alterations was higher in brain regions associated with volume/metabolism loss, i.e., the temporal and medial prefrontal cortex in semantic dementia and the lateral parietal and temporal cortex, and anterior cingulate gyrus in Alzheimer’s disease (Fig. 5C and D, and Supplementary Fig. S2). Regional between-group comparisons of Fisher r-to-z-transformed values showed stronger correlations in semantic dementia than Alzheimer’s disease in left more than right temporal and medial prefrontal regions (Fig. 5B). Stronger correlations in Alzheimer’s disease than semantic dementia were found in the right precuneus and left superior occipital gyrus. Only the stronger correlations in semantic dementia than Alzheimer’s disease in the temporal lobe and left medial prefrontal cortex (shown in red in Fig. 5B) survived Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons ($a = 0.05, P < 0.0009, 56$ models considered).

### Results Without Partial Volume Effect Correction

In our main analyses, PET images were corrected for partial volume effects related to the limited spatial resolution of the PET and allowing to correct the PET signal for gray matter atrophy. As we aimed at assessing the relationships between atrophy and hypometabolism in Alzheimer’s disease and semantic dementia patients, this correction seemed crucial. On the other hand, it might induce an artificial dependency between MRI and PET data. To ensure that our findings were not dramatically affected by this potential bias, we replicated all our analyses using PET images not corrected for partial volume effects. Our results remained essentially unchanged (Supplementary Figs. S3–5 for details).

### Discussion

Multimodal imaging provides a unique opportunity to investigate the topographical relationship between distinct brain alterations, and thus improve our understanding of pathophysiological interactions in vivo (Teipel et al. 2015). In the present study, we aimed at comparing atrophy and hypometabolism discrepancies in Alzheimer’s disease versus semantic dementia to highlight both similarities and differences in the pathological processes. Our results showed (i) more atrophy than hypometabolism in the medial temporal lobe in both disorders; (ii) a more extended pattern of topographic mismatch between hypometabolism and atrophy in Alzheimer’s disease than in semantic dementia; (iii) a high correspondence between the degree of atrophy and hypometabolism in semantic dementia versus a more complex pattern in Alzheimer’s disease, with different relationships according to brain regions. We interpret these results as reflecting distinct neuropathological processes in both diseases with a relatively unitary process in semantic dementia contrasting with a multidetermined process in Alzheimer’s disease, likely sustained by multiple pathologies including tau, amyloid-β, and other neuropathologies.

Our findings showed that Alzheimer’s disease patients present with more atrophy than hypometabolism in the medial temporal lobe. This result is consistent with previous investigations in Alzheimer’s disease showing a greater reduction of gray matter volume than metabolism (Carol et al. 2010; La Joie et al. 2012; Grothe et al. 2016) or cerebral blood flow (Alsop et al.
in medial temporal lobe structures. Moreover, we found that patients with semantic dementia similarly presented with more atrophy than hypometabolism in medial temporal areas, as confirmed by the statistical conjunction analysis. A similar pattern has also been reported in the behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia (Buhour et al. 2017). Altogether, these findings suggest that the discrepancy in the medial temporal lobe is not disease-specific and might not be underlain by a
Instead, it might reflect a common process or phenomenon proper to this region, or topographic specificities of each neuro-imaging modality (e.g., different local sensitivity). The relative preservation of metabolism compared to atrophy in the medial temporal lobe has been hypothesized to reflect the residual synaptic plasticity of surviving neurons (Caroli et al. 2010) or a disconnection from excitatory neurons (Alsop et al. 2008). Beyond the medial temporal lobe, the striatum also showed more atrophy than hypometabolism in semantic dementia in the present study, and in Alzheimer’s disease (Alsop et al. 2008) and behavioral variant of frontotemporal dementia (Buhour et al. 2017) in previous studies. As new neurons have been found in human medial temporal lobe and striatum (Ernst and Frisén 2015), the discrepancy in these regions may reflect neurogenesis processes. Finally, it is interesting to note that this larger pattern of topographical discrepancy coincides with the paths of the major cerebral vessels and their first few branches (Alsop et al. 2008; for atlas of brain vessels, see Viviani 2016). It is thus also possible that the discrepancy between hypometabolism (low) and atrophy (high) is partly related with neurovascular phenomenon and/or methodological aspects related to the neurovascular system (e.g., Viviani et al. 2017).
Alzheimer’s disease have mixed pathologies including vascular and/or other pathologies (e.g., TDP-43, α-synuclein) together with Alzheimer’s disease pathology rather than Alzheimer’s disease pathology only (Kapasi et al. 2017). Besides, the odds of a clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer’s disease is significantly increased with macroscopic infarcts (Schneider et al. 2009), cerebral vessel pathology (Arvanitakis et al. 2016), hippocampal sclerosis (Nag et al. 2015), TDP-43 (Nag et al. 2015; James et al. 2016) and Lewy bodies (Schneider et al. 2009).

Interestingly, when using individual values of atrophy–hypometabolism consistency instead of group averages our findings remained essentially unchanged. This suggests that the lower consistency observed in Alzheimer’s disease was not reflecting a greater heterogeneity, i.e., more variance in Alzheimer’s disease than semantic dementia in term of topography of the lesions and/or disease stage. Instead, we propose that the interaction between tau and amyloid-β, and/or the presence of and interaction with other co-pathologies, modify the relationship between atrophy and hypometabolism, and explain part of the difference between Alzheimer’s and semantic dementia patients. Further studies with neuropathological data are required to provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between pathological processes and the individual correlations between atrophy and hypometabolism.

This study has limitations. First, our sample of patients was relatively small and studies with larger cohort may find additional differences between gray matter atrophy and hypometabolism, especially within the semantic dementia group. However, we used a stringent threshold corrected for multiple comparisons to ensure the robustness of our results. In addition, as this is a monocentric study, we used homogeneous neuroimaging data, which is particularly relevant when performing complex multimodal neuroimaging comparisons. Second, we used cross-sectional measurements of atrophy, which are influenced by prionindividual variability. Longitudinal studies might therefore be helpful to provide a more accurate assessment of pathology-related atrophy–hypometabolism consistency. Finally, while our interpretation of the results relies on the presumed pathology of the patients based on clinico-pathological studies, we lacked neuropathological confirmation of the pathological diagnosis. Nevertheless, all Alzheimer’s disease patients had a positive Florbetapir-PET scan, which increased their likelihood of Alzheimer’s disease etiology, and semantic dementia is a highly homogenous clinical syndrome in term of underlying neuropathology (Hodges et al. 2010; Rohrer et al. 2011; Spinelli et al. 2017).

In summary, our results showed that multimodal neuroimaging-derived indexes, such as the individual correlations between atrophy and hypometabolism, differentiated Alzheimer’s disease from semantic dementia. These indexes might also be specifically related to the underlying pathological processes, and we proposed that the greater intermodality discrepancy found in Alzheimer’s disease compared to semantic dementia reflects the separate and/or synergistic effects of tau, amyloid-β and other neuropathologies on brain structure-function relationships. Hence, our study emphasizes the interest of multimodal neuroimaging analyses to unravel between-modality relationships that are disease-specific and thought to reflect specific underlying pathological processes.
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