Published in final edited form as:

Parkinsonism Relat Disord. 2014 January ; 20(1): 13–16. doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2013.08.021.

Risky driving and pedunculopontine nucleus-thalamic cholinergic denervation in Parkinson Disease

Shiao-Pei S. Weathers, MD¹, Vikas Kotagal, MD¹, Nicolaas I. Bohnen, MD, PhD^{1,2,3}, and Kelvin L. Chou, MD^{1,4}

¹Department of Neurology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

²Department of Radiology, Division of Nuclear Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

³Neurology Service and GRECC, VA Ann Arbor Healthcare System, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

⁴Department of Neurosurgery, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Abstract

Background—It is unknown whether driving difficulty in Parkinson disease (PD) is attributable to nigrostriatal dopaminergic or extranigral non-dopaminergic neurodegeneration.

Objective—To investigate *in vivo* imaging differences in dopaminergic and cholinergic innervation between PD patients with and without a history of risky driving.

Methods—Thirty non-demented PD subjects (10 women/20 men) completed a driving survey. These subjects had previously undergone (+)-[¹¹C] dihydrotetrabenazine vesicular monoamine transporter 2 and [¹¹C] methyl-4-piperidiny propionate acetylcholinesterase PET imaging. Acetylcholinesterase PET imaging assesses cholinergic terminal integrity with cortical uptake largely reflecting basal forebrain and thalamic uptake principally reflecting pedunculopontine nucleus integrity.

Results—Eight of thirty subjects reported a history of risky driving (been pulled over, had a traffic citation, or been in an accident since PD onset) while 22 had no such history (safe drivers). There was no difference in striatal dihydrotetrabenazine vesicular monoamine transporter uptake between risky and safe drivers. There was significantly less thalamic acetylcholinesterase activity in the risky drivers compared to safe drivers (0.0513 ± 0.006 vs. 0.0570 ± 0.006 , $p = 0.022$) but no difference in neocortical acetylcholinesterase activity. Using multivariable logistic regression, decreased thalamic acetylcholinesterase activity remained an independent predictor of risky driving in PD even after controlling for age and disease duration.

Conclusions—Risky driving is related to pedunculopontine nucleus-thalamic but not neocortical cholinergic denervation or nigrostriatal dopaminergic denervation in PD. This suggests

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*Corresponding author: Kelvin L. Chou, MD, University of Michigan Medical School, 2301 Commonwealth Blvd., Ann Arbor, MI 48105-2945, Phone: 734-936-3087, Fax: 734-232-1170, klchou@med.umich.edu.

Financial disclosure related to research covered in this article: The authors report no conflicts of interest related to the research covered in this article. This work was supported in part by the Department of Veterans Affairs; the Michael J. Fox Foundation; and the NIH [grant numbers P01 NS015655 and RO1 NS070856].

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

that degeneration of the pedunculopontine nucleus, a brainstem center responsible for postural and gait control, plays a role in the ability of PD patients to drive.

Keywords

Parkinson disease; PET imaging; Driving

1. Introduction

Driving is a complex task that requires intact motor, perceptual, and cognitive function. Parkinson disease (PD) is a neurodegenerative disorder characterized by progressive motor, cognitive, and other non-motor (visual) manifestations, likely resulting from multiple neurotransmitter deficiencies. All of these manifestations may interfere with the ability to drive safely [1]. There is a growing body of literature regarding driving ability in PD. The greatest contributions to unsafe driving in patients with PD include declines in visual sensory ability, motion perception, and general cognition, all of which can be impaired in early PD [2, 3]. PD patients commit more driving errors and have more collisions on driving simulation tasks compared to age-matched healthy controls [4]. PD patients also perform poorly on “on road” driving evaluations compared to controls [5–8].

Physicians are often asked to assess a patient’s driving ability, typically based on information that can be obtained in a routine office visit, such as a limited cognitive and motor examination. While motor and disease severity measures that may be performed in the office, such as the Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) and the Hoehn and Yahr staging system, are not generally predictive of driving performance [1, 9], there is some evidence that postural imbalance and gait problems may predict driving safety in PD [10, 11]. One study found that the postural imbalance and gait disorder (PIGD) subtype of PD was more likely to fail an on road driving assessment than the tremor dominant (TD) subtype [11]. Another measure shown to predict outcome on a road test in PD drivers was the Rapid Walk Test (RPW), an assessment of stride length, balance, and overall mobility [10].

Cognitive status may also predict driving safety in PD. Crizzle et al. [1], in an evidence based review, reported that several visual and cognitive tests, such as the Useful Field of View (UFOV) subtest 2, cumulative UFOV scores (based on 4 subsets), contrast sensitivity, Risk Index, Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure Test (ROCF), Trails B, Trails B-A, and functional reach, were probably predictive of impaired driving performance in PD.

There is a need to explore mechanisms of neurodegeneration in PD that contribute to impaired driving ability. The association between driving in PD and neurobiological measures of dopaminergic and cholinergic denervation has not been explored. Nigrostriatal dopaminergic denervation is characteristically associated with PD motor severity. Cortical cholinergic denervation becomes more prominent with the emergence of PD dementia [12], while subcortical cholinergic denervation, specifically of the PPN- thalamic system, is associated with postural control and gait difficulty in PD [13]. Given that poor performance on cognitive tasks and postural instability appear to be more strongly associated with impaired driving performance than overall motor function, we hypothesized that risky driving would associate more strongly with cortical and PPN-thalamic cholinergic denervation than with nigrostriatal dopaminergic denervation in PD.

2. Methods

2.1 Subjects and driving survey

The subjects analyzed in this study were originally recruited for a research study on the PET imaging correlates of non-motor symptoms in PD (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT01565473). As part of this larger study, participating subjects complete (+) – [^{11}C] dihydrotetrabenazine (DTBZ) vesicular monoamine transporter type 2 (VMAT2) and [^{11}C] methyl-4-piperidiny propionate (PMP) acetylcholinesterase (AChE) PET imaging, Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MOCA), MDS-revised UPDRS and Hoehn-Yahr severity assessments. Thirty-eight participants who had completed these study assessments were sent a survey about their driving habits, behaviors, and general demographics. All subjects in our cross-sectional study met UK PD Society Brain Bank Research Center clinical diagnostic criteria for PD [14], and all subjects demonstrated evidence of striatal dopaminergic denervation on DTBZ PET imaging consistent with the clinical diagnosis of PD. Subjects with dementia, as defined by a Mini-Mental State Exam (MMSE) score <24 , were excluded. No subjects were taking cholinesterase inhibitors or pure anticholinergic drugs.

Out of the total of 38 subjects who were mailed a driving survey, three subjects did not return the driving survey and five subjects reported on their driving survey that they were not current drivers. Thus, thirty total recruited PD subjects were analyzed.

The cohort was dichotomized into safe drivers ($n = 22$, 13M/9F) and risky drivers ($n = 8$, 7M/1F) based upon a positive response to one of three separate driving survey question items: have you been pulled over, received a traffic citation, or been involved in a motor vehicle accident since the onset of PD? In our cohort, 1 subject reported having been involved in an accident and given a ticket. Three subjects reported having been pulled over without being issued a ticket, and four subjects were pulled over and issued a ticket. These 3 questionnaire items have not been validated in PD but rather were chosen based on our estimation of their brevity and frequent use in routine clinical interactions with PD patients. Safe drivers had no self-reported history of any of these 3 items.

2.2 Standard protocol approvals, registrations, and patient consents

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the University of Michigan. Written consent was obtained from all subjects.

2.3 Imaging Techniques

DTBZ and PMP PET imaging were performed in 3D imaging mode using an ECAT HR+ tomograph (Siemens Molecular Imaging, Inc., Knoxville, TN), which acquires 63 transaxial slices (slice thickness: 2.4 mm; intrinsic in-plane resolution: 4.1 mm full-width at half maximum (FWHM) over a 15.2 cm axial field-of-view. A NeuroShield (Scanwell Systems, Montreal, Canada) head-holder/shielding unit was attached to the patient bed to reduce the contribution of detected photon events originating from the body outside the scanner field-of-view [15]. Before radioligand injections began, a 5-minute transmission scan was acquired using rotating ^{68}Ge rods for attenuation correction of emission data using the standard vendor-supplied segmentation and re-projection routines. All subjects were studied in the supine position, with eyes and ears unoccluded, resting quietly in a dimly lit room.

2.3.1 DTBZ PET imaging—No-carrier-added (+)-[^{11}C]DTBZ (250 to 1000 Ci/mmol at the time of injection) was prepared as reported previously [16]. Dynamic PET scanning was performed for 60 minutes immediately following a bolus injection of 55% of 555MBq (15 mCi) of (+)-[^{11}C]DTBZ dose (containing less than 50 micrograms of cold DTBZ mass) over the first 15 to 30 seconds of the study, while the remaining 45% of the dose was

continuously infused over the next 60 minutes, resulting in stable arterial tracer levels and equilibrium with brain tracer levels after 30 minutes [17]. A series of 15 scan frames over 60 minutes was obtained as follows: four $\times$ 30 seconds; three $\times$ 1 minute; two $\times$ 2.5 minutes; two $\times$ 5 minutes; and four $\times$ 10 minutes.

2.3.2 PMP PET imaging— $[^{11}\text{C}]\text{PMP}$ was prepared in high radiochemical purity (>95%) by N- $[^{11}\text{C}]$ methylation of piperidin-4-yl propionate using a previously described method [18]. Dynamic PET scanning was performed for 70 minutes immediately following a bolus intravenous injection of 666 MBq (18 mCi) of $[^{11}\text{C}]\text{PMP}$. The dose contained less than 200 microgram of cold PMP mass. Emission data were collected in 16 sequential emission scans (the DTBZ protocol plus an additional 10 min frame).

2.3.3 MRI Imaging—All subjects underwent brain magnetic resonance imaging on a 3T Philips Achieva system (Philips, Best, The Netherlands) utilizing an 8-channel headcoil and the “ISOVOX” exam card protocol primarily designed to yield isotropic spatial resolution. A standard T1-weighted series of a 3D inversion recovery-prepared turbo-field-echo was performed in the sagittal plane using TR/TE/TI=9.8/4.6/1041ms; turbo factor=200; single average; FOV=240 $\times$ 200 $\times$ 160mm; acquired Matrix = 240 $\times$ 200. One hundred and sixty slices were reconstructed to 1mm isotropic resolution. This sequence maximizes contrast among gray matter, white matter, and CSF and provides high-resolution delineation of cortical and subcortical structures. These MRIs were used mainly for co-registration to PET images, but showed no evidence of large artery stroke, tumor, demyelination, or findings consistent with an atypical parkinsonian disorder.

2.4 Data Analysis

Interactive Data Language image analysis software (Research systems, Inc., Boulder, CO) was used to manually trace volumes of interest (VOIs) on MRI images including the thalamus and striatum (caudate and putamen regions) of each hemisphere. Right and left hemisphere values were averaged together within subjects to create a composite score for each region. Total neocortical VOI were defined using semi-automated threshold delineation of the cortical gray matter signal.

All image frames were spatially coregistered within subjects with a rigid-body transformation to reduce the effects of subject motion during the imaging session. These motion-corrected PET frames were spatially co-registered to the T1-weighted MR using standard co-registration procedures in SPM8b implemented in Matlab 2010b (The Mathworks, Natick, MA). Time activity curves for each VOI were generated from the spatially aligned PET frames. ^{11}C -DTBZ distribution volume ratio (DVR) was then estimated by using the Logan plot graphical analysis method [19] with the time activity curves as the input function and the neocortex as reference tissue for ^{11}C -DTBZ [17, 19, 20]. AChE hydrolysis rates (k_3) were estimated using a method using the striatum as the reference input tissue.

Demographic factors, clinical measurements, and PET outcomes were compared between safe and risky drivers using Fisher’s exact test, two-sample pooled t-tests, or Satterthwaite’s t-test as appropriate. In order to control for the effects of age and duration of disease on driving safety, multivariable logistic regression was used to model the likelihood of being a risky driver using age, duration of disease, and PET measure as predictor variables. Maximum likelihood estimates for each of these 3 predictor variables were calculated using the Wald Chi-square test. All analyses were performed using SAS version 9.3, SAS institute, Cary, NC.

3. Results

The mean time between survey completion and PET scan for all 30 patients was 125.1 days (SD 87.13 days, range 8–312 days). Table 1 compares safe and risky drivers. While risky drivers were slightly older (70.6 ± 12.9 vs. 65.1 ± 6.5 years) and had a longer disease duration (8.6 ± 6.5 vs. 4.4 ± 3.7), these differences were not statistically significant. There were no significant differences in gender, Hoehn and Yahr score, MDS-UPDRS motor score, levodopa equivalent dose, MoCA score or mean number of days, trips or miles driven per week between the 2 groups. There were also no differences in visual acuity or self-reported musculoskeletal pain between safe and risky drivers. All 8 risky drivers reported a score of 0 out of 4 on MDS-UPDRS item 1.3 (Depressed mood).

Safe and risky drivers showed no differences in self-reported walking and balance difficulties on MDS-UPDRS item 2.12 (0.38 ± 0.50 vs. 0.50 ± 0.53 ; $t = 0.56$, $p = 0.58$) or in the proportion of patients who reported a history of falls ($n=29$, 28.6% vs. 27.3%; $X^2 = 0.005$, $p = 0.947$). Freezing was not a common finding in our cohort as all 30 of our subjects scored a 0 on MDS-UPDRS-III item 3.11 (Freezing of Gait). We explored differences in the Gait (item 3.10) and Postural Stability (item 3.12) scores on the MDS-UPDRS and found higher scores (signifying greater disability) in risky drivers compared to safe drivers on Gait (1.50 ± 0.59 vs. 0.8 ± 0.35 ; $t = 3.48$, $p = 0.0017$) but no significant differences in Postural Stability (1.37 ± 1.51 vs. 1.04 ± 1.29 ; $t = 0.59$, $p = 0.56$). Inter-group differences in the MDS-UPDRS Gait score remained significant after Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons ($p < 0.01$).

Eleven out of 30 total subjects had MoCA scores of $<26/30$, consistent with the operative cut-off for Mild cognitive Impairment (MCI) in PD [21]. Ten of these 11 MCI subjects were categorized as safe drivers and 1 was categorized as a risky driver.

Lower cholinergic uptake on thalamic PMP PET imaging was seen in risky drivers compared to safe drivers ($t = 2.43$, $p = 0.022$). There was no significant difference in neocortical PMP uptake or striatal DTBZ binding between the groups. Multivariable logistic regression was then used to model the likelihood of being a risky driver based on age, duration of disease, and thalamic PMP as predictor variables (Overall Model Likelihood Ratio $X^2 = 13.90$, $p = 0.003$). Age ($X^2 = 0.14$, $p = 0.71$) and duration of disease ($X^2 = 3.74$, $p = 0.053$) were not significant predictor variables for risky driving, but decreased thalamic PMP uptake significantly predicted risky driving ($X^2 = 4.52$, $p = 0.034$).

4. Discussion

Previous PD studies have not examined the association between driving and dopaminergic or cholinergic innervation on PET imaging. Our findings indicate that PPN-thalamic cholinergic activity is significantly lower in PD subjects with a history of risky driving compared to those without such a history. There was no significant difference in neocortical cholinergic activity or nigrostriatal dopaminergic denervation between the safe and risky PD drivers. Multivariable logistic regression analysis identified decreased PPN-thalamic cholinergic activity as an independent predictor of risky driving in PD even after controlling for the effects of age and duration of disease.

As prior studies have shown that motor measures failed to reliably predict impaired driving performance in PD [1, 4, 6, 9], we did not hypothesize that risky driving would be associated with nigrostriatal dopaminergic denervation. However, it makes intuitive sense that motor dysfunction in PD would contribute to risky driving. Although nigrostriatal dopaminergic denervation is characteristically associated with global PD motor symptom severity and bradykinesia in particular, denervation of the brainstem cholinergic system

could result in sensorimotor abnormalities that contribute to risky driving. Thalamic cholinergic activity, not neocortical cholinergic activity, was decreased in the risky PD drivers in this study, reflecting PPN cholinergic afferent degeneration [13].

The PPN is a brainstem locomotor center located in the dorsolateral part of the pontomesencephalic tegmentum and degenerates in PD [22]. It is composed of 2 groups of neurons including the pars compacta which contains mostly cholinergic projections and the pars dissipata, which contains mostly glutaminergic projections. The ascending cholinergic efferent fibers of the PPN connect to all of the thalamic nuclei, as well as the basal ganglia, cerebellum and the spinal cord [23]. The PPN is important for the maintenance of balance, initiation of and modulation of gait, and other stereotyped movements [24]. We postulate that quick motor responses coordinated by the sensory processing of proprioceptive information from the legs may contribute to operating a motor vehicle safely, and this complex feedback loop may have a neural substrate via the PPN-vermis-thalamic cholinergic system [25]. This is supported by our finding that the MDS-UPDRS Gait item was more impaired in risky drivers compared to safe drivers, and by increasing evidence in the literature that postural imbalance and gait problems may predict driving safety in PD [10, 11].

Neocortical cholinergic denervation did not correlate with risky driving in our cohort. This was an unexpected result given that cognitive dysfunction has been implicated as contributing to impaired driving ability in PD patients. Prior research has demonstrated that certain cognitive tests such as the Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure Test (ROCF), Trails B, Trails B-A, and functional reach may be predictive of impaired driving performance in PD [1]. Although we did not have these specific detailed cognitive tests to analyze in our cohort, our study found no significant difference in MOCA scores, nor a significant difference in proportion of drivers with MoCA scores in the MCI range between the safe and risky groups, supporting our observation that neocortical cholinergic uptake is not associated with risky driving behavior.

Limitations of our study include a small number of subjects and the method we employed to dichotomize our cohort into safe and risky drivers, based upon a self-reported history of having been pulled over, receipt of a traffic citation, or having been involved in a motor vehicle accident since the onset of PD. We did not collect information regarding the details or timing of these citations or accidents. Because these responses could not be confirmed, our data is subject to recall bias and the number of risky drivers in our cohort may have been underestimated. Three of the participants were pulled over but did not receive a citation. Thus it is possible that they were driving safely but pulled over for reasons unrelated to driving ability (license plate sticker, broken taillight), causing us to overestimate the number of risky drivers. An additional limitation of our study is the variable interval time between completion of PET imaging and the driving survey.

In summary, risky driving is related to PPN-thalamic cholinergic denervation but not neocortical cholinergic or nigrostriatal dopaminergic denervation in PD. Further studies in a larger cohort will be needed to confirm the relationship between risky driving in PD and cholinergic and dopaminergic denervation, using more objective measures, such as an “on-road” driving evaluation, to separate safe from unsafe drivers. Nevertheless, our findings suggest that degeneration of the PPN, a brainstem center responsible for postural and gait control, may play a large role in the ability of PD patients to drive. Future research should also focus on whether cholinergic augmentation therapy might be helpful in enhancing driving performance in PD.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Christine Minderovic, Virginia Rogers, the PET technologists, cyclotron operators, and chemists, for their assistance. This work was supported in part by the Department of Veterans Affairs; the Michael J. Fox Foundation; and the NIH [grant numbers P01 NS015655 and RO1 NS070856]. **Dr. Weathers** has no disclosures. **Dr. Kotagal** receives research support from the University of Michigan Neurology Training Grant (NINDS NS007222) and the American Academy of Neurology Clinical Research Training Fellowship. **Dr. Bohnen** receives research support from the NIH [grant numbers P01 NS015655 and RO1 NS070856], the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Michael J. Fox Foundation. **Dr. Chou** receives research support from the NIH (NS44504-08, 5R44NS070438) and the Michael J. Fox Foundation, participates as a site-PI in clinical trials sponsored by the Huntington Study Group (2CARE), receives royalties from UpToDate, receives royalties from Demos Health for his book *Deep Brain Stimulation; A New Life for People with Parkinson's, Dystonia, and Essential Tremor*, and serves as a consultant for Medtronic, Merz Pharmaceuticals, and Accordant.

References

1. Crizzle AM, Classen S, Uc EY. Parkinson disease and driving: an evidence-based review. *Neurology*. 2012 Nov 13; 79(20):2067–74. [PubMed: 23150533]
2. Uc EY, Rizzo M, Anderson SW, Sparks J, Rodnitzky RL, Dawson JD. Impaired visual search in drivers with Parkinson's disease. *Ann Neurol*. 2006 Oct; 60(4):407–13. [PubMed: 16969860]
3. Uc EY, Rizzo M, Anderson SW, Sparks JD, Rodnitzky RL, Dawson JD. Driving with distraction in Parkinson disease. *Neurology*. 2006 Nov 28; 67(10):1774–80. [PubMed: 17130409]
4. Uc EY, Rizzo M, Johnson AM, Dastrup E, Anderson SW, Dawson JD. Road safety in drivers with Parkinson disease. *Neurology*. 2009 Dec 15; 73(24):2112–9. [PubMed: 20018639]
5. Classen S, McCarthy DP, Shechtman O, Awadzi KD, Lanford DN, Okun MS, et al. Useful field of view as a reliable screening measure of driving performance in people with Parkinson's disease: results of a pilot study. *Traffic Inj Prev*. 2009 Dec; 10(6):593–8. [PubMed: 19916131]
6. Cordell R, Lee HC, Granger A, Vieira B, Lee AH. Driving assessment in Parkinson's disease--a novel predictor of performance? *Mov Disord*. 2008 Jul 15; 23(9):1217–22. [PubMed: 18528878]
7. Heikkila VM, Turkka J, Korpelainen J, Kallanranta T, Summala H. Decreased driving ability in people with Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 1998 Mar; 64(3):325–30. [PubMed: 9527142]
8. Wood JM, Worringham C, Kerr G, Mallon K, Silburn P. Quantitative assessment of driving performance in Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2005 Feb; 76(2):176–80. [PubMed: 15654027]
9. Grace J, Amick MM, D'Abreu A, Festa EK, Heindel WC, Ott BR. Neuropsychological deficits associated with driving performance in Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*. 2005 Oct; 11(6):766–75. [PubMed: 16248912]
10. Crizzle AM, Classen S, Lanford DN, Malaty II, Okun MS, Wang Y, et al. Postural/Gait and Cognitive Function as Predictors of Driving Performance in Parkinson's Disease. *Journal of Parkinson's Disease*. 2013;10.3233/JPD-120152
11. Devos, H.; Vandenbergh, W.; Tant, M.; Akinwuntan, A.; De Weerd, W.; Nieuwboer, A. Profiling unsafe drivers with Parkinson's disease: does clinical subtype predict on-road driving performance?. *Transportation Research Board 92nd Annual Meeting*; Washington, D.C. 2013. p. 13-1527.
12. Bohnen NI, Kaufer DI, Hendrickson R, Ivancic LS, Lopresti BJ, Constantine GM, et al. Cognitive correlates of cortical cholinergic denervation in Parkinson's disease and parkinsonian dementia. *J Neurol*. 2006 Feb; 253(2):242–7. [PubMed: 16133720]
13. Bohnen NI, Muller ML, Koeppe RA, Studenski SA, Kilbourn MA, Frey KA, et al. History of falls in Parkinson disease is associated with reduced cholinergic activity. *Neurology*. 2009 Nov 17; 73(20):1670–6. [PubMed: 19917989]
14. Hughes AJ, Daniel SE, Kilford L, Lees AJ. Accuracy of clinical diagnosis of idiopathic Parkinson's disease: a clinico-pathological study of 100 cases. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 1992 Mar; 55(3):181–4. [PubMed: 1564476]
15. Thompson CJ, Kecani S, Boelen S. Evaluation of a neck shield for use during neurological studies with a whole-body PET scanner. *Ieee T Nucl Sci*. 2001 Aug; 48(4):1512–7.

16. Jewett DM, Kilbourn MR, Lee LC. A simple synthesis of [^{11}C]dihydrotetrabenazine (DTBZ). *Nucl Med Biol.* 1997 Feb; 24(2):197–9. [PubMed: 9089713]
17. Innis RB, Cunningham VJ, Delforge J, Fujita M, Gjedde A, Gunn RN, et al. Consensus nomenclature for in vivo imaging of reversibly binding radioligands. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab.* 2007 Sep; 27(9):1533–9. [PubMed: 17519979]
18. Snyder SE, Tluczek L, Jewett DM, Nguyen TB, Kuhl DE, Kilbourn MR. Synthesis of 1-[^{11}C]methylpiperidin-4-yl propionate ([^{11}C]PMP) for in vivo measurements of acetylcholinesterase activity. *Nucl Med Biol.* 1998 Nov; 25(8):751–4. [PubMed: 9863562]
19. Logan J, Fowler JS, Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Ding YS, Alexoff DL. Distribution volume ratios without blood sampling from graphical analysis of PET data. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab.* 1996 Sep; 16(5):834–40. [PubMed: 8784228]
20. Koeppe RA, Frey KA, Snyder SE, Meyer P, Kilbourn MR, Kuhl DE. Kinetic modeling of N-[^{11}C]methylpiperidin-4-yl propionate: alternatives for analysis of an irreversible positron emission tomography trace for measurement of acetylcholinesterase activity in human brain. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab.* 1999 Oct; 19(10):1150–63. [PubMed: 10532640]
21. Dalrymple-Alford JC, MacAskill MR, Nakas CT, Livingston L, Graham C, Crucian GP, et al. The MoCA: well-suited screen for cognitive impairment in Parkinson disease. *Neurology.* 2010 Nov 9; 75(19):1717–25. [PubMed: 21060094]
22. Bohnen NI, Albin RL, Muller LTM, Chou KL. Advances in therapeutic options for gait and balance in Parkinson's disease. *US Neurology.* 2011; 7(2):100–8. [PubMed: 24348751]
23. Heckers S, Geula C, Mesulam MM. Cholinergic innervation of the human thalamus: dual origin and differential nuclear distribution. *J Comp Neurol.* 1992 Nov 1; 325(1):68–82. [PubMed: 1282919]
24. Pahapill PA, Lozano AM. The pedunclopontine nucleus and Parkinson's disease. *Brain.* 2000 Sep; 123(Pt 9):1767–83. [PubMed: 10960043]
25. Hazrati LN, Parent A. Projection from the deep cerebellar nuclei to the pedunclopontine nucleus in the squirrel monkey. *Brain Res.* 1992 Jul 10; 585(1–2):267–71. [PubMed: 1380869]

Table 1

Comparisons of Safe vs. Risky Drivers

	Safe Drivers (n=22)	Risky Drivers (n=8)	Statistical Significance
Age (years)	65.1 ± 6.5	70.6 ± 12.9	t [*] = 1.31, p = 0.225
Gender	13M/9W	7M/1F	P ^{**} = 0.13, p = 0.21
Disease duration	4.4 ± 3.7	8.6 ± 6.5	t [*] = 1.53, p = 0.16
H-Y (stage 1/2/2.5/3)	(n=1/6/10/5)	(n=0/3/2/3)	P ^{**} = 0.05, p = 0.69
LED (mg)	562.5 ± 374.3	532.4 ± 263.6	t = 0.52, p = 0.61
Days driven per week	6.0 ± 1.3	6.3 ± 1.2	t = 0.48, p = 0.64
Driving trips per week	12.8 ± 5.7	12.3 ± 5.5	t = 0.22, p = 0.82
Miles driven per week	208.7 ± 223.2	160.2 ± 106.1	t [*] = 0.59, p = 0.57
MoCA	26.0 ± 3.2	26.8 ± 1.3	t [*] = 0.76, p = 0.45
MDS-UPDRS Motor exam	30.5 ± 12.6	32.8 ± 14.8	t = 0.42, p = 0.67
PET measures			
Thalamus PMP	0.0570 ± 0.006	0.0513 ± 0.006	t = 2.43, p = 0.022
Neocortex PMP	0.0246 ± 0.003	0.0233 ± 0.004	t = 1.06, p = 0.29
Striatal DBTZ	2.01 ± 0.29	2.04 ± 0.31	t = 0.23, p = 0.82

* Satterthwaite t-test due to unequal variances

** Fisher's exact test

H-Y = Modified Hoehn and Yahr

LED = Levodopa equivalent dose

MoCA = Montreal Cognitive Assessment