Published in final edited form as:

Neurobiol Aging. 2015 October ; 36(10): 2861–2868. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2015.06.026.

Role of Brain Infarcts in Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia:

Clinicopathological Characterization in the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center Database

Teresa Torralva^{1,2,3,4,*}, Luciano A. Sposato, MD, MBA, FAHA^{5,*}, Patricia M. Riccio, MD⁵, Ezequiel Gleichgerrcht, MD⁶, María Roca, PhD^{1,2,3}, Jon B. Toledo, MD⁷, John Q. Trojanowski, MD⁷, Walter A. Kukull, PhD⁸, Facundo Manes, MD^{1,2,3,4}, and Vladimir Hachinski, CM, MD, FRCPC, DSc⁵

¹Institute of Cognitive Neurology (INECO). Buenos Aires, Argentina

²UDP-INECO Foundation Core on Neuroscience (UIFCoN), Diego Portales University. Santiago, Chile

³Institute of Neurosciences, Favaloro University, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Corresponding author: Luciano A. Sposato, MD MBA FAHA, 339 Windermere Road, Room ALL-130, University Hospital, London Health Sciences Centre, Western University, London ON, Canada, N6A 5A5, Tel (519) 685-8500 Ext 34264, lucianosposato@gmail.com, lsposato@uwo.ca, Fax (519) 663-3196.

*Teresa Torralva and Luciano Sposato equally contributed to qualify as first authors

Author Contributions

Teresa Torralva: study concept and design, analysis and interpretation, drafting of the manuscript.

Luciano A. Sposato: study concept and design, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation, drafting of the manuscript, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, study supervision.

Patricia Riccio: acquisition of data, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Ezequiel Gleichgerrcht: study concept and design, drafting of the manuscript, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

María Roca: study concept and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Jon B. Toledo: study concept and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

John Q. Trojanowski: study concept and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Walter A. Kukull: study concept and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Facundo Manes: critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Vladimir Hachinski: study concept and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

The authors had no conflicts of interest.

Disclosures

Teresa Torralva reports no disclosures.

Luciano A. Sposato reports no disclosures.

Patricia M. Riccio reports no disclosures.

Ezequiel Gleichgerrcht reports no disclosures.

María Roca reports no disclosures.

Jon B. Toledo reports no disclosures.

John Q. Trojanowski Dr. Trojanowski may accrue revenue in the future on patents submitted by the University of Pennsylvania wherein he is co-Inventor and he received revenue from the sale of Avid to Eli Lilly as co-inventor on imaging related patents submitted by the University of Pennsylvania. He receives research support from the NIH, GSK, Janssen and several non-profits.

Walter A. Kukull is funded primarily by a NIH grant U01AG016976 (NACC)

Facundo Manes reports no disclosures.

Vladimir Hachinski reports no disclosures.

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.

⁴Australian Research Council (ACR) Centre of Excellence in Cognition and its Disorders

⁵Department of Clinical Neurological Sciences, London Health Sciences Centre. The Western Ontario University. London, ON, Canada

⁶Department of Neurology, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, USA

⁷Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Perelman School of Medicine, Center for Neurodegenerative Disease Research, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA

⁸Department of Epidemiology, and Director, National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center

Abstract

Diagnosing behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia (bvFTD) in patients with prior history of stroke or with silent brain infarcts on neuroimaging studies can be challenging. Vascular changes in patients with bvFTD are not unusual, but bvFTD tends to be ruled out in the presence of cerebrovascular disease. We aimed to identify the clinical, cognitive, and risk factor profile of bvFTD with coexistent cerebrovascular disease (V-bvFTD). We compared demographic data, clinical diagnoses, vascular risk factors, functional status, and normalized neuropsychological z-scores between patients with V-bvFTD vs. bvFTD without concomitant cerebrovascular disease (NV-bvFTD) from the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Centre database. We included 391 neuropathologically diagnosed cases of frontotemporal lobe degeneration (FTLD). We excluded patients that were diagnosed with aphasic variants of frontotemporal dementia before death. Patients with V-bvFTD (n=62) were older at the time of onset of cognitive decline (71.6 vs. 62.5 years, $p<0.001$) and death (78.7 vs. 69.6, $p<0.001$), more likely to be hypertensive (75.8 vs. 45.7%, $p=0.002$), and to have a history of stroke (21.2 vs. 6.1%, $p=0.007$) than those with NV-bvFTD (n=329). V-bvFTD was often underdiagnosed, affected elderly patients, and had a similar cognitive profile as NV-bvFTD despite the presence of brain infarcts. In the whole cohort, we observed enhanced cognitive performance with increasing age quintiles despite larger proportions of cerebrovascular disease pathology, likely meaning that FTLD-related primary neurodegeneration exerts a stronger impact on cognition than cerebrovascular disease. Coexisting cerebrovascular disease should not preclude the diagnosis of bvFTD.

Keywords

frontotemporal; dementia; vascular; stroke; risk; infarct; cognition; cerebrovascular disease

INTRODUCTION

Frontotemporal lobe degeneration (FTLD) is the term encompassing the underlying pathological findings of frontotemporal dementias (FTD), which share a common process of relatively restricted and rapidly progressive atrophy of the frontal and temporal lobes, displaying a wide array of clinical and neuropathological profiles.[1,2] FTD can express as progressive changes in language or behavior. Language is mainly impaired in the aphasic forms, while behavior is affected in the behavioral variant. Patients with behavioral variant FTD (bvFTD) show marked impairment of cognitive and behavioral functioning, particularly in social cognition. Other common symptoms of bvFTD are executive

dysfunction, inattention, impulsivity, and socially inappropriate behavior.[3] In the presence of a history of stroke or even when silent brain infarcts are detected on neuroimaging studies, distinguishing between FTD and cerebrovascular behavioral syndromes can be remarkably challenging. Moreover, FTD is often ruled out in the presence of cerebrovascular disease. However, as shown in population-based studies, both conditions can coexist.[4,5] Furthermore, since among subjects aged 60 or over the prevalence of covert cerebral infarcts is >3-fold higher than that of symptomatic infarcts, the coexistence of FTD and silent brain infarcts may be even greater than that of FTD and stroke.[6]

Identifying the clinical profile of patients diagnosed with FTLT with coexistent cerebrovascular disease in neuropathology may result in more diagnosed cases and more opportunities to prevent the progression of cerebrovascular disease by treating vascular risk factors. The correct diagnosis bvFTD with coexistent cerebrovascular disease would also ensure the opportunity to provide patients and their families with a more accurate disease prognosis. A better portrayal of these patients would be also beneficial for research purposes.

The problem with most prior FTD studies is that subjects with evident cerebrovascular disease (i.e. brain infarcts on neuroimaging studies) were excluded and, thus, the resulting study populations were possibly subject to selection bias towards the forms of FTD without coexistent cerebrovascular disease. Moreover, most studies were focused on atrophic changes rather than on vascular lesions, which are seldom reported.[7,8]

In the present study, we interrogated the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) database and selected patients with neuropathologically confirmed FTLT without pre-mortem clinical diagnosis of aphasic variants of FTD, to compare demographic data, clinical diagnoses before death, vascular risk factors, functional status (clinical dementia rating), and neuropsychological functioning between cases with and without coexistent cerebrovascular disease.

METHODS

The NACC, established by the National Institute on Ageing (NIA) in 1999 with the aim of enabling collaborative research (U01 AG016976), collects data from 35 past and present NIA funded Alzheimer disease (AD) Centers across the USA. For this study, neuropathological data were downloaded from the NACC Neuropathology Data Set, while clinical data from the same cases were obtained from both the NACC Minimum Data Set (MDS) and the NACC Uniform Data Set (UDS).[9–11] The MDS was implemented in 1999 and contains information on demographic data, clinical manifestations, clinical diagnoses, and neuropathological diagnoses. The UDS replaced the MDS in 2005, by following still living and active cases in the MDS, recruiting new cases, and recording more comprehensive information (i.e. neurological examination, functional status, neuropsychological assessment, and genetic data). Our analysis was performed using records from the September 2013 freeze of the data sets (August 2013 was the last month included). Further information about the NACC database can be found online (<http://www.alz.washington.edu/>).

The initial dataset comprised 7,298 subjects (Figure 1). For most of the neuropathological diagnoses, two categories were available: primary or contributing. Only subjects with primary neuropathological diagnosis of FTLD were selected for this study (n=429). Among them, we excluded 38 patients with pre-mortem clinical diagnosis of primary progressive aphasia (PPA). Therefore, the final cohort comprised 391 patients with pathological diagnosis of primary FTLD but without clinical diagnosis of aphasic variants of FTD. By excluding aphasic variants of FTD, patients with pathology findings of FTLD could most certainly be deemed as either clinical (full expression of dementia) or subclinical (asymptomatic with normal or nearly normal cognition) cases of bvFTD. Clinical diagnoses of the dementia types were done by the referring clinician, based on information obtained through the subject, next of kin, medical records or observation; according to the NACC UDS Coding Guidebook for IVP (version 2.0, February 2008, based on Neary criteria, available at <http://www.alz.washington.edu/NONMEMBER/UDS/DOCS/VER2/ivpguide.pdf>).[12] The reason for excluding patients with PPA was that, due to the prominent language disturbances, the clinical diagnosis of aphasic forms is less challenging than the characterization of behavioral variants. Patients were further classified as whether presenting (V-bvFTD) or not (NV-bvFTD) with concomitant vascular lesions upon pathological examination. Vascular brain lesions included among findings from the neuropathological examination were large macroscopic infarcts, lacunar macroscopic infarcts, microinfarcts, and intraparenchymal hemorrhage. The criteria used by the neuropathologists to assess the vascular features are described in the Neuropathology Diagnosis Coding Guidebook available at <https://www.alz.washington.edu/NONMEMBER/NP/npguide9.pdf>. For the purpose of this study, the presence of at least one of any of the abovementioned vascular lesions was enough for considering patients as having V-bvFTD. As a consequence, NV-bvFTD cases were those without any microinfarcts or macroinfarcts. There were no patients with pathological diagnosis of primary cerebrovascular disease.

We analyzed data regarding sex, age at the onset of cognitive decline, age at the last visit, age at death, and years of education. We also used the available information regarding history of hypertension, diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia, smoking (>100 cigarettes smoked in a lifetime), history of stroke, transient ischemic attack (TIA), atrial fibrillation, congestive heart failure, and coronary artery disease. These clinical variables were only available from the UDS and were obtained by the treating physician (n=164). They were coded as unknown, absent, recent/active or remote/inactive. For analytical purposes, active and inactive categories were merged and compared to the absent category. History of stroke was defined as the composite of any of 3 variables comprised in the original dataset: stroke (variable #2A), history of stroke (variable #6), and temporal relationship between stroke and onset of cognitive impairment (variable #10). A history of coronary artery disease was defined as present if the patient had a history of “heart attack” (variable #1A), “angioplasty/endarterectomy/stent” (variable #1C), or “cardiac bypass surgery” (variable #1D). On the basis of underlying neuropathology, FTLD cases were classified as FTLD-tau if they were characterized by tau pathology while those positive for ubiquitin and TAR DNA-binding protein 43 were classified as FTLD-U.

We used the NACC cognitive battery for assessing cognitive status in the last visit prior to death.[10] The battery comprised the following domains and tests: (1) Broad cognitive status: Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE)[13]; (2) Executive functions: Digit Span Backward (Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised)[14], Digit Symbol Coding (Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised)[15], and Trail Making Test, Part B[16]; (3) Memory: immediate and delayed recall (Story A, Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised)[14]; (4) Language: animal and vegetable list generation (verbal fluency)[17] and Boston Naming Test (naming)[18]; (5) Attention: Digit Span Forward (Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised)[14] and Trail Making Test, Part A[19]. The dementia-related functional status was assessed according to the Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR) comprising memory, orientation, judgment, community affairs, home and hobbies, behavior and personality, language, global impairment, and overall mean score.[20]

Statistical Analysis

We compared demographics, risk factor profiles, and vascular comorbidities, CDR scores, results of neuropsychological assessments, and neuropathological findings between V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD cases. All the results of neuropsychological assessments were normalized (z scores) for age and sex.[21] We evaluated the proportion of cerebrovascular disease pathology across increasing age quintiles and we used the Jonckheere-Terpstra test to assess the level of significance of the observed trends. We employed a similar approach to assess trends in cognitive measures across age quintiles. The χ^2 and Fisher exact tests were used to compare categorical variables, and the Mann-Whitney *U* and Student *t*-tests were used to compare continuous variables for the non-normally and normally distributed variables. All tests were 2-tailed and a *p*-value <0.05 was deemed statistically significant for this analysis. We used IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 for Macintosh (IBM Corp.) for all statistical analyses.

RESULTS

Of the 391 cases of neuropathologically confirmed bvFTD, 62 and 329 patients were classified as V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD, respectively. The comparison of demographic data, vascular risk factors, and comorbidities between V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD is shown in Table 1. Patients with V-bvFTD were older at the time of onset of cognitive decline (71.6 ± 12.1 vs. 62.5 ± 12.0 years, $p < 0.001$) and at death (78.7 ± 11.3 vs. 69.6 ± 11.5 , $p < 0.001$), were more likely to be hypertensive (75.8 vs. 45.7%, $p < 0.001$), and to have a history of stroke (21.2 vs. 6.1%, $p = 0.004$) compared to those with NV-bvFTD. As expected, large infarcts (29.0 vs. 0.0%, $p < 0.001$), lacunar infarcts (59.7 vs. 0.0%, $p < 0.001$) and microinfarcts (40.3 vs. 0.0%, $p < 0.001$) were more frequent among the V-bvFTD group than among NV-bvFTD subjects. The proportion of patients with cerebrovascular disease pathology increased with each age quintile ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 2, Panel A). FTLD-tau pathology predominated over FTLD-U in both V-bvFTD (85.2%) and NV-bvFTD (79.9%), without differences between groups ($p = 0.36$).

The last cognitive assessment before death showed that V-bvFTD patients had better performances in only one test involving executive functioning (normalized Trail Making

Test B -1.82 ± 1.87 vs. -3.33 ± 1.84 , $p=0.022$) and one test assessing naming (animal list -1.96 ± 1.11 vs. -2.56 ± 0.94 , $p=0.005$) than NV-bvFTD subjects (Table 2). There were no differences in the sum of boxes of the CDR or on any of its items between the two groups (Table 2). Interestingly, almost all measures of cognitive function and functional status improved across increasing age quintiles (Figure 2, Panels A–E).

Table 3 shows the clinical diagnoses given to the patients during follow-up. Some cases received multiple diagnoses and thus, the addition of the frequency of different diagnoses does not equal 100%. Dementias with Lewy bodies and of undetermined cause were more frequently diagnosed among patients with cerebrovascular disease than among those without. There were no other major significant differences in regards to clinical diagnoses between groups.

Regarding FTLD types, there were no differences between V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD, with the exception of primary age-related tauopathy-argyrophilic grain disease (PART-AGD), which was most frequently diagnosed among patients with V-bvFTD (29.0 vs. 10.9%, $p<0.001$) (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Patients with V-bvFTD represent a significant diagnostic challenge in clinical practice. As some neuropsychological findings (e.g. inattention and executive dysfunction) can be explained by cerebrovascular disease, diagnosing bvFTD in subjects with a prior stroke or with brain infarcts on neuroimaging studies may be arduous. Moreover, patients with evident cerebrovascular disease are excluded from FTD studies, which can potentially lead to bias when characterizing the clinical, pathological, and prognostic profile of FTD in the medical literature.[7,8] These knowledge gaps could ultimately result in patients being misdiagnosed. Identifying the clinicopathological profile of V-bvFTD may likely result in more accurate diagnoses and better treatment opportunities. In the present anatomopathological study comprising 391 cases from the NACC, we aimed to characterize the demographic and vascular risk factor profiles, functional status, and neuropsychological functioning of neuropathologically confirmed cases of V-bvFTD.

Patients with V-bvFTD were older at the time of onset of cognitive decline and at death, were more likely to be hypertensive, and over three-fold more prone to have a history of stroke than those with NV-bvFTD. There were almost no differences regarding the neuropsychological and functional status of both groups. Cognition and functional status improved with increasing age quintiles in the whole cohort. The clinical diagnosis of bvFTD was made twice as frequently among patients with NV-bvFTD as among those with V-bvFTD. Surprisingly, probable or possible AD was diagnosed twice as frequent in V-bvFTD subjects than in those with NV-bvFTD. Moreover, half of V-bvFTD cases were clinically diagnosed with AD. There were no differences in the frequency of tau pathology between both forms of bvFTD. PART-AGD was three times more frequent in the V-bvFTD group than among NV-bvFTD cases. As expected, all types of infarcts were more prevalent among the V-bvFTD group and the proportion of patients with cerebrovascular disease escalated across increasing age quintiles.

Patients with V-bvFTD were, on average, 9 years older at the onset of cognitive decline and at death than those with NV-bvFTD. Similar findings were described for other neurodegenerative diseases such as AD and α -synucleinopathy.[22] This finding is likely explained by more severe and rapid neurodegenerative processes occurring in patients with pure NV-bvFTD. A younger onset may be a marker of more aggressive neurodegeneration. We were not able to test the association between less severe neurodegeneration and more frequent cerebrovascular disease because there were no available measures of the burden of disease pathology for confirmed cases of bvFTD. However, we were able to show that despite larger proportions of cerebrovascular disease pathology across increasing age quintiles, cognitive performance was better with older age, meaning that more severe primary FTLD neurodegenerative processes likely explained the worse cognitive functioning of younger patients. Similarly, an association between greater presence of cerebrovascular disease pathology and lower neurofibrillary tangle Braak stages was shown in AD cases from the NACC and from other cohorts.[22,23] Furthermore, patients with earlier onset FTLD show more severe atrophy of the frontal and temporal lobes than elderly FTLD patients.[24] Accordingly, The PART-AGD, a subtype of FTLD affecting very old individuals, usually showing milder degrees of neurodegeneration, was more frequent in patients with V-bvFTD (29.0%) compared to those with NV-bvFTD (10.9%).[25,26] We therefore hypothesize that patients who present as V-bvFTD exhibit a slower neurodegenerative disease process, which allows them to live longer. Further, the longer life span of V-bvFTD relative to NV-bvFTD patients may make them more prone to developing hypertension and other vascular risk factors which subsequently lead to cerebrovascular lesions. Cerebrovascular disease pathology in FTLD patients might thus partially lower the threshold for dementia but not significantly enough to equal the degree of cognitive dysfunction caused by degeneration itself.[27] The improvement in cognitive tasks with increasing age may be also explained by selection bias. By dying earlier, NV-bvFTD patients, who harbor the more toxic form of the disease, may have contributed less to the overall changes in scores across increasing quintiles.

The neuropsychological findings of bvFTD subjects in our study are consistent with the classical cognitive profile of patients with bvFTD, typically including impaired attention and executive functions.[28] Age and sex normalized cognitive performance and functional status of patients with V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD were similar. We therefore propose a hypothetical model capable of explaining the present findings in which V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD represent extreme phenotypes of the various possible combinations of degrees of primary FTLD neurodegenerative processes and proportions of cerebrovascular disease pathology (Figure 3). Because of this, the highest proportion of cerebrovascular disease pathology in the V-bvFTD group combined with likely lower frequencies of severe neurodegeneration, may have resulted in a similar extent of age-normalized cognitive dysfunction when compared NV-bvFTD patients who had no cerebrovascular disease and probably the most severe neurodegenerative changes.[22,29–33]

There are some limitations to the present study that should be taken into consideration. First, although presenting a large size sample, the proportion of available neuropsychological assessments and clinical diagnoses from the NACC database were limited. Also, the battery for neuropsychological testing used in the NACC is not comprehensive, although it covers

all the clinically significant cognitive domains. The lack of neuropsychological assessments for some patients could have been the consequence of selection bias (e.g. patients with more severe dementia not being assessed at later stages of the disease) and may hence not be representative of the overall cohort. Second, none of the used cognitive measures constitute a specific tool for evaluating patients with bvFTD and more specific tools could give more information related to their cognition. For instance, recently developed measures such as the Frontotemporal Rating Scale could have helped to better characterize the clinical profile of the participants.[34] Despite the limitations regarding the cognitive and functional assessments, the scope of our study was broader, comprising demographic data, vascular risk factors profiles, clinical diagnoses, and neuropathological examinations. Finally, we did not have information related to the localization of brain infarcts and the genetic status of bvFTD patients, which could have enriched the analysis and the interpretation of our results.

In conclusion, in our study of 391 neuropathologically confirmed cases of bvFTD from the NACC, we assessed the role of cerebrovascular disease in bvFTD. Our findings suggest that V-bvFTD is characterized by less severe neurodegeneration, thus enabling the additive effect of vascular risk factors to express later in life. Accordingly, older age, a prominent vascular risk factor profile, a history of stroke or TIA, and the presence of brain infarcts on neuroimaging studies, rather than precluding the clinical diagnosis of FTD should prompt the initiation of the most intense vascular prevention strategy with the aim of reducing the extent of neuropsychological and functional impairment of patients with this apparently distinctive entity.

Acknowledgments

The NACC database is supported by U01 AG016976 and the Penn ADCC by AG10124. JQT is the William Maul Measey-Truman G. Schnabel, Jr., Professor of Geriatric Medicine and Gerontology. The authors appreciate the ongoing support of Creighton Phelps, PhD, and Marcelle Morrison-Bogorad, PhD, from the NIA in developing the Uniform Data Set and the cooperation of all NIA-supported ADC directors and their staff in its implementation. Thanks to all the Clinical, Neuropathology and Data Management Core and Leaders and their associates for their input and responses to many surveys and questionnaires.

The NACC database is funded by NIA/NIH Grant U01 AG016976. NACC data are contributed by the NIA funded ADCs: P30 AG019610 (PI Eric Reiman, MD), P30 AG013846 (PI Neil Kowall, MD), P50 AG008702 (PI Scott Small, MD), P50 AG025688 (PI Allan Levey, MD, PhD), P30 AG010133 (PI Andrew Saykin, PsyD), P50 AG005146 (PI Marilyn Albert, PhD), P50 AG005134 (PI Bradley Hyman, MD, PhD), P50 AG016574 (PI Ronald Petersen, MD, PhD), P50 AG005138 (PI Mary Sano, PhD), P30 AG008051 (PI Steven Ferris, PhD), P30 AG013854 (PI M. Marsel Mesulam, MD), P30 AG008017 (PI Jeffrey Kaye, MD), P30 AG010161 (PI David Bennett, MD), P30 AG010129 (PI Charles DeCarli, MD), P50 AG016573 (PI Frank LaFerla, PhD), P50 AG016570 (PI David Teplow, PhD), P50 AG005131 (PI Douglas Galasko, MD), P50 AG023501 (PI Bruce Miller, MD), P30 AG035982 (PI Russell Swerdlow, MD), P30 AG028383 (PI Linda Van Eldik, PhD), P30 AG010124 (PI John Trojanowski, MD, PhD), P50 AG005133 (PI Oscar Lopez, MD), P50 AG005142 (PI Helena Chui, MD), P30 AG012300 (PI Roger Rosenberg, MD), P50 AG005136 (PI Thomas Montine, MD, PhD), P50 AG033514 (PI Sanjay Asthana, MD, FRCP), and P50 AG005681 (PI John Morris, MD)."

References

1. Mackenzie IR, Neumann M, Bigio EH, Cairns NJ, Alafuzoff I, Kril J, Mioshi E, Hsieh S, Savage S, et al. Nomenclature and nosology for neuropathologic subtypes of frontotemporal lobar degeneration: an update. *Acta Neuropathol.* 2010; 119:1–4. [PubMed: 19924424]
2. Rademakers R, Neumann M, Mackenzie IR. Advances in understanding the molecular basis of frontotemporal dementia. *Nat Rev Neurol.* 2012; 8:423–434. [PubMed: 22732773]

3. Rascovsky K, Hodges JR, Knopman D, Mendez MF, Kramer JH, Neuhaus J, et al. Sensitivity of revised diagnostic criteria for the behavioural variant of frontotemporal dementia. *Brain*. 2011; 134:2456–2477. [PubMed: 21810890]
4. Ratnavalli E, Brayne C, Dawson K, Hodges JR. The prevalence of frontotemporal dementia. *Neurology*. 2002; 58:1615–1621. [PubMed: 12058088]
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). . Prevalence of stroke-United States, 2006–2010. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2012; 61:379–382. [PubMed: 22622094]
6. Price TR, Manolio TA, Kronmal RA, Kittner SJ, Yue NC, Robbins J, et al. Silent brain infarction on magnetic resonance imaging and neurological abnormalities in community-dwelling older adults. The Cardiovascular Health Study. CHS Collaborative Research Group. *Stroke*. 1997; 28:1158–1164. [PubMed: 9183343]
7. Whitwell JL, Josephs KA, Rossor MN, Stevens JM, Revesz T, Holton JL, et al. *Arch Neurol*. 2005; 62:1402–1408. [PubMed: 16157747]
8. Davies RR, Kipps CM, Mitchell J, Kril JJ, Halliday GM, Hodges JR. Progression in frontotemporal dementia: identifying a benign behavioral variant by magnetic resonance imaging. *Arch Neurol*. 2006; 63:1627–1631. [PubMed: 17101833]
9. Beekly DL, Ramos EM, van Belle G, Deitrich W, Clark AD, Jacka ME, Kukull WA. NIA-Alzheimer's Disease Centers. The National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) Database: an Alzheimer disease database. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2004; 18:270–277. [PubMed: 15592144]
10. Beekly DL, Ramos EM, Lee WW, Deitrich WD, Jacka ME, Wu J, et al. NIA Alzheimer's Disease Centers. The National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) database: the Uniform Data Set. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2007; 21:249–258. [PubMed: 17804958]
11. Weintraub S, Salmon D, Mercaldo N, Ferris S, Graff-Radford NR, Chui H, et al. The Alzheimer's Disease Centers' Uniform Data Set (UDS): the neuropsychologic test battery. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2009; 23:91–101. [PubMed: 19474567]
12. Neary D, Snowden JS, Gustafson L, Passant U, Stuss D, Black S, et al. Frontotemporal lobar degeneration: a consensus on clinical diagnostic criteria. *Neurology*. 1998; 51:1546–1554. [PubMed: 9855500]
13. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res*. 1975; 12:189–98. [PubMed: 1202204]
14. Wechsler, D.; Stone, CP. WMS-R: Wechsler Memory Scale–Revised Manual. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 1987.
15. Wechsler, D. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 1987.
16. Arbuthnott K, Frank J. Trail making test, part B as a measure of executive control: validation using a set-switching paradigm. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 2000; 22:518–528. [PubMed: 10923061]
17. Morris JC, Heyman A, Mohs RC, Hughes JP, van Belle G, Fillenbaum G, et al. The Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD). Part I. Clinical and neuropsychological assessment of Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology*. 1989; 39:1159–1165. [PubMed: 2771064]
18. Kaplan, E.; Goodglass, H.; Weintraub, S. The Boston Naming Test. Philadelphia, PA: Lea and Febiger; 1983.
19. Reitan, RM.; Wolfson, D. The Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Test Battery. 2. Tucson, AZ: Neuropsychology Press; 1985.
20. Morris JC. The Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR): current version and scoring rules. *Neurology*. 1993; 43:2412–2414. [PubMed: 8232972]
21. Shirk SD, Mitchell MB, Shaughnessy LW, Sherman JC, Locascio JJ, Weintraub S, et al. A web-based normative calculator for the uniform data set (UDS) neuropsychological test battery. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2011; 3:32. [PubMed: 22078663]
22. Toledo JB, Arnold SE, Raible K, Brettschneider J, Xie SX, Grossman M, et al. Contribution of cerebrovascular disease in autopsy confirmed neurodegenerative disease cases in the National Alzheimer's Coordinating Centre. *Brain*. 2013; 136:2697–2706. [PubMed: 23842566]
23. Petrovitch H, Ross GW, Steinhorn SC, Abbott RD, Markesbery W, Davis D, et al. AD lesions and infarcts in demented and non-demented Japanese-American men. *Ann Neurol*. 2005; 57:98–103. [PubMed: 15562458]

24. Baborie A, Griffiths TD, Jaros E, Momeni P, McKeith IG, Burn DJ, et al. Frontotemporal dementia in elderly individuals. *Arch Neurol*. 2012; 69:1052–1060. [PubMed: 22529248]
25. Jellinger KA, Attems J. Neurofibrillary tangle-predominant dementia: comparison with classical Alzheimer disease. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2007; 113:107–117. [PubMed: 17089134]
26. Crary JF1, Trojanowski JQ, Schneider JA, Abisambra JF, Abner EL, Alafuzoff I, et al. Primary age-related tauopathy (PART): a common pathology associated with human aging. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2014; 128:755–766. [PubMed: 25348064]
27. Jellinger KA. Prevalence and impact of cerebrovascular lesions in Alzheimer and lewy body diseases. *Neurodegener Dis*. 2010; 7:112–115. [PubMed: 20173339]
28. Garcin B, Lillo P, Hornberger M, Piguet O, Dawson K, Nestor PJ, et al. Determinants of survival in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia. *Neurology*. 2009; 73:1656–1661. [PubMed: 19917988]
29. Baborie A, Griffiths TD, Jaros E, McKeith IG, Burn DJ, Richardson A, et al. Pathological correlates of frontotemporal lobar degeneration in the elderly. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2011; 121:365–371. [PubMed: 20978901]
30. Chui HC, Zarow C, Mack WJ, Ellis WG, Zheng L, Jagust WJ, et al. Cognitive impact of subcortical vascular and Alzheimer's disease pathology. *Ann Neurol*. 2006; 60:677–687. [PubMed: 17192928]
31. De Reuck JL, Deramecourt V, Cordonnier C, Leys D, Pasquier F, Maurage CA. Cerebrovascular lesions in patients with frontotemporal lobar degeneration: a neuropathological study. *Neurodegener Dis*. 2012; 9:170–175. [PubMed: 22377662]
32. Esiri MM, Nagy Z, Smith MZ, Barnettson L, Smith AD. Cerebrovascular disease and threshold for dementia in the early stages of Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet*. 1999; 354:919–920. [PubMed: 10489957]
33. Norton S, Matthews FE, Barnes DE, Yaffe K, Brayne C. Potential for primary prevention of Alzheimer's disease: an analysis of population-based data. *Lancet Neurol*. 2014; 13:788–794. [PubMed: 25030513]
34. Hornberger M, Hodges JR. Clinical staging and disease progression in frontotemporal dementia. *Neurology*. 2010; 74:1591–1597. [PubMed: 20479357]

HIGHLIGHTS

Compared to cases without cerebrovascular disease, patients with behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia presenting with brain infarcts on neuropathological examination:

- were older at the time of onset of cognitive decline and at death,
- were more likely to be hypertensive,
- were more than three-fold more prone to have a history of stroke,
- showed almost no differences regarding the neuropsychological and functional status,

What are the practical implications of our findings?

Our findings suggest that bvFTD with concomitant cerebrovascular disease may be likely characterized by less severe neurodegeneration and thus enabling the additive effect of vascular risk factors to express later in life.

Older age, a prominent vascular risk factor profile, a history of stroke or TIA, or the presence of brain infarcts on neuroimaging studies, should not preclude the clinical diagnosis of bvFTD. Physicians should be aware of the relatively frequent association between bvFTD and cerebrovascular disease.

Figure 1.

Description of the Study Cohort

MDS: minimum data set. **UDS:** uniform data set. **FTLD:** frontotemporal lobe degeneration.**PPA:** primary progressive aphasia. **V-bvFTD:** behavioral variant frontotemporal dementiawith cerebrovascular disease. **NV-bvFTD:** behavioral variant frontotemporal dementiawithout cerebrovascular disease. **CV:** cardiovascular.

Figure 2. Proportion with Cerebrovascular Disease, Neuropsychological Performance and Functional Status across Age Quintiles

Panel A shows the proportion of cerebrovascular disease pathology (e.g. large infarcts, lacunes, or microinfarcts) across age quintiles, general cognitive performance (MMSE) and functional status (CDR Sum of boxes) across age quintiles. Panels B, C, D, and E show the trends for tests of executive functioning, memory, language, and attention, respectively. P-values were obtained by using the Jonckheere-Terpstra test for trends. Red and black lines represent significant ($p < 0.05$) and non-significant ($p \geq 0.05$) trends, respectively.

Q: Quintile. **MMSE:** Mini Mental State Examination. **CDR:** Clinical Dementia Rating.

Figure 3. Hypothetical Model Explaining the Relationship between FTLD Primary Neurodegeneration, Cerebrovascular Disease, and Cognitive Impairment

The hypothetical model shows that milder FTLD neurodegenerative processes result in a longer life span, ultimately leading to a greater exposure to vascular risk factors and cerebrovascular disease (Panel A). According to this model, V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD represent extreme phenotypes of the variety of possible combinations of degrees of primary FTLD neurodegenerative processes and proportions of cerebrovascular disease pathology (Panel B). Primary FTLD neurodegenerative processes may have a greater impact on cognitive performance than cerebrovascular disease.

FTLD: frontotemporal lobe degeneration. **CVD:** cerebrovascular disease. **V-bvFTD:** behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia with cerebrovascular disease. **NV-bvFTD:** behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia without cerebrovascular disease.

Table 1

Comparison of Demographic Data, Vascular Risk factors and Comorbidities between V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD

	V-bvFTD	NV-bvFTD	p-value
Demographics			
Age of onset of cognitive decline, mean $\pm$ SD (years)	71.6 $\pm$ 12.1	62.5 $\pm$ 12.0	< 0.001
Age at last assessment, mean $\pm$ SD (years)	78.3 $\pm$ 11.6	69.6 $\pm$ 11.6	< 0.001
Age at death, mean $\pm$ SD (years)	78.7 $\pm$ 11.3	69.6 $\pm$ 11.5	< 0.001
Years of education, % (n)	15.2 $\pm$ 2.9	14.8 $\pm$ 2.9	0.30
Male Sex, % (n)	48.4 (30/62)	58.1 (191/329)	0.16
Vascular Risk Factors			
Hypertension, % (n)	75.8 (25/33)	45.7 (59/129)	0.002
Diabetes mellitus, % (n)	18.2 (6/33)	8.5 (11/130)	0.10
Hyperlipidemia, % (n)	42.4 (14/33)	40.6 (52/128)	0.85
Smoking, % (n)	45.2 (14/31)	50.0 (64/128)	0.63
Atrial fibrillation, % (n)	12.1 (4/33)	6.9 (9/131)	0.32
Comorbidities			
Coronary artery disease, % (n)	18.2 (6/33)	10.7 (14/131)	0.24
Congestive heart failure, % (n)	3.0 (1/33)	1.5 (2/131)	0.57
Prior TIA, % (n)	8.1 (5/62)	2.3 (3/131)	0.06
Prior stroke, % (n)	21.2 (7/33)	6.1 (8/131)	0.007

Table 2

Comparison of Neuropsychological Performance and Functional Status of V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD

	V-bvFTD	NV-bvFTD	<i>p</i> -value
General Cognitive Function			
Mini Mental State Examination, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-8.31 $\pm$ 8.0	-8.76 $\pm$ 7.19	0.64
Executive Functions			
Digit Symbol Coding, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-1.62 $\pm$ 1.64	-1.96 $\pm$ 1.47	0.48
Digit Span Backward (Trials), mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-1.23 $\pm$ 1.33	-1.49 $\pm$ 1.08	0.37
Trail Making Test - B, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-1.82 $\pm$ 1.87	-3.33 $\pm$ 1.84	0.022
Memory			
Immediate memory, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-1.60 $\pm$ 1.54	-1.93 $\pm$ 1.29	0.37
Delayed memory, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-1.74 $\pm$ 1.48	-1.66 $\pm$ 1.17	0.84
Language (verbal fluency and naming)			
Boston, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-3.11 $\pm$ 3.34	-2.75 $\pm$ 3.11	0.68
Animal list, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-1.96 $\pm$ 1.11	-2.56 $\pm$ 0.94	0.005
Vegetable list, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-1.45 $\pm$ 1.31	-1.85 $\pm$ 1.14	0.20
Attention			
Digit Span Forward (Trials), mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-0.72 $\pm$ 1.67	-1.44 $\pm$ 1.36	0.054
Trail Making Test - A, mean $\pm$ SD z-score	-2.98 $\pm$ 2.85	-3.58 $\pm$ 3.11	0.51
Clinical Dementia Rating			
Memory, mean $\pm$ SD	0.86 $\pm$ 1.17	0.63 $\pm$ 1.06	0.13
Orientation, mean $\pm$ SD	0.83 $\pm$ 1.20	0.62 $\pm$ 1.08	0.20
Judgment, mean $\pm$ SD	0.89 $\pm$ 1.20	0.80 $\pm$ 1.19	0.58
Community affairs, mean $\pm$ SD	0.79 $\pm$ 1.15	0.84 $\pm$ 1.19	0.78
Home and hobbies, mean $\pm$ SD	0.94 $\pm$ 1.26	0.85 $\pm$ 1.24	0.62
Personal care, mean $\pm$ SD	0.78 $\pm$ 1.24	0.80 $\pm$ 1.21	0.89
Behavior and Personality, mean $\pm$ SD	0.40 $\pm$ 0.94	0.34 $\pm$ 0.84	0.63
Language, mean $\pm$ SD	0.30 $\pm$ 0.84	0.35 $\pm$ 0.88	0.68
Global impairment, mean $\pm$ SD	0.84 $\pm$ 1.15	0.76 $\pm$ 1.17	0.63
Sum of boxes, mean $\pm$ SD	9.8 $\pm$ 6.5	11.6 $\pm$ 5.4	0.13

Table 3

Comparison of Pre-mortem Clinical Diagnoses and Neuropathology between V-bvFTD and NV-bvFTD

	V-bvFTD	NV-bvFTD	p-value
Clinical Diagnosis			
Normal cognition, % (n)	0.0 (0/62)	0.8 (9/329)	0.19
Non-aphasic frontotemporal dementia, % (n)	45.2 (28/62)	40.4 (133/329)	0.49
Cerebrovascular disease, % (n)	3.2 (2/62)	2.4 (8/329)	0.72
Probable or Possible Alzheimer disease, % (n)	27.4 (17/62)	22.2 (73/329)	0.37
Dementia with Lewy bodies, % (n)	8.1 (5/62)	1.5 (5/329)	0.003
Progressive supranuclear palsy, % (n)	9.7 (6/62)	7.5 (25/329)	0.58
Parkinson's disease, % (n)	0.0 (0/62)	1.5 (5/329)	0.33
Corticobasal degeneration, % (n)	11.3 (7/62)	9.1 (30/329)	0.59
Dementia secondary other causes, % (n)	16.1 (10/62)	16.4 (54/329)	0.95
Dementia of undetermined cause, % (n)	4.8 (3/62)	1.2 (4/329)	0.0483
Neuropathology			
FTLD Groups			
FTLD-tau, % (n)	85.2 (46/54)	79.9 (222/278)	0.36
FTLD-U, % (n)	14.8 (8/54)	20.1 (56/278)	
FTLD Types			
Undetermined FTLD-tau, % (n)	4.8 (3/62)	7.9 (26/329)	0.40
FTLD-U, % (n)	12.9 (8/62)	17.0 (56/329)	0.42
Non specified FTLD, % (n)	12.9 (8/62)	15.5 (51/329)	0.60
Corticobasal degeneration, % (n)	8.1 (5/62)	13.4 (44/329)	0.25
Pick, % (n)	12.9 (8/62)	15.2 (50/329)	0.64
Progressive supranuclear palsy, % (n)	19.4 (12/62)	20.1 (66/329)	0.90
Primary age-related tauopathy - AGD, % (n)	29.0 (18/62)	10.9 (36/329)	< 0.001
Neurofibrillary Tangles & Amyloid Deposition			
Braak & Braak V and VI, % (n)	6.7 (4/60)	3.2 (10/308)	0.21
CERAD C, % (n)	5.0 (3/60)	2.7 (8/298)	0.34
Vascular Findings			
Large infarcts, % (n)	29.0 (18/62)	0.0 (0/322)	<0.001
Lacunar infarcts, % (n)	59.7 (37/62)	0.0 (0/322)	<0.001
Microinfarcts, % (n)	40.3 (25/62)	0.0 (0/322)	<0.001
Other Neuropathological Findings			
Hippocampal sclerosis, % (n)	8.5 (5/59)	9.4 (30/318)	0.82
Amyloid angiopathy, % (n)	10.0 (6/60)	6.0 (19/317)	0.25

Diagnoses may overlap since the addition of the frequency of different diagnoses does not equal 100%.

CERAD: Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's disease. **AGD:** argyrophilic grain disease.