



Dynamic association between AT(N) profile and cognition mediated by cortical thickness in Alzheimer's continuum

Jae-Won Jang, Yeshin Kim, Seongheon Kim, Sang Won Park, Sung Ok Kwon, Young Ho Park, Jae-Sung Lim, Young Chul Youn, Sung Hun Kim, SangYun Kim, Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative,



PII: S2213-1582(20)30119-4
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102282>
Reference: YNICAL 102282

To appear in: *NeuroImage: Clinical*

Received Date: 13 October 2019
Revised Date: 2 May 2020
Accepted Date: 4 May 2020

Please cite this article as: J-W. Jang, Y. Kim, S. Kim, S.W. Park, S.O. Kwon, Y.H. Park, J-S. Lim, Y.C. Youn, S. Hun Kim, S. Kim, Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative, Dynamic association between AT(N) profile and cognition mediated by cortical thickness in Alzheimer's continuum, *NeuroImage: Clinical* (2020), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102282>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. 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.

1 **Dynamic association between AT(N) profile and cognition**
2 **mediated by cortical thickness in Alzheimer's continuum**

3

4 Jae-Won Jang^{a,b}, Yeshin Kim^{a,b}, Seongheon Kim^{a,b}, Sang Won Park^b, Sung Ok Kwon^c, Young Ho
5 Park^{d,e}, Jae-Sung Lim^f, Young Chul Youn^g, Sung Hun Kim^{a,b}, SangYun Kim^{d,e} and the Alzheimer's
6 Disease Neuroimaging Initiative¹

7 ^aDepartment of Neurology, Kangwon National University Hospital, Chuncheon, Republic of Korea

8 ^bKangwon National University School of Medicine, Chuncheon, Republic of Korea

9 ^cBiomedical Research Institute, Kangwon National University Hospital, Chuncheon, Republic of
10 Korea

11 ^dDepartment of Neurology, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital, Seongnam, Republic of
12 Korea

13 ^eDepartment of Neurology, Seoul National University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

14 ^fDepartment of Neurology, Hallym University Sacred Heart Hospital, Hallym University College of
15 Medicine, Anyang, Republic of Korea.

16 ^gDepartment of Neurology, Chung-Ang University Hospital, Chung-Ang University College of
17 Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

18

19 E-mail addresses:

20 Jae-Won Jang: light26@kangwon.ac.kr

21 Yeshin Kim: yeshins@gmail.com

22 Seongheon Kim: dr.kim94@gmail.com

23 Sang Won Park: chicwon229@kangwon.ac.kr

24 Sung Ok Kwon: kamelon@hanmail.net

25 Jae-Sung Lim: rophe.pneuma@gmail.com

26 Young Ho Park: kumimesy@snubh.org

27 Sung Hun Kim: marinen@kangwon.ac.kr

28 Young Chul Youn: neudoc@cau.ac.kr

29

30 Correspondence to:

31 SangYun Kim, MD, PhD, Department of Neurology, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital, 82,

32 Gumi-ro 173 Beon-gil, Bundang-gu, Seongnam-si, Gyeonggi-do 13620, Korea. Tel.: +82 31 787

33 7462; Fax: +82 31 787 4059; E-mail: neuroksy@snu.ac.kr

34

35 *Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease

36 Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.usc.edu). As such, the investigators within the

37 ADNI contributed to the design and implementation of ADNI and/or provided data but did not

38 participate in analysis or writing of this report. A complete listing of ADNI investigators can be found

39 at: http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/how_to_apply/ADNI_Acknowledgement_List.pdf

40

41 **Abstract**

42 **Background:** The recently-proposed National Institute on Aging and Alzheimer's Association
43 research framework organizes Alzheimer's disease (AD) biomarkers based on
44 amyloid/tau/neurodegeneration (AT(N)). This study investigated the mediating effect of structural
45 change in brain MRI on changes in cognitive function according to initial AT(N) profiles.

46 **Methods:** We included 576 subjects (cognitively unimpaired (N=136), mild cognitive impairment
47 (N=294), dementia (N=146)) from the Alzheimer's disease Neuroimaging Initiative study. The
48 parallel-process latent growth curve model was applied to test the mediational effect of cortical
49 thickness growth trajectory between the initial AT(N) profiles and cognitive growth trajectory.

50 **Results:** In Alzheimer's continuum, only the A+T+(N)+ profile showed a mediational effect of the
51 cortical thickness growth trajectory. A+T-(N)- was not sufficient to induce direct or indirect effects on
52 cognitive dysfunction, and A+T+(N)- showed a significant direct path from an altered cortical
53 thickness to cognitive decline.

54 **Conclusion:** The sequential effect between changes in brain MRI and cognition varied by baseline
55 AT(N) profile, suggesting the dynamic changes in the relationships among biomarkers in the current
56 cascade model.

57
58 **Keywords:** Mild cognitive impairment, Alzheimer's disease, CSF biomarkers, Brain MRI, Beta
59 amyloid, Tau, Structural equation modeling, Parallel process latent growth curve model

60 **1.Introduction**

61 Alzheimer's disease (AD) is the most common cause of cognitive impairment among the elderly.

62 Recently, the pathophysiologic sequential changes in amyloid- β ($A\beta$), pathologic tau, and

63 neurodegeneration were conceptualized as the [AT(N)] system constituting a new biomarker

64 definition of AD (Jack et al., 2018).

65 The cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) has been used to detect and track $A\beta$, pathologic tau, and

66 neurodegeneration in AD across clinical stages (Olsson et al., 2016). The best identified example

67 includes CSF measurement of the 42-aminoacid form of $A\beta$ ($A\beta_{1-42}$), which is found at low

68 concentration in subjects with AD because of cortical amyloid deposition, phosphorylated tau (P-tau)

69 at high concentration reflecting cortical tangle formation (Seppälä et al., 2012), and total tau (T-tau) at

70 high concentration due to cortical neuronal injury (de Souza et al., 2012). According to the AT(N)

71 system, CSF $A\beta$ abnormality reflects "Alzheimer's pathophysiologic change," CSF $A\beta$ and P-tau

72 abnormality reflects "AD," and the neurodegeneration is indicated by abnormal T-tau (Jack et al.,

73 2018). The National Institute on Aging and Alzheimer's Association (NIA-AA) also adopted atrophy

74 observed on structural MRI as a neurodegenerative marker of AD along with hypometabolism on

75 [18F]-fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG)-positron emission tomography (PET) (Jack et al., 2018). Among the

76 neurodegenerative markers, brain MRI has been consistently reported to be effective in detecting

77 structural change in dementia (Jack et al., 1997) as well as predicting MCI progression (Visser et al.,

78 1999), but the temporal effects of these biomarkers on cognitive decline have not been studied with

79 the mediational hypothesis in a multimodal framework.

80 The "modified amyloid cascade hypothesis" involves sequential change from amyloidosis, pathologic

81 tau, and neurodegeneration to cognitive decline (Jack and Holtzman, 2013). Some studies have

82 attempted to explain the possible causal relationships between these biomarkers and their effect on

83 cognition using longitudinal mediation models (Fletcher et al., 2018; Mattsson et al., 2015; Villeneuve

84 et al., 2014). To test and explore the hypothesis on the role of biomarkers in terms of the AT(N)

85 system, these modeling approaches can be applied in the sequence of events. The current study used a
86 parallel-process latent growth curve model (PPLGCM) (Cheong et al., 2003) to identify the mediating
87 effects of change in an AD-signature cortical region of interest for pathways between AT(N) profiles
88 determined by CSF components of A β , t-tau and p-tau and cognitive change, in each of the
89 Alzheimer's continuum biomarker profiles (i.e. A+) in the AT(N) schema. Our hypothesis was that the
90 mediating role of structural MRI in the assumed sequential chain would vary according to the
91 different AT(N) profiles at baseline.

92

93 **2.Methods**

94 **2.1. Subjects**

95 Data used in this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI)
96 database (adni.loni.usc.edu). The ADNI was started in 2003 as a public-private partnership, by
97 Principal Investigator Michael W. Weiner. The principal aim of ADNI has been to investigate whether
98 serial MRI, PET, other biological markers, neuropsychological and clinical assessments can be
99 combined to measure the progression of MCI and early AD. For the latest information, see [www.adni-](http://www.adni-info.org)
100 [info.org](http://www.adni-info.org).

101 Data used in this study were downloaded from the ADNI database on the 21th January, 2018. The
102 population for this study included all subjects with brain MRI measures (up to the 24-month) and
103 neuropsychological measures (up to the 36-month visit) for at least two time points and obtainable
104 baseline CSF measures. Table 1 summarizes ADNI diagnostic criteria for subjective with cognitively
105 unimpaired (CU), MCI and dementia (Petersen et al., 2010). Subjects with cognitively unimpaired
106 (CU) are distinguished from MCI by Clinical Dementia Rating score of 0 versus 0.5, respectively.
107 Diagnosis of MCI was made based on the presence of objective memory impairment without meeting
108 the criteria for dementia. All participants had a Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE) score of 24
109 to 30, a global Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR) score of 0.5, a CDR memory score of 0.5 or higher,
110 and a score that indicated impairment on the delayed recall of Story A of the Wechsler Memory Scale-
111 Revised (≥ 16 years of education: < 11 ; 8-15 years of education: ≤ 9 ; 0-7 years of education: ≤ 6).

112 Diagnosis of dementia was made based on the presence of objective memory impairment and all
113 subjects had a MMSE score of between 20 and 24, CDR score of 0.5 or 1, and a score that indicated
114 impairment on the delayed recall of Story A of the Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised (≥ 16 years of
115 education: ≤ 8 ; 8-15 years of education: ≤ 4 ; 0-7 years of education: ≤ 2). A final total of 576 subjects
116 from the ADNI-1/GO/2 cohort were included in this study.

117 **2.2. MRI measures**

118 All participants were imaged using a 1.5-T and 3-T MRI scanner (GE, Philips or Siemens). Data were
119 collected at multiple sites with a standardized MRI protocol that was made by evaluating and
120 comparing 3D T1-weighted sequences for morphometric analyses. As longitudinal mediator, MRI
121 data were taken at five time points: baseline, month 6, month 12, month 18, month 24 and month 36.
122 MRI acquisition and processing were performed according to standard protocol (Jack et al., 2008).

123 Regional volumes were estimated automatically by the Freesurfer image analysis tool obtainable
124 freely for download (<http://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu>). The ADNI1 1.5 T MR data were run on
125 Freesurfer version 4.3, and 3 T MR data of ADNI1 and ADNI2 were run on Freesurfer version 5.1.
126 Each scan was segmented in accordance with an atlas defined by Freesurfer (Fischl and Dale, 2000).
127 We calculated mean cortical thickness of the AD-signature area (Dickerson et al., 2009) that is
128 composed of eight bilateral regions including the medial temporal gyrus, temporal pole, inferior
129 temporal gyrus, and superior frontal gyrus. The average cortical thickness in these regions were
130 computed that each subject had a single value representing AD-signature of cortical
131 thickness (Busovaca et al., 2016).

132 **2.3. CSF biomarker measures**

133 The standardized protocol for CSF analysis and sample collection in ADNI is available elsewhere (Shaw,
134 2008). In brief, after executing the quality control studies and organizing the validity of the platform,
135 the baseline CSF $A\beta_{1-42}$, t-Tau and p-Tau_{181p} were measured by Innogenetics (INNO-BIA AlzBio3,
136 Ghent, Belgium) immunoassay kit and the multiplex xMAP Luminex platform. This system can
137 measure the biomarkers simultaneously in the same sample in ADNI subjects and in an age-matched
138 cohort of autopsy-confirmed AD cases (Shaw et al., 2009).

139 2.4. Classification of AT(N) profiles

140 In current study, AT(N) profiles were classified by CSF abnormality with CSF $A\beta_{1-42}$ of less than 192
141 pg/ml as A+, p-Tau_{181p} more than 23pg/ml as T+ and t-Tau more than 93 pg/ml as N+(Shaw et al., 2009).
142 Baseline means and standard deviations for raw CSF variables and AT(N) profiles based on them are
143 presented in Table 2.

144 2.5. Neuropsychological measures

145 Longitudinal neuropsychological data such as MMSE, Alzheimer's Disease Scale Cognitive Subscale
146 (ADAS-cog) (Rosen et al., 1984), and CDR-Sum of Boxes score were evaluated at baseline. Among
147 them, ADAS-cog was used as longitudinal outcome measure and taken at five time points: baseline,
148 month 6, month 12, month 18, month 24 and month 36. Compared with the MRI mediation process,
149 measured from baseline to month 24, the outcome changes of ADAS-cog increased to include another
150 year to attenuated issues regarding concurrent causation (Salthouse, 2011).

151 2.6. Statistical analysis

152 As displayed in Fig. 1, the mediational process was modeled by associating baseline AT(N) profiles by
153 CSF measures (predictors) and latent growth factors for MRI measures (mediator) and cognitive
154 function also indexing changes over time(outcome). **By baseline AT(N) profiles using initial CSF values,**
155 **we compared each of Alzheimer's continuum profiles (A+T-(N)-, A+T+(N)-, A+T+(N)+) with normal**
156 **AD biomarker (A-T-(N)-) as reference profile to calculate β coefficients.** To improve the validity of the
157 mediation analysis, all models were controlled for the following covariates: initial clinical diagnosis
158 (normal control as the reference), gender, age at baseline, educational level, and *ApoE* status (coded as
159 $\epsilon 4$ present versus absent).

160 A structural equation model approach to build and evaluate LGCMs (Meredith and Tisak, 1990; Muthén
161 and Curran, 1997; Singer et al., 2003; Tucker-Drob and Salthouse, 2013) was used for differentiating
162 the direct versus indirect effects of the initial AT(N) profiles by CSF abnormality(CSF $A\beta_{1-42}$ of less
163 than 192 pg/ml as A+, p-Tau_{181p} more than 23pg/ml as T+ and t-Tau more than 93 pg/ml as N+) on the
164 potential mediating effects of changes in cortical thickness and the rate of decline in cognitive function
165 comprising the causal pathway of a parallel change process. The simultaneous modeling of the growth

166 trajectories of the mediator and outcome as well as of the mediational process was performed with the
167 PPLGCM (Cheong et al., 2003; MacKinnon et al., 2004). The hypothesis regarding the mediational or
168 indirect effects was tested by parameter estimates obtained from the effect of the initial AT(N) profiles
169 on the growth rate of the cortical thickness and the growth rate of the cognition by a two-wave PPLGC
170 mediation model (Fig. 1). The growth variables included vectors for the slope (Muthén and Curran,
171 1997) on the pathway of the AT(N) profiles → AD-signature slope → ADAS-cog slope. By using the
172 vector of repeated measures of individuals over the timepoints for the MRI mediator and the cognitive
173 outcome, the mediational effect of the initial AT(N) profiles by CSF measures through the MRI slope
174 was $\beta_a * \beta_b$ and the direct effect on the cognitive slope was β_c . Both effects are representative of linear
175 change over the study period and conditional on the combined effect of all the predictors in the model.
176 LGC modeling can define changes over time with regard to unobserved latent factors, estimate
177 parameters concurrently, and include measurement errors that result in complex multivariate modeling
178 (Rovine and Molenaar, 2001; Singer et al., 2003). PPLGC modeling with a univariate two-factor LGCM
179 was used to examine the presence of change in the MRI mediator and cognitive outcome and whether
180 the AT(N) profile could change these trajectories. This latent growth model estimated MRI cortical
181 thickness and cognitive measures with two latent factors defining the intercept and the slope of the
182 “growth” curve, respectively. The control variables were also selected in these models. To explore the
183 marginal growth trends and growth shape, subject-specific mean functions were plotted and time-based
184 LGCM was adopted. After examining the shape of the trajectories and confirming growth, the models
185 were combined to simultaneously incorporate two outcomes and the longitudinal mediational effects of
186 MRI measures estimating the parameters.

187 The significance of the mediational effect was examined using 95% bias-corrected bootstrapped
188 asymmetric confidence intervals (CIs) in the PPLGCMs (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). Bias-corrected
189 bootstrapped asymmetric CIs do not require the mediational effect estimate sampling distribution to be
190 normal (MacKinnon et al., 2004). All mediation was tested with 10,000 bootstrap replications. If the
191 spectrum of the 95% bias-corrected CI for the given point estimate did not include 0, the effect was

192 considered significant. The normal approximation of the CIs was investigated for all single direct paths
193 in the model.

194 The hypothesized models were assessed with multiple fit indexes including the root mean square error
195 of approximation (RMSEA) (Bollen and Long, 1993), the comparative fist index (CFI) (Bentler and
196 Bonett, 1980) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) (Tucker and Lewis, 1973). The models with RMSEA
197 lower than 0.08 and with CFI and TLI values higher than 0.9 were regarded to adequately fit the data
198 (Hoyle, 1995). Residual diagnostics procedures were performed to assess possible model
199 misspecification (Wang et al., 2005). To analyzing longitudinal measurement change of ADAS-Cog
200 across AT(N) profiles, factorial invariance was assessed using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).
201 Establishing factorial invariance consists of a hierarchy of levels that include configural, weak, strong,
202 strict and structural invariance, which are evaluated in a measurement model (Horn and McArdle, 1992;
203 McArdle, 2009; Meredith, 1993; Muthen and Muthen, 2017; Widaman and Reise, 1997).

204 Evidence of invariance between the less restrictive model (e.g., configural invariance model) and more
205 restrictive model (e.g., weak measurement invariance models) were based on recommendations from
206 the literature (Chen, 2007; Cheung and Rensvold, 2002; Wang and Wang, 2019). The configural model
207 was then used to compare against the more restrictive measurement invariance. The values of the change
208 in CFI (Δ CFI) smaller than or equal to 0.01 indicates that the hypothesis of invariance should not be
209 rejected. For Δ TLI, the critical value is 0.01. The Chi-square difference test was also reported for each
210 comparison. Descriptive analyses were analyzed using R (Version 3.5.0, The R Foundation for
211 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria; 64-bit platform). Growth curve model analyses were performed
212 with Mplus, Version 8.3 (Muthen and Muthen, 2017) using a full information maximum likelihood
213 estimator.

214

215 **3. Results**

216 As presented in Table 2, the final sample included 576 subjects with available data, diagnosed at study
217 entry as CU (N = 136), MCI (N = 294), and Dementia (N = 146). The participants were mostly male

218 (58.3%), ranging in age from 55 to 90 years ($M = 74.0$, $SD = 7.0$), reported an average of 15.8 years
219 of education ($SD = 2.9$; range, 4–20 years), and approximately 54% were carriers of more than one
220 *APOE-ε4* allele. Table 2 also shows global cognition at baseline measured by the MMSE (Folstein et
221 al., 1975).

222 The bivariate correlations among baseline predictors (CSF measures), the longitudinal mediator
223 (MRI), and longitudinal outcome (cognition) are reported in Fig. 2. MRI mediators and cognitive
224 outcomes were negatively correlated across all data collection timepoints. Moreover, most CSF
225 measures were correlated with both longitudinal MRI and cognitive measures. Because all variables
226 appeared to be correlated with cognitive outcomes, it was appropriate to include them in the multiple
227 comparison.

228 **3.1. Univariate Latent growth curve model for the MRI mediator**

229 Table 3 presents the results of the univariate LGCMs for the MRI mediator as an outcome measure.
230 The models fit the data well according to the overall fit indices (CFI, range: 0.998–1.000; TLI, 0.998–
231 1.002; RMSEA, 0.000–0.035). The linear LGCM showed good fit and appeared appropriate for the
232 data.

233 The shape of the growth curve was also investigated using individual and mean plots. As a result, the
234 mean of the slope growth factor of the unconditional models for the AD signature was negative and
235 statistically significant (-0.049 , $P < .001$). The negative rate of change in the slope suggested that the
236 MRI scores decreased by approximately 0.04 points between each evaluation. The statistically
237 significant variance of intercepts and slopes indicated that they had important individual variability
238 around their mean values across five timepoints. Subjects varied in their initial MRI cortical thickness
239 and their rates of change over time. The effect of baseline CSF measures on initial and longitudinal
240 changes in cortical thickness varied by AT(N) profile. The A+T+(N)+ profile by CSF measures
241 revealed a significant negative regression coefficient for the MRI measure slope growth factor
242 compared to those with normal AD biomarker profile (A-T-(N)-). That is, AD with an A+T+(N)+ CSF
243 profile was associated with faster decline in AD-specific cortical thickness.

244 3.2. Univariate latent growth curve model for cognitive outcome

245 The results for each univariate LGCM, including ADAS-Cog13 as the cognitive outcome, are reported
246 in Table 4. All models yielded a good fit based on established criteria (Hoyle, 1995); the CFI and TLI
247 values ranged between 0.983–0.995 and 0.977–0.993, respectively, and the RMSEA values varied
248 between 0.029–0.053. The mean growth trajectory for the unconditional (without covariates) model
249 was positive and significant (2.346, $P < .001$) for an average decline of approximately 2.3 points/year
250 in the ADAS-cog-13 score. In the conditional model, the variances of the intercept and growth factors
251 showed statistically significant variability at baseline and change in cognition over time ($P < .05$). All
252 Alzheimer's continuums, (A+T-(N)-, A+T+(N)-, and A+T+(N)+), revealed positive and significant
253 effects on the baseline status and change in cognitive function over time except for the intercept of
254 A+T-(N)- (0.994, $P = .270$). The effect of Alzheimer's pathophysiologic change (A+T-(N)-) on the
255 intercept was statistically insignificant although significant on the slope.

256 3.3. Mediation tests and parallel process LGCMs

257 One of the primary goals of this study was to test the mediational effect of changes in MRI measures
258 on the relationship between baseline AT(N) profiles by CSF biomarkers and changes in cognitive
259 performance. That is, we tested the hypothesis that different AT(N) stages by CSF measures would
260 result in structural changes in the brain and that these changes could increase cognitive decline over a
261 3-year period.

262 To this end, the MRI mediator LGCM was combined with the cognitive outcome growth model in a
263 PPLGCM and regressed on the initial AT(N) profile, sex, education, age, *APOE*, and diagnosis at
264 entry. The relationships among predictors and the latent growth factors describing the mediational
265 process were estimated separately for each analyte and hypothesized as shown in Fig. 1. The values of
266 the point estimates of these relationships and 95% CIs are presented by the AT(N) profiles in Fig. 3.
267 The role of decline in MRI cortical thickness as a process variable mediating the effects of the initial
268 AT(N) profiles on changes in cognitive function varied even in the Alzheimer's continuum, and the
269 mediating effect of changes in cortical thickness on changes in cognition was statistically significant
270 only for the A+T+(N)+ profile (1.373, $P = .024$). That is, only in the A+T+(N)+ profile, a decreased

271 slope of cortical thickness mediated the initial CSF profiles and cognitive decline over time.
272 Additionally, the direct path from the initial CSF profile to the MRI slope was also significant only for
273 the A+T+(N)+ profile (-0.026 , $P < .001$) and the direct paths from the longitudinal changes of MRI
274 measures to those of cognitive performance were significant for AD (e.g., A+T+(N)- and A+T+(N)+
275 profiles) (Fig. 3).

276 3.4. Evaluation of longitudinal factorial (measurement and structural) invariance

277 The weak invariance model (M1), fit the data well (Supplementary Table1). When the weak
278 invariance model is compared with the configural invariance model (M0), changes of CFI and TLI
279 were within acceptable values ($\Delta CFI = -0.002$, $\Delta TLI = 0.001$ for A+T-(N)-, $\Delta CFI = -0.008$,
280 $\Delta TLI = -0.005$ for A+T+(N)-, $\Delta CFI = -0.011$, $\Delta TLI < 0.001$ for A+T+(N)+). This indicates that
281 the metric of factor scores was invariant across AT(N) profiles. The next restrictive model, the strong
282 invariance model (M2) also fit the data well. This constrained the factor loadings and item intercept to
283 create the strong invariance model, resulted in the demonstration of strong invariance ($\Delta CFI = -$
284 0.005 , $\Delta TLI = 0.000$ for A+T-(N)-, $\Delta CFI = -0.014$, $\Delta TLI = -0.001$ for A+T+(N)-, $\Delta CFI = -0.02$,
285 $\Delta TLI = 0.001$ for A+T+(N)+). This indicates that both factor loadings and intercept are invariant
286 across AT(N) profiles. The last more restrictive model, which constrained the factor loadings,
287 intercept, and residual variances, to produce the strict invariance model (M3) was then inspected. The
288 changes of the fit indices were within the recommended values ($\Delta CFI = -0.031$, $\Delta TLI = -0.025$ for
289 A+T-(N)-, $\Delta CFI = -0.011$, $\Delta TLI = -0.006$ for A+T+(N)-, $\Delta CFI = -0.038$, $\Delta TLI = -0.025$ for
290 A+T+(N)+). When comparing structural invariance model (M4) with the less restrictive model (M2)
291 (i.e., strong measurement invariance model), the differences of several fit indices are within the
292 acceptable values ($\Delta CFI = -0.029$, $\Delta TLI = -0.032$ for A+T-(N)-, $\Delta CFI = -0.034$, $\Delta TLI = -0.038$
293 for A+T+(N)-, $\Delta CFI = -0.025$, $\Delta TLI = -0.0027$ for A+T+(N)+). In longitudinal factorial invariance

294 across AT(N) profiles, at least the third level of factorial invariance, strong factorial invariance, must
295 be met. The overall conclusion is that there is a reasonable level of longitudinal factorial invariance
296 for the CFA model of AD spectrum across AT(N) profiles group.

297 **4. Discussion**

298 This study attempted to examine the dynamic association between the initial AT(N) profiles by CSF
299 and longitudinal change in brain MRI and cognitive function after controlling for demographic variables,
300 baseline clinical diagnosis, and *APOE* status in Alzheimer's continuum. Adopting a simultaneous
301 longitudinal scheme, the sequential effect between brain MRI and cognition according to the AT(N)
302 profiles was analyzed. It was tested whether the relationship between the initial AT(N) profiles and the
303 growth trajectory for cognitive decline was mediated by the growth trajectory of cortical thickness. In
304 the A+T+(N)- profile, a direct path from an altered level of cortical thickness was hypothesized to result
305 in cognitive decline. Only in the A+T+(N)+ profile, the initial CSF measures appeared to result in
306 cognitive decline mediated by cortical thickness in addition to the direct path from the initial CSF profile
307 to brain MRI as well as from brain MRI to cognitive decline. To our knowledge, this is the first study
308 using PPLGCM to test the biomarker sequence hypothesis based on the AT(N) system.

309 These findings suggested a dynamic causal sequence that identifies change in cortical thickness as a
310 mediator between antecedent change in the AT(N) profile by CSF and subsequent cognitive decline.
311 Based on the new biomarker profiles by the NIA-AA research framework (Jack et al., 2018), there was
312 different sequential change among the A+T-(N)-, A+T+(N)-, and A+T+(N)+ profiles compared to the
313 normal AD biomarker (A-T-(N)-). At the category of Alzheimer's pathologic change (A+T-(N)-), there
314 were no significant direct or indirect paths among the initial CSF profile, MRI slope, and cognitive
315 slope. From the category of AD (A+T+(N)- and A+T+(N)+), a relationship was observed between the
316 brain MRI and cognition slopes (Fig. 3). Another direct path between the initial CSF profile and the
317 brain MRI slope became significant in the A+T+(N)+ profile in addition to the indirect path mediated
318 by the MRI slope. Although the A+T+(N)- and A+T+(N)+ profiles are both categorized as "Alzheimer's
319 disease" in NIA-AA research framework, the A+T+(N)+ profile is distinct from the A+T+(N)- profile
320 because the former contains (N) positivity, which is an indicator of neurodegeneration or neuronal injury

321 of varying causality. This implies that the A+T+(N)+ profile might be related to other possible comorbid
322 conditions as well as to AD pathology and that these combined pathologies may increase the possibility
323 of activation of other biomarker pathways. Consequently, these findings provide support for the NIA-
324 AA research framework model that defines biomarker profiles based on the AT(N) system where the
325 presence of more abnormal biomarker groups represents more advanced pathologic stages (Mormino
326 et al., 2014). In addition to sequential change in AD biomarkers by “modified amyloid cascade
327 hypothesis” (Jack et al., 2013), our results suggested another relationship among biomarkers and
328 cognition. Consistent with the findings of previous studies, primarily cross-sectional (Vemuri et al.,
329 2010), an initial pathologic CSF profile such as the A+T-(N)- did not directly affect the cognitive or
330 MRI slope in our study. However, the MRI slope began to affect the cognitive slope starting at the
331 A+T+(N)- profile, then mediational test modeling changes in brain MRI, as a mediator of the effect of
332 the CSF profile on cognitive change across time, were significant at the A+T+(N)+ profile in addition
333 to the direct effect from the initial CSF profile to the MRI slope. This finding extended the scope of
334 research from sequential ordering of events (Petrella et al., 2019; Young et al., 2014) to longitudinal
335 mediation using the PPLGCM, which considered changes in structural MRI and cognitive function
336 across time. Investigation using this model has only been performed for FDG uptake using PET as a
337 mediator between CSF profiles and cognitive change (Dowling et al., 2015). Although structural MRI
338 and FDG PET are placed in the same (N) biomarker group, there is some difference because atrophy on
339 MRI reflects loss of the neuropil (Barkhof et al., 2007), while FDG PET shows functional impairment
340 of neurons in addition to shrinkage of the neuropil (Chételat et al., 2016). Additionally, brain MRI is
341 more widely used in clinical practice according to the diagnostic guidelines of dementia (Wang et al.,
342 2017) that we used the AD signature of cortical thickness including the eight bilateral regions (Busovaca
343 et al., 2016). According to recent mediation model, sequence of A β , tau, atrophy and cognitive change
344 vary by brain region and disease state for nondemented cohort (Fletcher et al., 2018). Another study
345 found the mediational effect of neurodegenerative marker such as FDG-PET or brain MRI between
346 initial A β pathology and episodic memory for MCI (Mattsson et al., 2015) and this effect can be

347 affected by vascular risk and brain region (Villeneuve et al., 2014). These studies using mediational
348 model gave insight for causal relationship among AD biomarkers based on cognitive stage, and our
349 study investigated another mediational effect focused on AT(N) system with PPLGC model that
350 consider time-dependent effects of biomarkers. Additionally, one of the big differences between
351 previous mediational studies and ours is that they used individual CSF measurement ($A\beta_{1-42}$, pTau_{181p},
352 t-Tau) as continuous variables but we used them as categorical variables for ATN profiles. When we
353 performed mediational analysis using CSF measures as continuous variables, $A\beta_{1-42}$ showed significant
354 effects for all of the direct and indirect pathways while Tau did not reveal significant direct effect from
355 CSF (pTau_{181p}, t-Tau) to MRI slope (Supplementary Table2).

356 Our study adopted PPLGC modeling to validate the newly-developed biological definition of AD by
357 the NIA-AA research framework (Jack et al., 2018). One of the main changes of the research
358 framework was that it defined AD biologically, separating cognitive impairment as a subsequent
359 symptom of the preceding AD pathology. In line with this notion, we examined longitudinal ADNI
360 data representing the whole range of the AD continuum from CU to dementia to investigate temporal
361 change based on the initial AT(N) profiles. In the research framework, CSF biomarkers and brain
362 imaging are placed into common groups but fundamental difference and discordance between them
363 should be recognized (Gordon et al., 2016a; Vos et al., 2016) because CSF biomarkers measure the
364 concentration of protein at a given timepoint, while imaging measures the neuropathologic or
365 neurodegenerative loading accumulated over time (Alexopoulos et al., 2014; Blennow and Hampel,
366 2003; Gordon et al., 2016b). This discordance was also observed in our study where the A+T+(N)-
367 profile by CSF measures without neurodegeneration already showed a direct effect between the MRI
368 slope (i.e., another (N) marker) and cognitive slope. However, initial CSF did not directly affect the
369 cognitive slope across the entire Alzheimer's continuum even in the A+T+(N)+ profile. Taking
370 together these observations, the hypothetical biomarker sequence might be appropriate because the
371 number of significant direct and indirect pathways between biomarkers increased across Alzheimer's
372 continuum, but detailed effects between biomarkers across time must be considered in the future. Our
373 study showed that sequential changes of AT(N) profiles by initial CSF measures according to research

374 framework did not reflect sequential changes of biomarkers and cognition although the number of
375 significant direct or indirect pathways increased across Alzheimer's continuum. Presently, the AT(N)
376 biomarker system of the research framework does not include the notion of time-dependent effects of
377 biomarkers because it is an unbiased system for grouping biomarkers and classifying participants
378 (Jack et al., 2016). **So our finding will be useful for designing detailed clinical trials using NIA-AA
379 Research Framework based on AT(N) profiles in the future.**

380 This study has several limitations. First, Alzheimer's continuum included the A+T-(N)+ profile, which
381 was not included in our study because there were no subjects with this profile in the ADNI data. This
382 was not in line with previous studies that reported approximately 35 (8.0%) of 435 subjects (Jack et al.,
383 2017) and 19 (2.3%) of 814 subjects (Soldan et al., 2019) with this profile for CU individuals, and this
384 discrepancy according to study cohorts may be the target of a future study. Second, we defined the
385 AT(N) classification based on initial CSF biomarkers, but it could also be defined by imaging markers
386 that validation of mediational effects using this image-based AT(N) classification may be necessary to
387 strengthen our results. Third, a better model for assessing the temporal sequence of events and reducing
388 concurrent causation might have been achieved by using longitudinal CSF biomarkers rather than initial
389 categorization by the AT(N) classification. Although using biomarkers as continuous measures might
390 be better for research purposes, denoting abnormal cutoff points is necessary to support decision making
391 for individual patients in the clinic as well as subject selection in clinical trials. This study attempted to
392 prove causal inference by mediation analysis investigating the effect of changes in cortical thickness on
393 changes in cognition according to the initial AT(N) classification, and this was consistent with the
394 supposition of the research framework that the presence of more biomarker abnormalities denotes more
395 advanced stages of the disease (Mormino et al., 2014). More appropriate modeling approaches
396 employed by longitudinal studies are required to validate the complex sequence of events that results
397 in neurodegeneration and cognitive dysfunction in AD.

398

399 **5. Conclusions**

400 Our findings demonstrate the hypothetical biomarker sequence related to mediation effect is
401 different according to AT(N) profile. These suggest the need to consider dynamic changes in
402 the relationship among biomarkers in current cascade model.

403

404 **Abbreviations**

405 A β : Amyloid- β 1-42; AD: Alzheimer's disease; ADNI: Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging
406 Initiative; ADAS-cog: Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-cognitive subscale; APOE:
407 Apolipoprotein E; AT(N): Amyloid/tau/neurodegeneration; CDR-SOB: Clinical Dementia
408 Rating Sum of Boxes; CSF: Cerebrospinal fluid; CFI: Comparative fist index; FDG:[18F]-
409 fluorodeoxyglucose; MCI: Mild cognitive impairment; MMSE: Mini Mental State
410 Examination; MRI: Magnetic resonance imaging; NIA-AA : National Institute on
411 Aging and Alzheimer's Association; PET: Positron emission tomography; PPLGCM: Parallel-
412 process latent growth curve model; RMSEA: Root mean square error of approximation; TLI:
413 Tucker-Lewis Index

414

415 **Declarations**

416

417 **Ethical approval, consent to participate, and consent for publication**

418 The study procedures were approved by the institutional review board of all participating centers
419 (http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/how_to_apply/ADNI_Acknowledgement_List.pdf) and
420 written informed consent was obtained from all participants or authorized representatives.

421 **Availability of data and material**

422 Not applicable.

423 **Competing interests**

424 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

425 **Authors' contributions**

426 JWJ, and SYK designed the study and participated in data analysis and interpretation. JWJ, SOK and
427 SHK participated in data analysis and interpretation, drafted the manuscript, and revised the
428 manuscript for important intellectual content. JSL, YHP, YSK, SHK, SWP and YCY participated in
429 data analysis. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

430 **Acknowledgements**

431 Data collection and sharing for this project was funded by the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging
432 Initiative (ADNI) (National Institutes of Health Grant U01 AG024904) and DOD ADNI (Department
433 of Defense award number W81XWH-12-2-0012). ADNI is funded by the National Institute on Aging,
434 the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, and through generous contributions
435 from the following: AbbVie, Alzheimer's Association; Alzheimer's Drug Discovery Foundation;
436 Araclon Biotech; BioClinica, Inc.; Biogen; Bristol-Myers Squibb Company; CereSpir, Inc.; Cogstate;
437 Eisai Inc.; Elan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Eli Lilly and Company; EuroImmun; F. Hoffmann-La Roche
438 Ltd and its affiliated company Genentech, Inc.; Fujirebio; GE Healthcare; IXICO Ltd.; Janssen
439 Alzheimer Immunotherapy Research & Development, LLC.; Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceutical
440 Research & Development LLC.; Lumosity; Lundbeck; Merck & Co., Inc.; Meso Scale Diagnostics,
441 LLC.; NeuroRx Research; Neurotrack Technologies; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation; Pfizer
442 Inc.; Piramal Imaging; Servier; Takeda Pharmaceutical Company; and Transition Therapeutics. The
443 Canadian Institutes of Health Research is providing funds to support ADNI clinical sites in Canada.
444 Private sector contributions are facilitated by the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health
445 (www.fnih.org). The grantee organization is the Northern California Institute for Research and
446 Education, and the study is coordinated by the Alzheimer's Therapeutic Research Institute at the
447 University of Southern California. ADNI data are disseminated by the Laboratory for Neuro Imaging
448 at the University of Southern California.

449

450 **References**

- 451 Alexopoulos, P., Kriett, L., Haller, B., Klupp, E., Gray, K., Grimmer, T., Laskaris, N., Förster, S., Pernecky,
452 R., Kurz, A., Drzezga, A., Fellgiebel, A., Yakushev, I., 2014. Limited agreement between
453 biomarkers of neuronal injury at different stages of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement.*
454 10, 684–689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2014.03.006>
- 455 Barkhof, F., Polvikoski, T.M., van Straaten, E.C.W., Kalaria, R.N., Sulkava, R., Aronen, H.J., Niinistö, L.,
456 Rastas, S., Oinas, M., Scheltens, P., Erkinjuntti, T., 2007. The significance of medial temporal
457 lobe atrophy: a postmortem MRI study in the very old. *Neurology* 69, 1521–1527.
458 <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000277459.83543.99>
- 459 Bentler, P.M., Bonett, D.G., 1980. Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance
460 structures. *Psychol. Bull.* 88, 588–606. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588>
- 461 Blennow, K., Hampel, H., 2003. CSF markers for incipient Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet Neurol.* 2, 605–
462 613. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(03\)00530-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(03)00530-1)
- 463 Bollen, K.A., Long, J.S., 1993. *Testing Structural Equation Models*. SAGE.
- 464 Busovaca, E., Zimmerman, M.E., Meier, I.B., Griffith, E.Y., Grieve, S.M., Korgaonkar, M.S., Williams, L.M.,
465 Brickman, A.M., 2016. Is the Alzheimer's disease cortical thickness signature a biological
466 marker for memory? *Brain Imaging Behav.* 10, 517–523. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-015-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-015-9413-5)
467 9413-5
- 468 Chen, F.F., 2007. Sensitivity of Goodness of Fit Indexes to Lack of Measurement Invariance. *Struct.*
469 *Equ. Model. Multidiscip. J.* 14, 464–504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834>
- 470 Cheong, J., MacKinnon, D.P., Khoo, S.T., 2003. Investigation of Mediational Processes Using Parallel
471 Process Latent Growth Curve Modeling. *Struct. Equ. Model. Multidiscip. J.* 10, 238–262.
472 https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM1002_5
- 473 Chételat, G., Ossenkoppele, R., Villemagne, V.L., Perrotin, A., Landeau, B., Mézenge, F., Jagust, W.J.,
474 Dore, V., Miller, B.L., Egret, S., Seeley, W.W., Flier, V.D., M, W., La Joie, R., Ames, D., Berckel, V.,
475 M, B.N., Scheltens, P., Barkhof, F., Rowe, C.C., Masters, C.L., de La Sayette, V., Bouwman, F.,
476 Rabinovici, G.D., 2016. Atrophy, hypometabolism and clinical trajectories in patients with
477 amyloid-negative Alzheimer's disease. *Brain* 139, 2528–2539.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/aww159>
- 479 Cheung, G.W., Rensvold, R.B., 2002. Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indexes for Testing Measurement
480 Invariance. *Struct. Equ. Model. Multidiscip. J.* 9, 233–255.
481 https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5
- 482 de Souza, L.C., Chupin, M., Lamari, F., Jardel, C., Leclercq, D., Colliot, O., Lehericy, S., Dubois, B., Sarazin,
483 M., 2012. CSF tau markers are correlated with hippocampal volume in Alzheimer's disease.
484 *Neurobiol. Aging* 33, 1253–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2011.02.022>
- 485 Dickerson, B.C., Bakkour, A., Salat, D.H., Feczko, E., Pacheco, J., Greve, D.N., Grodstein, F., Wright, C.I.,
486 Blacker, D., Rosas, H.D., Sperling, R.A., Atri, A., Growdon, J.H., Hyman, B.T., Morris, J.C., Fischl,
487 B., Buckner, R.L., 2009. The Cortical Signature of Alzheimer's Disease: Regionally Specific
488 Cortical Thinning Relates to Symptom Severity in Very Mild to Mild AD Dementia and is

- 489 Detectable in Asymptomatic Amyloid-Positive Individuals. *Cereb. Cortex* N. Y. NY 19, 497–
490 510. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhn113>
- 491 Dowling, N.M., Johnson, S.C., Gleason, C.E., Jagust, W.J., 2015. The mediational effects of FDG
492 hypometabolism on the association between cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers and
493 neurocognitive function. *NeuroImage* 105, 357–368.
494 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.10.050>
- 495 Fischl, B., Dale, A.M., 2000. Measuring the thickness of the human cerebral cortex from magnetic
496 resonance images. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 97, 11050–11055.
497 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.200033797>
- 498 Fletcher, E., Filshtein, T.J., Harvey, D., Renaud, A., Mungas, D., DeCarli, C., 2018. Staging of amyloid β ,
499 t-tau, regional atrophy rates, and cognitive change in a nondemented cohort: Results of
500 serial mediation analyses. *Alzheimers Dement. Diagn. Assess. Dis. Monit.* 10, 382–393.
501 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dadm.2018.04.001>
- 502 Folstein, M.F., Folstein, S.E., McHugh, P.R., 1975. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading
503 the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J. Psychiatr. Res.* 12, 189–198.
- 504 Gordon, B.A., Blazey, T., Su, Y., Fagan, A.M., Holtzman, D.M., Morris, J.C., Benzinger, T.L.S., 2016a.
505 Longitudinal β -Amyloid Deposition and Hippocampal Volume in Preclinical Alzheimer
506 Disease and Suspected Non-Alzheimer Disease Pathophysiology. *JAMA Neurol.* 73, 1192–
507 1200. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2016.2642>
- 508 Gordon, B.A., Friedrichsen, K., Brier, M., Blazey, T., Su, Y., Christensen, J., Aldea, P., McConathy, J.,
509 Holtzman, D.M., Cairns, N.J., Morris, J.C., Fagan, A.M., Ances, B.M., Benzinger, T.L.S., 2016b.
510 The relationship between cerebrospinal fluid markers of Alzheimer pathology and positron
511 emission tomography tau imaging. *Brain* 139, 2249–2260.
512 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/aww139>
- 513 Horn, J.L., McArdle, J.J., 1992. A practical and theoretical guide to measurement invariance in aging
514 research. *Exp. Aging Res.* 18, 117–144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610739208253916>
- 515 Hoyle, R.H. (Ed.), 1995. *Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues, and Applications*, 1 edition.
516 ed. SAGE Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks.
- 517 Jack, C.R., Bennett, D.A., Blennow, K., Carrillo, M.C., Dunn, B., Haeberlein, S.B., Holtzman, D.M., Jagust,
518 W., Jessen, F., Karlawish, J., Liu, E., Molinuevo, J.L., Montine, T., Phelps, C., Rankin, K.P., Rowe,
519 C.C., Scheltens, P., Siemers, E., Snyder, H.M., Sperling, R., Elliott, C., Masliah, E., Ryan, L.,
520 Silverberg, N., 2018. NIA-AA Research Framework: Toward a biological definition of
521 Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement. J. Alzheimers Assoc.* 14, 535–562.
522 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2018.02.018>
- 523 Jack, C.R., Bennett, D.A., Blennow, K., Carrillo, M.C., Feldman, H.H., Frisoni, G.B., Hampel, H., Jagust,
524 W.J., Johnson, K.A., Knopman, D.S., Petersen, R.C., Scheltens, P., Sperling, R.A., Dubois, B.,
525 2016. A/T/N: An unbiased descriptive classification scheme for Alzheimer disease biomarkers.
526 *Neurology* 87, 539–547. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000002923>
- 527 Jack, C.R., Bernstein, M.A., Fox, N.C., Thompson, P., Alexander, G., Harvey, D., Borowski, B., Britson, P.J.,

- 528 L. Whitwell, J., Ward, C., Dale, A.M., Felmlee, J.P., Gunter, J.L., Hill, D.L.G., Killiany, R., Schuff, N.,
529 Fox-Bosetti, S., Lin, C., Studholme, C., DeCarli, C.S., Gunnar Krueger, Ward, H.A., Metzger, G.J.,
530 Scott, K.T., Mallozzi, R., Blezek, D., Levy, J., Debbins, J.P., Fleisher, A.S., Albert, M., Green, R.,
531 Bartzokis, G., Glover, G., Mugler, J., Weiner, M.W., 2008. The Alzheimer's disease neuroimaging
532 initiative (ADNI): MRI methods. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 27, 685–691.
533 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.21049>
- 534 Jack, C.R., Holtzman, D.M., 2013. Biomarker Modeling of Alzheimer's Disease. *Neuron* 80, 1347–1358.
535 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.12.003>
- 536 Jack, C.R., Knopman, D.S., Jagust, W.J., Petersen, R.C., Weiner, M.W., Aisen, P.S., Shaw, L.M., Vemuri, P.,
537 Wiste, H.J., Weigand, S.D., Lesnick, T.G., Pankratz, V.S., Donohue, M.C., Trojanowski, J.Q., 2013.
538 Update on hypothetical model of Alzheimer's disease biomarkers. *Lancet Neurol.* 12, 207–
539 216. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(12\)70291-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(12)70291-0)
- 540 Jack, C.R., Petersen, R.C., Xu, Y.C., Waring, S.C., O'Brien, P.C., Tangalos, E.G., Smith, G.E., Ivnik, R.J.,
541 Kokmen, E., 1997. Medial temporal atrophy on MRI in normal aging and very mild
542 Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology* 49, 786–794.
- 543 Jack, C.R., Wiste, H.J., Weigand, S.D., Therneau, T.M., Knopman, D.S., Lowe, V., Vemuri, P., Mielke, M.M.,
544 Roberts, R.O., Machulda, M.M., 2017. Age-specific and sex-specific prevalence of cerebral β -
545 amyloidosis, tauopathy, and neurodegeneration in cognitively unimpaired individuals aged
546 50–95 years: a cross-sectional study. *Lancet Neurol.* 16, 435–444.
- 547 MacKinnon, D.P., Lockwood, C.M., Williams, J., 2004. Confidence Limits for the Indirect Effect:
548 Distribution of the Product and Resampling Methods. *Multivar. Behav. Res.* 39, 99–128.
549 https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3901_4
- 550 Mattsson, N., Insel, P.S., Aisen, P.S., Jagust, W., Mackin, S., Weiner, M., Initiative, F. the A.D.N., 2015.
551 Brain structure and function as mediators of the effects of amyloid on memory. *Neurology*
552 84, 1136. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000001375>
- 553 McArdle, J.J., 2009. Latent variable modeling of differences and changes with longitudinal data. *Annu.*
554 *Rev. Psychol.* 60, 577–605. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163612>
- 555 Meredith, W., 1993. Measurement invariance, factor analysis and factorial invariance. *Psychometrika*
556 58, 525–543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02294825>
- 557 Meredith, W., Tisak, J., 1990. Latent curve analysis. *Psychometrika* 55, 107–122.
558 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02294746>
- 559 Mormino, E.C., Betensky, R.A., Hedden, T., Schultz, A.P., Amariglio, R.E., Rentz, D.M., Johnson, K.A.,
560 Sperling, R.A., 2014. Synergistic Effect of β -Amyloid and Neurodegeneration on Cognitive
561 Decline in Clinically Normal Individuals. *JAMA Neurol.* 71, 1379–1385.
562 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2014.2031>
- 563 Muthén, B.O., Curran, P.J., 1997. General longitudinal modeling of individual differences in
564 experimental designs: A latent variable framework for analysis and power estimation. *Psychol.*
565 *Methods* 2, 371–402. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.2.4.371>
- 566 Muthen, L.K., Muthen, B., 2017. *Mplus Version 8 User's Guide*. Muthen & Muthen.

- 567 Olsson, B., Lautner, R., Andreasson, U., Öhrfelt, A., Portelius, E., Bjerke, M., Hölttä, M., Rosén, C.,
568 Olsson, C., Strobel, G., Wu, E., Dakin, K., Petzold, M., Blennow, K., Zetterberg, H., 2016. CSF
569 and blood biomarkers for the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and
570 meta-analysis. *Lancet Neurol.* 15, 673–684. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(16\)00070-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(16)00070-3)
- 571 Petersen, R.C., Aisen, P.S., Beckett, L.A., Donohue, M.C., Gamst, A.C., Harvey, D.J., Jack, C.R., Jagust,
572 W.J., Shaw, L.M., Toga, A.W., Trojanowski, J.Q., Weiner, M.W., 2010. Alzheimer's Disease
573 Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI): Clinical characterization. *Neurology* 74, 201–209.
574 <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181cb3e25>
- 575 Petrella, J.R., Hao, W., Rao, A., Doraiswamy, P.M., 2019. Computational Causal Modeling of the
576 Dynamic Biomarker Cascade in Alzheimer's Disease. *Comput. Math. Methods Med.* 2019,
577 6216530. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/6216530>
- 578 Preacher, K.J., Hayes, A.F., 2008. Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing
579 indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behav. Res. Methods* 40, 879–891.
580 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879>
- 581 Rosen, W.G., Mohs, R.C., Davis, K.L., 1984. A new rating scale for Alzheimer's disease. *Am. J. Psychiatry*
582 141, 1356–1364. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.141.11.1356>
- 583 Rovine, M.J., Molenaar, P.C.M., 2001. A structural equations modeling approach to the general linear
584 mixed model, in: *New Methods for the Analysis of Change, Decade of Behavior*. American
585 Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US, pp. 67–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10409-003>
- 586
- 587 Salthouse, T.A., 2011. Neuroanatomical substrates of age-related cognitive decline. *Psychol. Bull.* 137,
588 753–784. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023262>
- 589 Seppälä, T.T., Nerg, O., Koivisto, A.M., Rummukainen, J., Puli, L., Zetterberg, H., Pyykkö, O.T., Helisalmi,
590 S., Alafuzoff, I., Hiltunen, M., Jääskeläinen, J.E., Rinne, J., Soininen, H., Leinonen, V., Herukka,
591 S.K., 2012. CSF biomarkers for Alzheimer disease correlate with cortical brain biopsy findings.
592 *Neurology* 78, 1568–1575. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182563bd0>
- 593 Shaw, L.M., 2008. PENN Biomarker Core of the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative.
594 *Neurosignals* 16, 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000109755>
- 595 Shaw, L.M., Vanderstichele, H., Knapik-Czajka, M., Clark, C.M., Aisen, P.S., Petersen, R.C., Blennow, K.,
596 Soares, H., Simon, A., Lewczuk, P., Dean, R., Siemers, E., Potter, W., Lee, V.M.-Y., Trojanowski,
597 J.Q., Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative, 2009. Cerebrospinal fluid biomarker
598 signature in Alzheimer's disease neuroimaging initiative subjects. *Ann. Neurol.* 65, 403–413.
599 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.21610>
- 600 Singer, J.D., Willett, J.B., Willett, C.W.E.P.J.B., Willett, J.B., 2003. *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis:*
601 *Modeling Change and Event Occurrence*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- 602 Soldan, A., Pettigrew, C., Fagan, A.M., Schindler, S.E., Moghekar, A., Fowler, C., Li, Q.-X., Collins, S.J.,
603 Carlsson, C., Asthana, S., Masters, C.L., Johnson, S., Morris, J.C., Albert, M., Gross, A.L., 2019.
604 ATN profiles among cognitively normal individuals and longitudinal cognitive outcomes.
605 *Neurology* 92, e1567–e1579. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.00000000000007248>

- 606 Tucker, L.R., Lewis, C., 1973. A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis.
607 *Psychometrika* 38, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291170>
- 608 Tucker-Drob, E.M., Salthouse, T.A., 2013. Individual Differences in Cognitive Aging, in: *The Wiley-*
609 *Blackwell Handbook of Individual Differences*. Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 242–267.
610 <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444343120.ch9>
- 611 Vemuri, P., Wiste, H.J., Weigand, S.D., Knopman, D.S., Trojanowski, J.Q., Shaw, L.M., Bernstein, M.A.,
612 Aisen, P.S., Weiner, M., Petersen, R.C., Jack, C.R., Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative,
613 2010. Serial MRI and CSF biomarkers in normal aging, MCI, and AD. *Neurology* 75, 143–151.
614 <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181e7ca82>
- 615 Villeneuve, S., Reed, B.R., Wirth, M., Haase, C.M., Madison, C.M., Ayakta, N., Mack, W., Mungas, D.,
616 Chui, H.C., DeCarli, C., Weiner, M.W., Jagust, W.J., 2014. Cortical thickness mediates the effect
617 of β -amyloid on episodic memory. *Neurology* 82, 761.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000000170>
- 619 Visser, P.J., Scheltens, P., Verhey, F.R., Schmand, B., Launer, L.J., Jolles, J., Jonker, C., 1999. Medial
620 temporal lobe atrophy and memory dysfunction as predictors for dementia in subjects with
621 mild cognitive impairment. *J. Neurol.* 246, 477–485.
- 622 Vos, S.J.B., Gordon, B.A., Su, Y., Visser, P.J., Holtzman, D.M., Morris, J.C., Fagan, A.M., Benzinger, T.L.S.,
623 2016. NIA-AA staging of preclinical Alzheimer disease: discordance and concordance of CSF
624 and imaging biomarkers. *Neurobiol. Aging* 44, 1–8.
625 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2016.03.025>
- 626 Wang, C.-P., Brown, C.H., Bandeen-Roche, K., 2005. Residual Diagnostics for Growth Mixture Models.
627 *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 100, 1054–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214505000000501>
- 628 Wang, J., Gu, B.J., Masters, C.L., Wang, Y.-J., 2017. A systemic view of Alzheimer disease — insights
629 from amyloid- β metabolism beyond the brain. *Nat. Rev. Neurol.* 13, 612–623.
630 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2017.111>
- 631 Wang, J., Wang, X., 2019. *Structural Equation Modeling: Applications Using Mplus*. John Wiley &
632 Sons.
- 633 Widaman, K.F., Reise, S.P., 1997. Exploring the measurement invariance of psychological instruments:
634 Applications in the substance use domain, in: *The Science of Prevention: Methodological*
635 *Advances from Alcohol and Substance Abuse Research*. American Psychological Association,
636 Washington, DC, US, pp. 281–324. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10222-009>
- 637 Young, A.L., Oxtoby, N.P., Daga, P., Cash, D.M., Fox, N.C., Ourselin, S., Schott, J.M., Alexander, D.C.,
638 2014. A data-driven model of biomarker changes in sporadic Alzheimer's disease. *Brain* 137,
639 2564–2577. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awu176>

640 **Fig. 1.** Schematic figure of the parallel process growth curve model to test the effect of CSF measures
 641 on the rate of cognitive change via rate of change in cortical thickness over time. The subscripts for
 642 AD-signature and ADAS cog refer to the months collected in the ADNI data. Latent variable slopes
 643 (circles) were regressed on the observed variables (squares) of the CSF adjusted by age, sex, *APOE*,
 644 educational level, and initial clinical diagnosis. Residual error variances are represented by two-headed
 645 curved arrows for observed and latent variables.

646

647 **Fig. 2.** Bivariate correlation matrix between variables.

648 The red color indicates a positive correlation, whereas the yellow indicates a negative correlation.

649

650 **Fig. 3.** Mediation effects of brain magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) on baseline cerebrospinal fluid
 651 (CSF) to cognitive slope

652 The diagram of the mediation model pathways is presented above the table.

653 Showing direct pathways among initial CSF, MRI slope, and cognitive slope (i.e., a, b, and c).

654 The strength of the mediation pathway (i.e., i) is the multiplication product of the component edge
 655 weights in these pathways (i.e., $\beta_a * \beta_b$).

656 Abbreviations: CSF, cerebrospinal fluid, CI, confidential interval

657 NOTE. Regression coefficients are computed by bootstrap sampling with 10,000 iteration after
 658 adjusted for age, gender, education, ApoE and diagnosis at entry.

659 In the table, β coefficients and 95% confidence intervals are displayed. Coefficients significance at
 660 95% confidence level are in bold.

661

662 Table1

663 Classification of ADNI to distinguish CU, MCI and dementia

	CU	MCI	
Subjective memory complaint	None	Yes	Yes

	CU	MCI	
MMSE score	≥24	≥24	Between 23 and 27 years
Logical memory score	≥9 for 16 or more years of education	≤8 for 16 or more years of education	≤8 for 16 or more years of education
	≥5 for 8-15 years of education	≤4 for 8-15 years of education	≤4 for 8-15 years of education
	≥3 for 0-7 years of education	≤2 for 0-7 years of education	≤2 for 0-7 years of education
CDR	CDR=0 Memory Box score must be 0	CDR=0.5 Memory Box score of at least 0.5	CDR=0.5-0.9
General cognition and functional status	Cognitively normal based on the absence of significant impairment in cognitive functions or activities of daily living	General cognition and functional performance sufficiently preserved such that a diagnosis of dementia cannot be made	NINCDS/ADRDA criteria for MCI

664 Abbreviations: ADNI, Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative; CU, cognitively unimpaired; MCI,
665 mild cognitive impairment; MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; CDR, The Clinical Dementia
666 Rating Scale; NINCDS/ADRDA, National Institute of Neurological and Communication Disorders and
667 Stroke/Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association. This table was adapted and modified
668 from the procedure manuals for ADNI1, ADNI GO, and ADNI 2 available at
669 <http://adni.loni.usc.edu/methods/documents/>.

670

671

Table 2

Descriptive statistics of study variables at baseline

	CU (N=136)	MCI (N=294)	Dementia (N=146)	Total (N=576)	P
Demographic characteristics					
Age	74.7 ± 5.5	73.4 ± 7.2	74.4 ± 7.8	74.0 ± 7.0	0.776
Male, n(%)	71 (52.2)	184 (62.6)	81 (55.5)	336 (58.3)	0.092
Education in years	16.0 ± 2.8	15.9 ± 2.9	15.3 ± 3.0	15.8 ± 2.9	0.034
<i>APOE</i> ε4 carrier, n(%)	37 (27.2)	166 (56.5)	118 (73.9)	311 (54.0)	< 0.001
Cognition					
ADAS-cog-13	10.0 ± 4.6	17.2 ± 6.8	29.5 ± 7.9	18.6 ± 9.6	< 0.001
CSF biomarkers					
Aβ	190.9 ± 54.7	158.3 ± 48.3	134.8 ± 33.7	160.0 ± 50.6	< 0.001
p-Tau	25.4 ± 14.8	39.7 ± 23.4	49.5 ± 27.5	38.8 ± 24.4	< 0.001
t-Tau	64.7 ± 28.8	98.2 ± 57.1	126.7 ± 60.8	97.5 ± 57.1	< 0.001
AT(N) profiles, n(%)					< 0.001
- A-T-(N)-	65 (47.8)	63 (21.4)	5 (3.4)	133 (23.1)	
- A+T-(N)-	28 (20.6)	26 (8.8)	10 (6.9)	64 (11.1)	
- A+T+(N)-	25 (18.4)	82 (27.9)	33 (22.6)	140 (24.3)	
- A+T+(N)+	18 (13.2)	123 (41.8)	98 (67.1)	239 (41.5)	
Mean cortical thickness					
AD signature	2.60 ± 0.16	2.44 ± 0.20	2.27 ± 0.22	2.44 ± 0.22	< 0.001

Abbreviations: CU, cognitively unimpaired; MCI, mild cognitive impairment; *APOE*, apolipoprotein E; MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; ADAS-cog, Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale Cognitive subscale; CDR-SB, The Clinical Dementia Rating Scale Sum of Boxes; CSF, cerebrospinal fluid; Aβ, beta amyloid; p-Tau, phosphorylated tau; t-Tau, total tau

Values are presented as mean ± SD unless otherwise stated.

1 Table3. Univariate Latent growth curve model results for AD signature as outcome (n=576)

	Model 1 ^a		Model 2 ^b		Model 3 ^b
<i>AD signature</i>	RMSEA=0.035 (0.000, 0.064), CFI=0.998, TLI=0.998	<i>p</i>	RMSEA=0.017 (0.000, 0.057), CFI=0.999, TLI=0.998	<i>p</i>	RMSEA=0.000 (0.000, 0.042), CFI=1.000, TLI=1.000
Intercept	2.483	0.000	3.549	0.000	3.504
Slope	-0.049	0.000	0.051	0.198	-0.038
Variance (intercept)	0.050	0.000	0.024	0.000	0.028
Variance (slope)	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.057	0.001
Covariance (intercept and slope)	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.790	0.002
ATN (A-T-(N)- vs. A+T-(N)-)					
Intercept on AD signature			-0.006	0.817	
Slope on AD signature			-0.008	0.243	
ATN (A-T-(N)- vs. A+T+(N)-)					
Intercept on AD signature					-0.037
Slope on AD signature					-0.012
ATN (A-T-(N)- vs. A+T+(N)+)					
Intercept on AD signature					
Slope on AD signature					

2 a. Unconditional latent growth curve model (model with no covariates).

3 b. Models also included all control variables, namely, age, education, gender, *ApoE* status, and
4 diagnosis at baseline.5 RMSEA, Root Mean Standardized Error of Approximation; CFI, Confirmatory Fit Index; TLI, Tucker
6 Lewis Index

7

8 Table4. Univariate Latent growth curve model results for ADAS-Cog 13 as outcome (n=576)

	Model 1 ^a		Model 2 ^b		Model 3 ^b
ADAS-Cog 13	RMSEA=0.053 (0.033, 0.074), CFI=0.993, TLI=0.993	<i>p</i>	RMSEA=0.049 (0.019, 0.073), CFI= 0.983, TLI=0.977	<i>p</i>	RMSEA=0.044 (0.020, 0.064), CFI=0.989, TLI=0.985
Intercept	18.419	0.000	-1.723	0.734	6.535
Slope	2.346	0.000	-1.112	0.542	0.166
Variance (intercept)	85.693	0.000	24.268	0.000	28.983
Variance (slope)	10.688	0.000	1.126	0.039	2.327
Covariance (intercept and slope)	20.821	0.000	2.619	0.004	5.201
ATN (A-T-(N)- vs. A+T-(N)-)					
Intercept on ADAS-Cog			0.994	0.270	
Slope on ADAS-Cog			0.815	0.011	
ATN (A-T-(N)- vs. A+T+(N)-)					
Intercept on ADAS-Cog					2.221
Slope on ADAS-Cog					1.164
ATN (A-T-(N)- vs. A+T+(N)+)					
Intercept on ADAS-Cog					
Slope on ADAS-Cog					

9 a. Unconditional latent growth curve model (model with no covariates).

10 b. Models also included all control variables, namely, age, education, gender, *ApoE* status, and

11 diagnosis at baseline.

12 RMSEA, Root Mean Standardized Error of Approximation; CFI, Confirmatory Fit Index; TLI, Tucker

13 Lewis Index

14

15

16 Highlights

17 • PPLGCM was used to test the biomarker sequence hypothesis based on AT(N)

18 profiles.

19 • Alzheimer's pathologic change (e.g. A+T-(N)-) was insufficient to induce effects on

20 cognitive dysfunction.

- 21 • There was a significant direct path from altered cortical thickness to cognitive decline
22 in A+T+(N)- profile.
- 23 • Only the A+T+(N)+ profile showed significant mediation effect of cortical thickness.
- 24 • Sequential effects between brain MRI and cognition changes varied by AT(N) profile.
- 25 • Dynamic changes in biomarker relations in the cascade model should be considered.

26

27 **Credit author statement**

28 **Jae-Won Jang, SangYun Kim:** Conceptualization, Methodology,
29 Software. **Jae-Won Jang, Sung OK Kwon:** Data curation, Writing-
30 Original draft preparation. **Jae-Won Jang, Young Ho Park:**
31 Visualization, **Yeshin Kim, Sang Won Park, Seongheon Kim:**
32 Investigation. **Jae-Sung Lim:** Resources. **Young Chul Youn, Sung**
33 **Hun Kim:** Supervision.: **SangYun Kim:** Supervision, Writing-
34 Reviewing and Editing

35