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Impact of molecular imaging on the diagnostic process in a memory clinic
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\textbf{Abstract}

\textbf{Background:} \textsuperscript{[11C]}Pittsburgh compound B (\textsuperscript{[11C]}PIB) and \textsuperscript{[18F]}-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (\textsuperscript{[18F]}FDG) PET measure fibrillar amyloid-\(\beta\) load and glucose metabolism, respectively. We evaluated the impact of these tracers on the diagnostic process in a memory clinic population.

\textbf{Methods:} One hundred fifty-four patients underwent paired dynamic \textsuperscript{[11C]}PIB and static \textsuperscript{[18F]}FDG PET scans shortly after completing a standard dementia screening. Two-year clinical follow-up data were available for 39 patients. Parametric PET images were assessed visually and results were reported to the neurologists responsible for the initial diagnosis. Outcome measures were (change in) clinical diagnosis and confidence in that diagnosis before and after disclosing PET results.

\textbf{Results:} \textsuperscript{[11C]}PIB scans were positive in 40 of 66 (61\%) patients with a clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer’s disease (AD), 5 of 18 (28\%) patients with frontotemporal dementia (FTD), 4 of 5 (80\%) patients with Lewy body dementia, and 3 of 10 (30\%) patients with other dementias. \textsuperscript{[18F]}FDG uptake patterns matched the clinical diagnosis in 38 of 66 (58\%) of AD patients, and in 6 of 18 (33\%) FTD patients. PET results led to a change in diagnosis in 35 (23\%) patients. This only occurred when prior diagnostic certainty was \(<90\%\). Diagnostic confidence increased from 71 \(\pm\) 17\% before to 87 \(\pm\) 16\% after PET (\(p < .001\)). Two-year clinical follow-up (\(n = 39\)) showed that \textsuperscript{[11C]}PIB and \textsuperscript{[18F]}FDG predicted progression to AD for patients with mild cognitive impairment, and that the diagnosis of dementia established after PET remained unchanged in 96\% of patients.

\textbf{Conclusions:} In a memory clinic setting, combined \textsuperscript{[11C]}PIB and \textsuperscript{[18F]}FDG PET are of additional value on top of the standard diagnostic work-up, especially when prior diagnostic confidence is low. © 2013 The Alzheimer’s Association. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

The diagnosis of patients with cognitive and/or behavioral symptoms can be complicated as different types of neurodegenerative disorders show overlap in clinical presentation, particularly in patients with an early onset of disease (\(<65\) years) \[1\]. Furthermore, it is difficult to identify patients in a prodromal stage of Alzheimer’s disease (AD) or other forms of dementia based on clinical symptoms alone. Improvement of early and differential...
diagnosis is desirable, especially in view of emerging disease-modifying agents. Over the past decades, several biomarkers have been developed to increase diagnostic accuracy in neurodegenerative diseases. These biomarkers have caused a major paradigm shift and have been incorporated in recently revised criteria that aim for more accurate and earlier diagnosis of AD, frontotemporal dementia (FTD), and dementia with Lewy bodies (DLB) [2–6].

Molecular imaging biomarkers most frequently used in the diagnosis of dementia are [18F]-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose ([18F]FDG) and [11C]Pittsburgh compound B ([11C]PIB), which can be imaged using positron emission tomography (PET). [18F]FDG is the more established tracer and provides a measure of metabolic activity of the brain. [18F]FDG does not directly measure pathology, but rather the extent of metabolic impairment predicts cognitive decline, and is closely related to disease severity [7–9]. Mapping the pattern of glucose hypometabolism has high sensitivity (94%) for diagnosing AD, but specificity is lower (73%), as other neurodegenerative diseases can induce a decrease in glucose metabolism resembling the pattern seen in AD [10–12]. Reading [18F]FDG images requires a well-trained eye, and even then only moderate interrater reliability is accomplished [13,14].

More recently, [11C]PIB [15] became available for in vivo detection of fibrillar amyloid plaques, a neuropathologic hallmark of AD. Probing the underlying neuropathologic substrate may be helpful in identifying the correct type of dementia, particularly in patients with an atypical presentation [16]. [11C]PIB discriminates AD patients from cognitively normal elderly [15,17,18], is a strong predictor of progression of mild cognitive impairment (MCI) to AD [19–21], and distinguishes AD reasonably well from other forms of dementia such as FTD [16,22] and vascular dementia (VaD) [23]. Patients with DLB, however, show positive [11C]PIB scans in up to 89% of cases [24], which corresponds to increased amyloid burden found at postmortem examination in the majority of DLB patients [25]. Visual assessment of parametric [11C]PIB images is straightforward and shows a high level of agreement between readers [14].

The current literature on [18F]FDG and especially [11C]PIB PET typically consists of comparisons of highly selected diagnostic groups. In general, these studies show good correspondence between clinical diagnosis and neuroimaging results. The potential lack of variation in pretest diagnostic certainty, however, may overestimate this concordance and may actually be lower in a more representative sample of a memory clinic population. The aim of the present study was therefore to assess the impact of [11C]PIB and [18F]FDG PET on the diagnostic process in a large sample of patients from a memory clinic, encompassing a wide spectrum of cognitive and/or behavioral symptoms.

2. Methods

2.1. Subjects and diagnostic procedure

Between March 2009 and September 2011, 154 patients were included from the outpatient memory clinic of the VU University Medical Center. All patients underwent standard diagnostic work-up for dementia consisting of medical history, informant based history, physical and neurologic examinations, screening laboratory tests, brain magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and neuropsychologic testing [26]. This was followed by paired [11C]PIB and [18F]FDG PET scans. To ensure substantial variation in pretest diagnostic certainty, patients were recruited from two cohorts. One hundred nine patients were enrolled in the Center for Translational Molecular Medicine (CTMM) Leiden Alzheimer Research Netherlands (LeARN) project. The aim of this project is to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of ancillary investigations in a memory clinic setting, encompassing a wide spectrum of cognitive and/or behavioral symptoms. Patients with a Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) score of ≥20 and a maximum clinical dementia rating (CDR) of 1, without major neurologic and psychiatric disorders, recent vascular events, and excessive substance abuse, could participate in LeARN. In a second group of 45 patients, [11C]PIB and [18F]FDG PET scans were performed in case of substantial uncertainty about the diagnosis after the standard diagnostic work-up. The aforementioned inclusion criteria did not apply to the latter group of patients. A clinical diagnosis was made by consensus of a multidisciplinary team using established clinical criteria [27–31]. Diagnostic categories were AD, FTD, VaD, DLB, dementia-other (i.e., corticobasal degeneration [CBD] and progressive supranuclear palsy [PSP]), MCI, subjective memory complaints (SMC), psychiatry, and neurology-other (i.e., normal pressure hydrocephalus). In December 2011, 2-year clinical follow-up data (consisting of neurologic and neuropsychologic reevaluation, without neuroimaging) were available for 39 patients. All patients gave written informed consent after they had received a complete written and verbal description of the study. The medical ethics review committee of the VU University Medical Center approved the study.

2.2. PET imaging and analysis

PET procedures have been reported elsewhere [26]. Briefly, PET scanning was performed on an ECAT Exact HR+ scanner (Siemens/CTI, Knoxville, TN). After a 10-minute transmission scan, a dynamic 90-minute emission scan was started simultaneously with an intravenous injection of 367 ± 43 MBq [11C]PIB. After coregistration of the MRIs to the corresponding PET images, the data were further analyzed using PVELab [32]. Regions of interest (ROIs) were projected onto nondisplaceable binding
potential (BPND) images of $[^{11}C]PIB$. These images were generated by applying a two-step basis-function implementation of the simplified reference tissue model (RPM2) [33]. For 12 patients, standardized uptake value ratio (SUVr) images of $[^{11}C]PIB$ for the interval between 60 and 90 minutes [34], rather than BPND images, were generated because of patient movement and/or technical issues. Cerebellar gray matter was chosen as reference tissue.

After an interval of at least 2 hours to allow for decay of $[^{11}C]PIB$, an intravenous bolus of approximately 185 MBq of $[^{18}F]FDG$ was administered. All subjects rested for 15 minutes before and for 35 minutes after injection with eyes closed and ears unplugged in a dimly lit room with minimal background noise. Next, patients underwent a 10-minute transmission scan followed by a 15-minute emission scan. Parametric SUVr images were extracted from the interval between 45 and 60 minutes after injection. In addition, $[^{18}F]FDG$ scans were analyzed using the PMOD Alzheimer’s discrimination (PALZ) tool [35]. Briefly, the PALZ tool compares age-corrected $[^{18}F]FDG$ uptake with predicted uptake. The $t$ values of all abnormal voxels within a predefined AD mask are summed, yielding an AD $t$-sum that automatically classifies the scan into either normal or abnormal.

For both tracers, T1-weighted MRI (3T Signa HDxt; General Electric, Milwaukee, WI) scans were used for coregistration and segmentation. Due to tracer synthesis failure, 21 patients did not undergo $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET scans on the same day but within an interval of, at most, 4 weeks. $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET scans were performed 2 ± 1 months after dementia screening.

2.3. Visual assessment of parametric $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ images

BPND ($n = 142$) and SUVr ($n = 12$) images of $[^{11}C]PIB$ and SUVr images of $[^{18}F]FDG$ were assessed visually by an experienced nuclear medicine physician (B.v.B.). $[^{11}C]PIB$ PET scans were rated as either PIB-positive (PIB+; binding in more than one cortical brain region; i.e., frontal, parietal, temporal, or occipital) or PIB-negative (PIB-, predominantly white matter binding). For $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET scans, the reader had access to both the original images and the results of the PALZ tool. The nuclear medicine physician made the final decision. $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET scans were interpreted as either normal or deviant and suggestive for AD (posterior cingulate and parietotemporal hypometabolism), FTD (frontotemporal metabolic impairment), DLB (occipital hypometabolism with relatively intact posterior cingulate gyrus), or dementia-other (PSP: mesencephalon, prefrontal, caudate nucleus, and thalamus hypometabolism; CBD: asymmetric hypometabolism with involvement of the basal ganglia). $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ scans were assessed together and the reader had access to the clinical differential diagnosis.

2.4. Assessment of impact PET on diagnostic process

After clinical assessment, that is, prior to PET, one of the neurologists (either N.D.P., A.W.L., Y.A.L.P., or P.S.) indicated the most probable (consensus) diagnosis on a questionnaire (refer to form in supplementary material). It was mandatory for the neurologists to select a diagnosis. In addition, the level of diagnostic certainty was estimated on a scale ranging from 0% to 100%. Next, PET scanning and subsequent rating was performed and the scans were discussed at a monthly meeting in the presence of the neurologists. Subsequently, the most probable diagnosis and corresponding diagnostic certainty were indicated again by the neurologist responsible for the initial diagnosis, now taking into account the findings on PET in addition to the clinical information. Furthermore, it was indicated whether both tracers, $[^{11}C]PIB$ alone, $[^{18}F]FDG$ alone, or none, contributed to the diagnostic process. To specify the utility of the individual tracers, the neurologists were asked whether $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ improved, confused, or had only little or no effect on their understanding of a patient’s disease.

2.5. Statistics

Differences in baseline values between groups were assessed using analysis of variance (ANOVA), Kruskal–Wallis tests, and $\chi^2$ tests, where appropriate. Paired-samples $t$ tests were used to assess change of diagnostic certainty after PET. Independent-sample $t$ tests were used to assess differences in diagnostic certainty prior to PET between AD patients with PIB+ and PIB− PET scans, and between patients with and without diagnostic alteration after PET.

3. Results

3.1. Subjects

After the initial standard dementia work-up, patients received the following clinical diagnoses: AD ($n = 66$); MCI ($n = 30$); SMC ($n = 15$); FTD ($n = 18$); DLB ($n = 5$); dementia-other ($n = 10$); psychiatry ($n = 6$); and neurology-other ($n = 4$). Characteristics according to diagnostic group are presented in Table 1. Diagnostic certainty did not differ between groups prior to PET.

3.2. Visual PET ratings

Table 1 also provides visual ratings of $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET scans. Most AD patients had PIB+ scans (61%) and most patients with non-Alzheimer’s dementia had $[^{11}C]PIB$ scans (67%). Consequently, still relatively high numbers of PIB− scans were seen in patients with a clinical AD diagnosis (39%), and PIB− scans in patients with a clinical diagnosis of FTD (28%), DLB (80%), “dementia-other” (30%), MCI (57%), and SMC
Demographic and clinical characteristics according to clinical diagnosis prior to PET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AD (n = 66)</th>
<th>MCI (n = 30)</th>
<th>SMC (n = 15)</th>
<th>FTD (n = 18)</th>
<th>DEM-other (n = 10)</th>
<th>DLB (n = 5)</th>
<th>Psychiatry (n = 6)</th>
<th>NEU-other (n = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>64 ± 7</td>
<td>64 ± 9</td>
<td>64 ± 6</td>
<td>67 ± 6</td>
<td>65 ± 10</td>
<td>65 ± 7</td>
<td>56 ± 7</td>
<td>59 ± 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (M/F)</td>
<td>44/22</td>
<td>23/7</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>12/6</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMSE</td>
<td>21 ± 5†</td>
<td>27 ± 2</td>
<td>28 ± 2</td>
<td>23 ± 5‡</td>
<td>25 ± 3</td>
<td>22 ± 2</td>
<td>26 ± 2</td>
<td>26 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDR</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.4†</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.7</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.7</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pre-PET diagnostic certainty</td>
<td>71 ± 19</td>
<td>69±15</td>
<td>79 ± 16</td>
<td>71 ± 16</td>
<td>62 ± 12</td>
<td>66 ± 11</td>
<td>73 ± 13</td>
<td>73 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% [11C]PIB+ [18F]FDG pattern</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all patients together, diagnostic certainty increased from 71 ± 17% before PET to 87 ± 16% after PET (p < .001). Diagnostic confidence prior to PET was lower for diagnoses that changed after PET (62 ± 18%) compared with those that remained unchanged (73 ± 15%, p < .05). Also, diagnostic confidence prior to PET was higher in patients with a clinical AD diagnosis who showed PIB+ PET scans (75 ± 16%) compared with those who showed PIB− scans (64 ± 20%, p < .05). A change in clinical diagnosis only occurred when diagnostic confidence prior to PET was <90% (Figure 1). Percent change in diagnosis after PET increased with lower pre-PET diagnostic confidence of the clinician (Figure 3).


In patients whose diagnosis changed after PET, 7 were PIB+ and 28 were PIB−. Corresponding patterns of [18F]FDG uptake fitted best to AD (12 cases), FTD (9 cases), DLB (2 cases), and dementia-other (2 cases), or were considered normal (10 cases). As shown in Table 2, combined [11C]PIB and [18F]FDG contributed most often to the diagnosis (104 cases), followed by [11C]PIB only (29 cases) and [18F]FDG only (11 cases).


[11C]PIB provided information that improved the clinicians understanding of a patient’s disease in 125 (81%) patients, whereas, for [18F]FDG, this was the case in 98 (64%) patients (refer to supplementary figure). [11C]PIB and [18F]FDG each confused the clinician in 8 (6%) and 12 (10%) cases, respectively. [18F]FDG more often (43 cases, 34%) had only little or no effect on the clinician’s comprehension of a patient’s disease than [11C]PIB (20 cases, 16%).
3.7. Clinical follow-up

Two-year clinical follow-up data were available for 39 patients. Six of 7 patients with MCI and \([11C]\text{PIB}\) PET scans progressed to AD during follow-up, of whom 5 had a baseline \([18F]\text{FDG}\) scan suggestive of AD (Table 3). None of the 5 MCI patients with \([11C]\text{PIB}\) and normal \([18F]\text{FDG}\) PET scans converted to AD. SMC patients did not convert during follow-up. Post-PET diagnosis changed in only 1 of 23 dementia patients (4%) (refer to supplementary table).

4. Discussion

In this study we have investigated the added value of combined \([11C]\text{PIB}\) and \([18F]\text{FDG}\) PET in the diagnostic process in a large sample of patients from a specialized memory clinic. The main result was that molecular imaging is indeed of additional value over standard diagnostic work-up, given that 23% of the initial clinical diagnoses changed and that diagnostic confidence increased after PET. The lower the diagnostic certainty prior to PET, the larger the percent change in diagnosis after PET. Two-year clinical follow-up in a small subset of patients (\(n = 39\)) showed that PET predicted progression to AD in MCI patients and that the clinical dementia diagnoses established after PET remained unchanged in 96% of cases. Application of \([11C]\text{PIB}\) and \([18F]\text{FDG}\) PET seems therefore most useful when confidence in a dementia diagnosis is low, and to increase prognostic certainty in patients with MCI.

There was a frequent mismatch between clinical diagnosis and PET findings in this study. Absence of \([11C]\text{PIB}\) binding in clinically diagnosed AD patients is a common finding, but in general this is less than the 39% observed in the present study [15]. False negative findings cannot be ruled out, as \([11C]\text{PIB}\) PET may not be able to detect more soluble species of A\(_{\beta}\)-42 or atypical amyloid deposits [36]. This is rare, however, and it is more likely that these patients present with an AD-like phenotype that originates from non-amyloidogenic neuropathology. On the other hand, \([11C]\text{PIB}\)-positive scans are regularly observed in patients with non-AD dementias, particularly in FTD and in DLB [16,22,24]. Autopsy studies in DLB patients have proven that these are not false positive findings but truly reflect AD pathology, next to the presence of Lewy bodies [25]. With respect to FTD, it is known from postmortem studies that about 15%–20% of clinical FTD patients actually have AD [37]. These patients potentially mimic an FTD clinical syndrome that is actually driven by AD pathology, also known as “the frontal variant of AD” [38]. Alternatively, comorbid FTD and AD pathology may be present, with FTD pathology as the force driving the clinical presentation and amyloid pathology as a byproduct of aging. In the present study, clinicians tended to use \([11C]\text{PIB}\) PET mostly...
to rule out AD, which seems justified according to the aforementioned neuropathologic findings.

Unlike $[^{11}C]PIB$, $[^{18}F]FDG$ does not provide dichotomous information, as metabolic impairment occurs in many brain disorders that cause cognitive deterioration [10]. $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET, however, can be used to identify patterns of cerebral glucose hypometabolism that characterize several neurodegenerative diseases. Due to its close relation with neuronal function, and therefore cognitive status, $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET can be helpful in diagnostic dilemmas [10].

In the present study, discrepancies between clinical diagnosis and $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET findings were common. This may be explained by diagnostic misclassification or by patients with atypical clinical presentations and equivalent patterns of glucose hypometabolism or by patients with an atypical clinical presentation but atypical $[^{18}F]FDG$ uptake.

The case presented in Figure 2 illustrates the synergistic effect of using both pathophysiologic and metabolic tracers. Indeed, clinicians indicated that the combination of $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ most often contributed to the diagnosis, followed by $[^{11}C]PIB$ alone and $[^{18}F]FDG$ alone. Cases in which $[^{11}C]PIB$ was decisive were mainly initial clinical diagnoses of SMC, MCI, or AD, whereas $[^{18}F]FDG$ was essential in some cases with a clinical diagnosis of FTD, DLB, or psychiatry. Based on the present study, combining $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET seems most useful in patients with low diagnostic certainty after standard diagnostic work-up. Cost-effectiveness of both $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ PET seems most useful in patients with low diagnostic certainty after standard diagnostic work-up. Cost-effectiveness of both $[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ in a memory clinic setting have yet to be proven, but, assuming that PET improves diagnostic accuracy, this will be greatly enhanced by the availability of disease-modifying agents in the future.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>$[^{11}C]PIB$ and $[^{18}F]FDG$ to diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10/6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>45/68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>19/63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>7/47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTD</td>
<td>14/78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia-other</td>
<td>8/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLB</td>
<td>4/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>4/67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology-other</td>
<td>3/75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are presented as number/percent. Neurologists indicated whether both tracers, $[^{11}C]PIB$ alone, $[^{18}F]FDG$ alone, or none, contributed to the diagnostic process. AD, Alzheimer’s disease; MCI, mild cognitive impairment; SMC, subjective memory complaints; FTD, frontotemporal dementia; DLB, dementia with Lewy bodies.
The results of our study cannot simply be generalized to a general memory clinic population. These patients had visited a last resort memory clinic, most of them for a second or third opinion. The relatively young age of the patients (64 years, on average) make an initial diagnosis more difficult as clinical presentations tend to overlap between diagnostic categories and this may not be representative for an older sample [1]. Furthermore, a subset of this sample underwent PET for diagnostic purposes because standard diagnostic work-up was not sufficient. All these factors together complicate the interpretation of the present results. In addition, the study design may have affected the outcome as it was mandatory for the neurologists to select a probability diagnosis, even in complex cases that would usually be postponed, when awaiting clinical follow-up and/or additional investigations. Another potential limitation of this study is the lack of postmortem verification, as no autopsy data were available. Alternatively, a subset of patients underwent 2-year clinical follow-up and, in these patients, the post-PET diagnoses remained stable in the dementia patients. Finally, $^{[11}C]PIB$ and $^{[18}F]FDG$ were always assessed together and the nuclear medicine physician was provided with the clinical differential diagnosis, which may have affected the interpretation of both scans.

In conclusion, in a memory clinic, $^{[11}C]PIB$ and $^{[18}F]FDG$ PET have additional value beyond standard diagnostic work-up. Molecular imaging in this setting is most useful for early diagnosis of AD and in cases of high diagnostic uncertainty after standard work-up.
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