



**HAL**  
open science

## Prediction of future cognitive scores and dementia onset in Mild Cognitive Impairment patients

Manon Ansart, Ninon Burgos, Olivier Colliot, Didier Dormont, Stanley  
Durrleman

► **To cite this version:**

Manon Ansart, Ninon Burgos, Olivier Colliot, Didier Dormont, Stanley Durrleman. Prediction of future cognitive scores and dementia onset in Mild Cognitive Impairment patients. OHBM 2019 - Organization for Human Brain Mapping Conference, Jun 2019, Rome, Italy. hal-02098427v2

**HAL Id: hal-02098427**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-02098427v2>**

Submitted on 31 Jul 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Prediction of future cognitive scores and dementia onset in Mild Cognitive Impairment patients

Manon Ansart<sup>1,2</sup>, Ninon Burgos<sup>1,2</sup>, Olivier Colliot<sup>2,3</sup>, Didier Dormont<sup>2,3</sup>, Stanley Durrleman<sup>2,1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sorbonne Université, UPMC Univ Paris 06, Inserm, CNRS, Institut du cerveau et la moelle (ICM) - Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, 75013 Paris, France

<sup>2</sup> Inria Paris, ARAMIS project-team, 75013 Paris, France

<sup>3</sup> Sorbonne Université, UPMC Univ Paris 06, Inserm, CNRS, Institut du cerveau et la moelle (ICM), APHP - Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, 75013 Paris, France

## Introduction

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is characterized by changes in brain structure and cognition that can be observed in subjects with a Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI). MCI subjects can evolve to develop AD or not, and identifying those who will is a key challenge (Falahati et al. 2014; Arbabshirani et al. 2017). Most approaches have focused on predicting a future AD diagnosis (Moradi et al. 2015; Ramírez et al. 2017). On the other hand, we believe that predicting the future cognitive scores would provide a more comprehensive view of the future patient state to the clinician, and thus result in more interpretable decision support systems. We therefore propose a method for identifying MCI subjects who will progress to AD within 1 year by first predicting the evolution of their cognitive scores, and then predicting a diagnosis from the predicted scores.

## Methods


Our method is composed of two steps (Figure 1). In a first step, we use a linear regression to predict the future of cognitive scores (ADAS, MMSE, RAVLT and CDR) at time  $t + 1$  year using MRI extracted volumes (whole brain, entorhinal, fusiform, mid temporal, ventricles and hippocampus volumes), socio-demographic information, APOE genotype and the cognitive scores at time  $t$ . In a second step, we use the predicted features to estimate the diagnosis at the same time point ( $t + 1$  year) using a Gaussian kernel Support Vector Machine (SVM).

We consider different approaches to improve this prediction pipeline. We consider using more input features: FDG PET SUVr and detailed MRI features (regional cortical thickness and white matter volumes). We also consider learning the regression on different groups, depending on the age ( $< 65$  years old and  $> 65$  years old), the amyloid status or the APOE genotype.

As our method only uses the latest visit for the prediction, we consider using information from former visits as well in 3 different approaches described in Figure 1: "averaging" (averaging the cognitive score predictions made using different visits), "stacking"

(stacking our cognitive score prediction with the output of a time linear regression) and “rate of change” (including the rate of change of the features in the inputs of the regression).

We evaluate our approach on the MCI patients of the ADNI database, using for each subject the latest pair of visits separated by a 1 year interval. Among the 480 subjects with such a pair and a MCI diagnosis before the latest visit, 15% converted to AD. Performance measures are obtained by splitting the cohort 50 times into a training (70%) and test (30%) set. As a comparison, we predict the diagnosis at time  $t+1$  by using a linear SVM on the features at time  $t$  directly.



**Figure 1.** Proposed approaches : A. cross-sectional framework; B. longitudinal framework, with 3 propositions: (a) averaging, (b) stacking, (c) rate of change.

## Results

Our method resulted in a Mean Absolute Error (MAE) of  $1.51 \pm 0.13$  on MMSE prediction and of  $3.69 \pm 0.28$  on ADAS prediction. It reached an Area under the ROC curve (AUC) of  $87.9 \pm 2.7$ , whereas direct classification gave an AUC of  $86.6 \pm 2.2$ , which is not significantly different. The results did not improve when using more features or building different regression groups (all AUC are presented in Table 1, similar conclusions can be drawn using the MAE). Averaging the predictions from different visits lowered the performance as predicting further in time is harder. The stacking did not improve the results, nor using a rate of change. The best results are therefore achieved using the simplest approach, and are not significantly different from those obtained using direct classification.

|                |        | Method            | AUC        | bacc       |
|----------------|--------|-------------------|------------|------------|
|                |        | Proposed approach | 87.9 ± 2.7 | 77.1 ± 6.1 |
| extra features |        | + FDG PET         | 86.7 ± 3.1 | 75.1 ± 3.9 |
|                |        | + detailed MRI    | 88.1 ± 2.8 | 76.9 ± 5.0 |
|                | groups | Age               | 87.7 ± 2.9 | 74.3 ± 7.2 |
|                |        | Amyloid status    | 87.5 ± 2.9 | 74.6 ± 5.8 |
|                |        | APOE genotype     | 87.4 ± 3.3 | 77.2 ± 4.1 |
| longitudinal   |        | Averaging         | 83.3 ± 3.9 | 75.4 ± 5.8 |
|                |        | Stacking          | 87.6 ± 3.3 | 75.9 ± 5.7 |
|                |        | Rate of change    | 87.8 ± 3.1 | 77.9 ± 6.5 |

**Table 1.** AUC and balanced accuracy (bacc) obtained on the tested approaches, in the form mean performance ± standard deviation

## Conclusions

We proposed to predict the conversion of MCI subjects to AD by first predicting the evolution of cognitive scores. The classification performances are similar to the ones obtained by predicting the future diagnosis from the current features. However, with the prediction of the future cognitive scores, it is possible to understand how the diagnosis prediction was made. We believe that such approaches are more likely to be adopted by the clinicians.

## References

- Arbabshirani, Mohammad R., Sergey Plis, Jing Sui, et Vince D. Calhoun. 2017. « Single subject prediction of brain disorders in neuroimaging: Promises and pitfalls ». *NeuroImage*, Individual Subject Prediction, 145 (janvier): 137-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.02.079>.
- Falahati, Farshad, Eric Westman, et Andrew Simmons. 2014. « Multivariate Data Analysis and Machine Learning in Alzheimer's Disease with a Focus on Structural Magnetic Resonance Imaging ». *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease* 41 (3): 685-708. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-131928>.
- Moradi, Elaheh, Antonietta Pepe, Christian Gaser, Heikki Huttunen, et Jussi Tohka. 2015. « Machine learning framework for early MRI-based Alzheimer's conversion prediction in MCI subjects ». *NeuroImage* 104 (Supplement C): 398-412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.10.002>.
- Ramírez, J., J. M. Górriz, A. Ortiz, F. J. Martínez-Murcia, F. Segovia, D. Salas-Gonzalez, D. Castillo-Barnes, I. A. Illán, et C. G. Puntonet. 2017. « Ensemble of random forests One vs. Rest classifiers for MCI and AD prediction using ANOVA cortical and subcortical feature selection and partial least squares ». *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, décembre. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.12.005>.