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## NACC UDS of normal controls Weintraub et al. (2018)

- 3,461 Individuals (Caucasian subset with complete data)
- 29 ADCS
- Outcomes considered - Trail Making Test A \& B, Letter fluency F \& L \& , Category fluency - animals \& vegetables, Multilingual Naming test total, Number Span longest digit forward \& backward, Craft memory - immediate \& delay, Benson figure copy \& recall, Montreal Cognitive Assessment (or MoCA), Number Span forward \& backward total correct trials
- Assume data approximates distribution of "healthy controls" for each outcome
- Objective - to detect extremely "bad" scores relative to the control distribution - indicative of dementia (focus on FTD)


## Basic "normative" Z-scores



Centered Trail Making Test B score

Consider a single neuropsychological test -- e.g. Trail Making Test B (TRAILB)

> Extreme Z-scores
> (e.g. > 2 or <-2) indicative of cognitive impairment

For a new individual: take score, subtract mean, divide total by SD, and compare with Z-score distribution

## But... "normal scores" for younger people not same as for older



## Linearly corrected Z-scores

- Linear approach: fit a linear regression to "adjust for" age, sex and education level -- Weintraub et al. (2018)
- To score a new individual - 2-stage process:

1. Adjust test score with fitted regression -- i.e. subtract predicted value for the individuals age, sex and education
2. Turn the adjusted test score into a z-score by dividing by linear regression residual standard deviation estimate

## Linear regression for age



## Linear regression for age - issue 1



FTD often occurs in this lower age range

## Issue 1: Can we improve on the straight line fit with a nonlinear fit?



## But, is nonlinear regression the right thing to do?



## Is nonlinear regression the right thing to do?




## Is nonlinear regression the right thing to do?



We do need to be careful when fitting nonlinear models that we do not "overfit"

## Present solution: use shape constrained additive models (SCAMs)

- Generalized additive models (GAMs) - flexible "smooth" curves to fit data - Hastie \& Tibshirani (1986)
- Extend to shape constrained models (SCAMs) -- strictly increasing or decreasing fits - Pya \& Wood (2015)
- GAMs/SCAMs use a set of smooth "basis functions" (e.g. P-splines = penalized B-splines) - knitted together with "nice" mathematical properties form a smooth function
- Avoids overfitting by cross-validating - checks for a "genuinely improved fit" when adding complexity
- We use SCAM to regress on Age, Sex and Education


## SCAM fitted model: TRAILB vs Age

Trail Making Test B vs. Age (Yrs)


## SCAM fitted model: TRAILB vs ED.

Trail Making Test B vs. Education (Yrs)


## Linear regression for age - issue 2



# Issue 2: Account for increasing variance - SCAM fitted model: SD vs Age 

Estimate standard deviation with age based on an 11 year window (blue line) and fit SCAM

Trail Making Test B vs. Age (Yrs)


Trail Making Test B SD vs. Age (Yrs)


## SCAM fitted model: ANIMALS vs Age



## SCAM fitted model: ANIMALS vs ED.

Category fluency - animals vs. Education (Yrs)


## SCAM fitted model: ANIMALS SD vs Age

Category fluency - animals vs. Age (Yrs)


Category fluency - animals SD vs. Age (Yrs)


## Procedure - look up table for TRAILB

|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NACCAGE | EDUC | SEX | mean.adj | sd.adj |
| 2 | 40 | 11 | 0 | 119.487918 | 7.55301009 |
| 3 | 41 | 11 | 0 | 119.500457 | 8.22482161 |
| 4 | 42 | 11 | 0 | 119.513383 | 8.89728201 |
| 5 | 43 | 11 | 0 | 119.526919 | 9.5707555 |
| 6 | 44 | 11 | 0 | 119.54129 | 10.2456063 |
| 7 | 45 | 11 | 0 | 119.556723 | 10.9221986 |
| 8 | 46 | 11 | 0 | 119.57344 | 11.6008966 |
| 9 | 47 | 11 | 0 | 119.591668 | 12.2820646 |
| 10 | 48 | 11 | 0 | 119.611631 | 12.9660668 |
| 11 | 49 | 11 | 0 | 119.634357 | 13.6532756 |
| 12 | 50 | 11 | 0 | 119.674358 | 14.3442042 |
| 13 | 51 | 11 | 0 | 119.757334 | 15.0394822 |
| 14 | 52 | 11 | 0 | 119.909324 | 15.7397425 |
| 15 | 53 | 11 | 0 | 120.156368 | 16.4456183 |
| 16 | 54 | 11 | 0 | 120.524504 | 17.1577428 |
| 17 | 55 | 11 | 0 | 121.039773 | 17.8767489 |
| 18 | 56 | 11 | 0 | 121.728213 | 18.6032698 |
| 19 | 57 | 11 | 0 | 122.615833 | 19.3379382 |
| 20 | 58 | 11 | 0 | 123.713499 | 20.0812027 |
| 21 | 59 | 11 | 0 | 124.992335 | 20.833029 |
| 22 | 60 | 11 | 0 | 126.417026 | 21.5933045 |
| 23 | 61 | 11 | 0 | 127.95226 | 22.3619164 |

For a new patient:

1. Obtain the patient's TRAILB score
2. Find the row in the table corresponding to the patients, age, education level and sex ( $0=\mathrm{M}, 1=\mathrm{F}$ ) - extract value for mean.adj and sd.adj
3. Take the patient's TRAILB score, subtract mean.adj, then divide by sd.adj = patient's z-score

$$
z=\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}=\frac{x-\text { mean. adj }}{\text { sd.adj }}
$$

## Limitations

- Nonlinear models need more "manipulation" to fit
- Ad hoc SD windowing technique
- Non-normally distributed variation in some variables
- Caucasians only
- Based only on normative individuals


## Never lose sight that ideal solution needs distribution of dementia group Z-scores




Optimal Z-score cut-point for classifying dementia depends on the distribution of the dementia Z -scores

## Conclusions

- Nonlinear model fitting via SCAMs provides greater improvement in fit (over linear) for the relationship between the predictors (age, sex and education level) and neurocognitive outcomes in the control population.
- Nonlinear modeling thereby leads to adjusted Z-scores that are more representative of the departures from cognitively normal levels relative to their specific age, sex, and education level.
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