Deciphering logopenic primary progressive aphasia: a clinical, imaging and biomarker investigation
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Within primary progressive aphasia the logopenic variant remains less understood than the two other main variants, namely semantic and non-fluent progressive aphasia. This may be because of the relatively small number of explored patients and because of the lack of investigations with a comprehensive three-level characterization of cognitive, brain localization and biological aspects. The aim of the present study was to decipher the logopenic variant through a multimodal approach with a large cohort of 19 patients (age 66.5 ± 8.7 years, symptom duration 3.2 ± 0.6 years) using detailed cognitive and linguistic assessments, magnetic resonance imaging and perfusion single-photon emission computed tomography as well as cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers screening for Alzheimer pathology. The linguistic assessment unveiled that language dysfunction is not limited to the typical feature of word finding and verbal working memory impairments but that it extends into the language system affecting to some degree syntactic production, phonological encoding and semantic representations. Perfusion tomography revealed damage of the temporal-parietal junction with a peak of significance in the superior temporal gyrus (Brodmann area 42), and of some less significant prefrontal areas (Brodmann areas 8, 9 and 46), whereas hippocampal cortices were unaffected. Magnetic resonance imaging, which was visually assessed in a larger group of 54 patients with logopenic, non-fluent, semantic variants as well as posterior cortical atrophy, confirmed that the logopenic variant demonstrates predominant atrophy of left temporal-parietal junction, but that this atrophy pattern has a relatively poor sensitivity and specificity for clinical diagnosis. Finally, the biomarker study revealed that two-thirds of the logopenic patients demonstrated a profile indicative of Alzheimer pathology whereas one-third had a non-Alzheimer profile. Splitting the two groups showed that logopenic aphasia due to probable Alzheimer pathology is a more aggressive variant characterized by more extensive language/cognitive disorders affecting in addition to lexical processes and verbal working memory, also phoneme sequencing, semantic processing and ideomotor praxis. Concordantly, logopenic aphasia due to probable Alzheimer pathology demonstrated more extensive brain hypoperfusion involving larger regions throughout the inferior parietal, the posterior-superior and the middle temporal cortex. These findings allow for unfolding logopenic aphasia into two subvariants differing by disease severity, lesion nature and lesion distribution, which has important implications for diagnosis, patient management and for potential future trials with...
Introduction

Primary progressive aphasia (PPA) is an umbrella term which identifies a group of neurodegenerative diseases that predominantly affect language processing. It encompasses three main variants (non-fluent/agrammatic, semantic and logopenic PPA), which can be distinguished by their aphasia profile and atrophy pattern. The prevalence of PPA has been estimated at about 7/100,000 upon epidemiologic data drawn from frontal-temporal lobar degeneration, which comprises non-fluent and semantic PPA but not the logopenic variant (Ratnavalli et al., 2002; Knopman and Roberts, 2011). Likewise, diagnostic criteria of PPA initially only comprised non-fluent and semantic PPA (Neary et al., 1998; Mesulam, 2001) whereas logopenic PPA has been included only recently (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011). This rather late consideration of logopenic PPA might primarily relate to the fact that research on this PPA variant has been limited in terms of number of studies and of explored patients. The characterization of logopenic PPA therefore remains still fragmentary and its potentially important prevalence within the PPA spectrum encourages a comprehensive specification of logopenic PPA features. Such a specification is furthermore crucial because logopenic PPA may represent a potential candidate for therapeutic trials with anti-Alzheimer drugs given that several studies have suggested a high proportion of underlying Alzheimer pathology (Mesulam et al., 2008; Migliaccio et al., 2009; Leyton et al., 2011).

Previous studies have shown that logopenic PPA is primarily characterized by a word finding impairment, related to a pathological ‘word-on-the-tip-of-the-tongue’ phenomenon, and by repetition and comprehension difficulties for sentences due to verbal working memory deficits (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2004, 2008). Several authors have shown that cortical atrophy mainly affects the left temporal-parietal junction (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2004; Migliaccio et al., 2009; Rohrer et al., 2010b), which is known to implement both lexical representations (Indefrey and Levelt, 2004) and phonological working memory (Paulesu et al., 1993; Jonides et al., 1998). Furthermore, several studies suggest that logopenic PPA is primarily due to underlying Alzheimer pathology as reflected by neuropathological data (Mesulam et al., 2008; Ridgway et al., 2012; Rohrer et al., 2012) and by in vivo findings from neuropathological surrogates such as $^{11}$C-Pittsburgh compound B (PIB)-PET imaging (Rabinovici et al., 2008; Leyton et al., 2011) or CSF biomarkers (Rohrer et al., 2010b, 2012; Hu et al., 2010). However, these findings derive from investigations including relatively small logopenic PPA samples and/or from studies that did not provide a comprehensive three-level characterization with respect to cognitive patterns, brain localization (imaging) and causative pathological mechanisms (neuropathology or surrogate markers). In this vein, studies focusing on brain localization or pathological mechanisms rarely provide a detailed language/neuropsychological characterization, and conversely, studies investigating the cognitive/linguistic profile of logopenic PPA mostly lack either imaging or neuropathological markers. Moreover, imaging studies in logopenic PPA primarily used MRI voxel-based morphometry whereas PET and single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) imaging, which provide sensitive markers of cortical dysfunction (Harbert et al., 2011), have only been applied to small cohorts (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2008; Rabinovici et al., 2008; Josephs et al., 2010) or within studies lacking language data (Kas et al., 2012). Finally, diagnostic criteria for logopenic PPA (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011), which are based on the expertise of PPA specialists may need additional support from comprehensive larger scale studies. It therefore appears crucial to enrich current research on PPA by investigating a large sample of logopenic PPA patients using a multi-modal approach. With the aim of ensuring clinical usefulness, establishing such a picture should furthermore be based on the application of tools that are commonly available in neurological centres while eventually avoiding high-level techniques such as voxel-based morphometry or PET-PIB.

In the present study, we therefore explored a large cohort of 19 patients with logopenic PPA using standardized language/neuropsychological tests, MRI and SPECT imaging, as well as CSF biomarkers. We furthermore aimed at individualizing cognitive and imaging phenotypes of logopenic PPA subforms as a function of CSF results, which should also allow for uncovering non-invasive predictors of Alzheimer pathology.

Materials and methods

Patients

Within a time interval of 2 years we recruited 61 patients at the neurological department of the Pitie´ Salpeˆtrie`re Hospital who satisfied the International Diagnostic Criteria of PPA (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011). All patients had isolated or largely predominant language disorders that evolved insidiously and for which only a degenerative mechanism could account. The patients were further classified into the three PPA main variants according to Gorno-Tempini et al. (2011) yielding 19 patients with logopenic PPA (31.1%), 24 patients with semantic PPA (39.3%) and 11 patients with non-fluent/agrammatic PPA (18.0%). Seven patients (11.5%) did not fulfil the criteria of any of these variants and were considered as non-classifiable PPA. For the purpose of the present study we subsequently focused on the
19 patients with logopenic PPA who were selected upon rigorous classification criteria. First, we applied the gold standard, namely a patient classification based on the judgement of three senior PPA experts (B.D., M.T., R.M.) that carefully screened language performance conforming to the international consensus criteria (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011). In accordance with these criteria all patients demonstrated the logopenic PPA core feature of word-finding difficulties and sentence repetition impairment. Furthermore, with respect to Gorno-Tempini et al. (2011), and according to previous reports on logopenic PPA (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2008), syntactic, semantic and phonological impairments were only accepted when these were mild and clearly less prominent than the logopenic PPA core feature. To ensure accurate distinction of logopenic from semantic PPA we did not include any patient with predominant disorders of single-word comprehension. Likewise, to ensure accurate distinction of logopenic from non-fluent/agrammatic PPA, we did not include any patient with ‘frank agrammatism’ and/or with ‘motor speech disorders’ (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011). As the term ‘frank agrammatism’ is open to interpretation, we used the four-point scale of Leyton et al. (2011) which showed that no patient had ‘severe’ agrammatism as opposed to ‘mild’, ‘questionable’ or ‘absent’ disorders. Furthermore, we quantified in each patient the number of syntactic errors and the number of word-finding pauses occurring after determiners (e.g. ‘this is a [pause], a . . . cookie’). Word finding pauses were at least four times more frequent than syntactic errors. Finally, we revised the annual speech recordings of our logopenic PPA patients to give additional confidence to the logopenic PPA diagnosis. This procedure showed that no patient had definite syntactic or semantic disorders 1 year before the inclusion whereas all patients demonstrated the language core feature of logopenic PPA.

All patients were recruited from the clinic follow-up of our neurological department. They had no previous neurological or psychiatric history. During the diagnostic procedure, MRI was used to exclude non-degenerative causes of brain damage including vascular white matter disease. Among the 19 patients with logopenic PPA, two had a parent with a neurocognitive disease, one with late onset matter disease. Among the 19 patients with logopenic PPA, two had a parent with a neurocognitive disease, one with late onset Alzheimer’s disease and another with fronto-temporal dementia. Demographic data of the patients with logopenic PPA are summarized in Table 1. All biological and clinical data were generated during a routine clinical work-up. Therefore, according to French legislation, explicit informed consent was waived. However, regulations concerning electronic filing were followed, and patients and their relatives were informed that anonymized data might be used in clinical research studies.

**Cognitive level: language and general cognitive assessment**

All patients underwent a language and a general cognitive battery which contained published tests with normative scores. The language battery was composed of four subtests of the Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Evaluation (Mazaux and Orgogozo, 1982), a picture naming test (DO80; Deloche and Hannequin, 1997) and a verbal fluency test comprising phonemic and category fluency (Cardebat et al., 1990). The subtests of the Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Evaluation comprised: (i) an evaluation of aphasia severity taking into account spontaneous speech and the description of the ‘cookies theft’ picture; (ii) a sentence repetition test; (iii) a sentence comprehension test; and (iv) a single-word comprehension task (pointing to pictures upon auditory word presentation). As the DO80 naming test contains 80 pictures depicting relatively high frequency nouns (34 ± 59 per million according to the LEXIQUE 2 database; New et al., 2004) we added 35 low frequency items that corresponded to parts of the represented objects (e.g. picture representing a horse: high frequency item ‘horse’, low frequency item = ‘máne’). Low frequency nouns had a lexical frequency of 13 ± 23 per million, which was sought to enhance the sensitivity of the assessment. Normative scores for the naming of the low frequency items were obtained with 30 healthy adults who were matched with the patients with logopenic PPA on age and number of years of education (both F’s < 1). Finally, two experienced speech therapists (S.F., M.N.) evaluated the presence or absence of speech apraxia (phonetic disorders), disorders of phoneme sequencing (phonological encoding) and syntactic errors during the different tests of the battery as well as during spontaneous speech. Testing took ~1h. Altogether, the language battery assessed several core domains of language processing comprising semantics, lexical processing, syntax, phonology and verbal working memory. More specifically, ‘single-word comprehension’ and ‘category fluency’ mainly assessed semantic capacities (the latter also probing for lexical capacities), ‘picture naming’ and ‘phonemic fluency’ primarily assessed lexical abilities, and ‘sentence repetition’ probed for verbal working memory. ‘Sentence comprehension’ is a more composite task assessing at a time verbal working memory, semantic word knowledge and syntactic competency. Furthermore, detailed evaluation of syntactic errors, phoneme sequencing errors and speech apraxia provided proxy markers for syntactic, phonological and phonetic abilities, respectively.

The general cognitive battery included the Mattis Dementia Rating Scale (Mattis, 1976), the Mini-Mental State Examination (Folstein et al., 1975), the Frontal Assessment Battery (Dubois et al., 2000) and a verbal span assessment (Wechsler, 1981). We also evaluated the presence or absence of ideomotor apraxia using the apraxia scale of Mahieux-Laurent et al. (2009). Testing took ~45 min.

**Biological level: cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers**

Thirteen patients (mean age 66.0 years ± 7.6, symptom duration 3.2 years ± 0.7) had a lumbar puncture with subsequent quantification of total tau (tau), phosphorylated tau at threonine 181 (P-tau) and amyloid-β peptide 1–42 (Ab42). CSF samples were centrifuged for 10 min at 1500 rpm at 48°C to remove cells, aliquoted to 0.4 ml samples in polypropylene tubes and stored at -80°C until analysis. CSF biomarker levels of tau, P-Tau and Ab42 were measured in duplicate using the double sandwich ELISA method (Innogenetics®). We also calculated derived ratios from single biomarkers, including tau/Ab42, P-Tau/Ab42 and the Innotest amyloid tau index (IATI) ratio (Ab-42/ [240 + (1.18 × tau)]). Analyses for all patients were performed in the Biochemistry Department at the Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, with all operators being blind to clinical and imaging information. With respect to
biomarker values predictive of Alzheimer's disease, a previous study of our department has provided two main cut-offs, namely a P-tau/Ab42 cut-off of $\geq 0.211$ pg/ml and a tau/Ab42 cut-off of $\geq 1.23$ pg/ml (Cruz de Souza et al., 2011). These cut-offs had respective sensitivities of 91.7% and 95%, and respective specificities of 89.1% and 84.8% in distinguishing Alzheimer's disease from frontal-temporal lobar degeneration. We predicted that using such markers would allow for splitting the whole logopenic PPA group into a subgroup of patients with probable underlying Alzheimer's disease (logopenic PPA+) and a subgroup of patients who presumably do not have Alzheimer disease (logopenic PPA−).

**Brain level: imaging**

**Atrophy rating on magnetic resonance imaging**

MRI scans included 3D T₁ (inversion recovery-fast spoiled gradient-echo; field of view = 250 mm²; acquisition matrix = 288 × 256; voxel resolution = 0.5 × 0.5 × 1.2 mm; slice thickness = 1.2 mm; space between slices = 1.2 mm), T₂ propeller, FLAIR and diffusion images. The scans were obtained with standard parameters on a 3 T General Electric scanner with a standard head coil for signal reception. Atrophy rating was performed on 3D T₁-weighted sequences by two experienced evaluators (C.B., R.M.; Boutet et al., 2012) who visually assessed the scans of our logopenic PPA patients within a large patient set (n = 54) comprising also non-fluent/agrammatic PPA, semantic PPA and posterior cortical atrophy. This procedure allowed for minimizing potential rating biases by randomizing the scans across patient groups and by blinding both evaluators to disease diagnosis and to the number of patients per group. Furthermore, the assessment of different PPA variants provided a basis for calculating the specificity and sensitivity of MRI-based logopenic PPA detection. The rating procedure followed a fully standardized protocol. First, we selected in both hemispheres eight regions of interest which were derived from previous imaging findings in PPA (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2004). This selection comprised four temporal (pole, posterior-superior, anterior-superior and medial), two parietal (inferior and superior) and two frontal regions (dorsolateral and inferior). The occipital lobe was evaluated as a whole. All regions were identified on six coronal reference planes, perpendicular to the hippocampal axis, while using six precise landmarks along an anterior-posterior axis: (i) anterior-to-genou; (ii) anterior commissure; (iii) posterior commissure; (iv) posterior-to-splenium; (v) mid-cuneus; and (vi) midpoint between mid-cuneus and occipital pole. Evaluators rated atrophy for each patient applying a 3-point scale (0 = absent, 1 = slight, 2 = severe). In case of score discrepancy between the two evaluators, consensus was to be reached upon an additional rating session.

The procedure was applied to 15 of 19 patients with logopenic PPA for whom adequate MRI acquisitions were available (mean age 65.1 years ± 9.2, symptom duration 3.2 years ± 0.7). According to CSF profiles, the logopenic PPA group was further split into two subgroups: logopenic PPA+ (n = 8, mean age 65.9 years ± 8.5, symptom duration 3.3 years ± 0.7) and logopenic PPA− (n = 5, mean age 66.2 years ± 6.9, symptom duration 3.2 years ± 0.7). Patients with atrophy in both the left posterior-superior temporal and the left inferior parietal region, which anatomically compose the temporal-parietal junction were considered to have an imaging pattern of logopenic PPA. The specificity and the sensitivity for detecting logopenic PPA was calculated by contrasting patients with logopenic PPA with nine patients with non-fluent PPA (mean age 69.1 years ± 7.5, symptom duration 3.0 years ± 1.3), 10 with semantic PPA (mean age 65.2 years ± 7.8, symptom duration 3.2 years ± 1.7) and 20 patients with posterior cortical atrophy (mean age 61.9 years ± 8.0, symptom duration 3.9 years ± 1.8). These three subgroups corresponded respectively to the international diagnosis criteria of PPA variants (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011) and of posterior cortical atrophy (McMonagle et al., 2006). Symptom duration and age at disease onset were similar in all patient groups.

**Cortical perfusion on single-photon emission computed tomography**

Sixteen patients with logopenic PPA (mean age 68.1 years ± 8.3, symptom duration 3.7 years ± 0.8, years of education: 11.8 years ± 3.8) and 24 healthy controls (mean age 69.0 years ± 6.9, years of education 10.6 years ± 4.1, Mini-Mental State Examination 28.8 ± 0.7) underwent a brain perfusion SPECT. According to their CSF profiles, the logopenic PPA group was further divided into two subgroups: logopenic PPA+ (n = 8, mean age 65.7 years ± 8.4, symptom duration 3.5 years ± 0.6, years of education 13 years ± 4.2) and logopenic PPA− (n = 3, mean age 63 years ± 4.6, symptom duration 3.5 years ± 1.1, years of education 10.7 years ± 1.5). Finally, we also included 24 patients with an amnesic syndrome of the hippocampal type and with CSF biomarkers indicative of underlying Alzheimer pathology thus fulfilling the revised diagnostic criteria of Alzheimer’s disease (Dubois et al., 2007). These typical Alzheimer’s disease patients (mean age 65.1 years ± 11, symptom duration 3.7 years ± 2.1, years of education 8.6 years ± 5.5) were matched to the logopenic PPA+ group for age, symptom duration and years of education. Clinical and cognitive characteristics of the patients with typical Alzheimer’s disease and the healthy subjects, as well as the procedures of SPECT acquisition and imaging preprocessing have been previously described in Kas et al. (2011). The following sets of analyses were performed: (i) logopenic PPA versus healthy controls to unveil the overall hypoperfusion pattern in the patient population; (ii) logopenic PPA+ versus healthy controls and logopenic PPA− versus healthy controls to explore differences in hypoperfusion patterns among logopenic PPA subtypes according to their CSF biomarker profiles; and (iii) typical Alzheimer’s disease versus healthy controls and logopenic PPA+ versus typical Alzheimer’s disease to individualize in patients with positive CSF biomarkers the cortical regions which are specifically involved in logopenic PPA+ as compared to typical amnesic Alzheimer’s disease.

All Statistical Parametric Mapping T-maps were obtained using a statistical significance threshold of P < 0.05 corrected for multiple tests using the family-wise error rate (FWE) method except for the direct comparison between logopenic PPA and typical Alzheimer’s disease. In this case, considering the small number of subjects and considering the direct contrast between pathological brains, a threshold of P < 0.001 uncorrected was accepted. To decrease the risk of false positive results, clusters of <300 voxels were not considered. Age was entered as a nuisance variable.

**Results**

**Cognitive level**

We calculated mean scores and standard deviations of the different tests of the language and the general cognitive battery and confronted them with normative values (Table 2). Patients with logopenic PPA had abnormal scores on all tests of the general cognitive battery whereas the performances on language tests showed a more differentiated picture with predominant impairment of picture naming, sentence repetition, phonemic fluency...
and category fluency. In addition, we found moderate disorders in syntactic production, single-word comprehension and phonological encoding. The mean aphasia severity score was 3.4 ± 0.7 corresponding to the ability to have a meaningful conversation which becomes information-limited when complex topics have to be elaborated. Overall speech output was fluent, yet disrupted by transient pauses due to word finding difficulties which mostly occurred after determiners preceding content words.

With the aim of assessing the proportion of patients with logopenic PPA who were effectively impaired on a given test we calculated the number of patients who had abnormal performance with respect to the normative scores corresponding to the age and to the years of education for each patient. Concerning apraxia of speech, phonological sequencing errors, syntax disorders and ideomotor apraxia, abnormal performance was assumed when a given test was scored as present. The results are illustrated in Fig. 1. More than 80% of the patients had impaired performance on the general cognitive tests comprising the Mattis Dementia Rating Scale, the Frontal Assessment Battery and the Mini-Mental State Examination. Verbal spans were impaired in 63% of the patients and moderate ideomotor apraxia causing a spatial gesture disorder was found in 53%. No patient was disoriented in time or space as shown by Mini-Mental State Examination subscores. Language testing confirmed that 100% of the patients with logopenic PPA had abnormal capacities of sentence repetition and of picture naming concerning low frequency nouns. Naming of high frequency nouns was impaired in 68% and phonemic and category fluency was abnormal in 68% and 63% of the patients, respectively. Sentence comprehension was hampered in a smaller range (47%) and moderately impaired scores of single-word comprehension were observed in 21% of the patients. Some syntax errors such as violations of phrase structures rules, omission of function words and incorrect gender agreements or verb conjugation were found in 32% of the patients. Finally, 26% had moderate difficulties with phoneme sequencing. No patient had speech apraxia.

Given that anoma is a core feature in logopenic PPA which was present in all patients, we also characterized error types during picture naming. The results show that 75% of the naming errors corresponded to non-responses, 21% were tied to semantic paraphasias and 4% to phonemic paraphasias.

We furthermore conducted correlation analyses on the scores of the general cognitive and the language battery in order to determine tests patterning together and to specify links between impairments in the different test domains (Table 3). With respect to general cognitive tests, Mattis Dementia Rating Scale scores correlated with Mini-Mental State Examination and Frontal Assessment Battery scores. Furthermore, the scores of these three tests correlated with picture naming capacities suggesting that poor performance with general cognitive tests are primarily related to word finding problems. Aphasia severity scores correlated with picture naming and with single-word comprehension capacities suggesting that the degree of language impairment is related to the severity of word finding difficulties and that concomitant semantic disorders enhance this impairment. In addition, the analyses showed that several tests pattern one with another indicating their respective usefulness as proxy markers for specific language/cognitive domains.

### Biological level: cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers

The results of the CSF analyses allowed for dividing the logopenic PPA population into a patient subgroup that demonstrated biomarker results indicative of Alzheimer’s disease (logopenic PPA+; n = 8, 61.5% of the patients) and a subgroup for which biomarkers were not indicative of underlying Alzheimer’s disease (logopenic PPA−; n = 5, 38.5% of the patients). The P-tau/ Ab42 cut-off of 0.211 pg/ml and the tau/Ab42 cut-off of 1.23 pg/ml yielded consistent results assigning the same patients to the same subgroup. Furthermore, analysing the distribution of CSF data in the two subgroups revealed a bimodal distribution of P-tau / Ab42 coordinates (Fig. 2). Logopenic PPA+ and logopenic PPA− were similar with respect to age (logopenic PPA+: 65.9 years ± 8.5, logopenic PPA−: 66.2 years ± 6.9; F < 1), sex (logopenic PPA+: four males, four females, logopenic PPA−: three males, two females; F(1,11) = 1.09, P = 0.32), number

### Table 2 Mean scores of patients with logopenic PPA on the general cognitive and the language battery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means ± SD</th>
<th>Normal threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General cognitive battery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMSE</td>
<td>21.3 ± 4.4*</td>
<td>≥ 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDRS</td>
<td>116.5 ± 12.3*</td>
<td>≥ 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAB</td>
<td>11.2 ± 2.7*</td>
<td>≥ 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal span (standard note)</td>
<td>5.1 ± 3.2</td>
<td>≥ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language battery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity rating scale BDAE</td>
<td>3.4 ± 0.7</td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence repetition BDAE</td>
<td>10.1 ± 2.8*</td>
<td>&gt; 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence comprehension BDAE</td>
<td>7.4 ± 2.3</td>
<td>&gt; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-word comprehension BDAE</td>
<td>66.1 ± 8.7</td>
<td>&gt; 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category fluency (‘fruits’ per 2 min)</td>
<td>8.7 ± 5.1*</td>
<td>&gt; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic fluency (‘P’ per 2 min)</td>
<td>8.3 ± 4.7*</td>
<td>&gt; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Naming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO80 (low frequency items)</td>
<td>21.3 ± 8.6*</td>
<td>≥ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO80 (HFI)</td>
<td>62.2 ± 16.2</td>
<td>≥ 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO80 HFI nb semantic paraphasias</td>
<td>2.9 ± 3.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO80 HFI nb phonemic paraphasias</td>
<td>0.5 ± 1.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO80 HFI nb non-responses</td>
<td>10.4 ± 11.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HFI = high frequency items; SD = standard deviation. MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination; MDRS = Mattis Dementia Rating Scale; FAB = Frontal Assessment Battery; BDAE = Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination. *Scores > 1 SD below the normal threshold.
Figure 1  Percentage of patients with logopenic PPA with impaired performance on the tests of the general cognitive battery (A) and the language battery (B). Aphasia severity = aphasia severity scale of the Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Evaluation; naming HFI = DO80 picture naming of high frequency items; naming LFI = DO80 picture naming of low frequency items. FAB = Frontal Assessment Battery; MDRS = Mattis Dementia Rating Scale; MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination.

Table 3  Correlation analyses between test scores of the general cognitive and the language battery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General cognitive tests</th>
<th>Aphasia severity</th>
<th>Verbal WM</th>
<th>Lexical processing</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAB</td>
<td>R 0.351</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.613*</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.141</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDRS</td>
<td>R 0.707*</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.472*</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.474*</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span</td>
<td>R 0.062</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.536*</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.801</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.604*</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphasia severity</td>
<td>R 0.133</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.588</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.688*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence repetition</td>
<td>R 0.133</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.485*</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.588</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.688*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture naming</td>
<td>R 0.040</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.036</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic fluency</td>
<td>R 0.460*</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.460*</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.048</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category fluency</td>
<td>R 0.465*</td>
<td>0.582*</td>
<td>0.460*</td>
<td>0.582*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.045</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = correlation coefficient, *P is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed). Verbal WM = verbal working memory. Span = direct verbal span; aphasia severity = aphasia severity scale of the Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Evaluation; picture naming = DO80 picture naming.
Innotest amyloid tau index ratios were smaller for logopenic PPA+ than in logopenic PPA. Biomarker results are illustrated in Table 4. ANOVAs were performed to detect significant differences between both subgroups. In general cognitive and the language battery, ANOVAs were performed taking into account the number of patients. Taking into account the number of patients, ANOVAs showed that Ab42 levels were lower in logopenic PPA+ than in logopenic PPA and that tau and P-tau levels were higher in logopenic PPA+ than in the logopenic PPA-. Moreover, Innotest amyloid tau index ratios were smaller for logopenic PPA+ than for logopenic PPA-. Patients.

**Brain level: imaging**

**Atrophy rating on magnetic resonance imaging**

The ratings of the evaluators reached a high level of inter-evaluator consistency. More specifically, we found full rating concordance with respect to regions that were scored as either atrophied or not atrophied. Some scarce inter-evaluator discrepancies concerned the rating of atrophy severity but consensus was easily reached upon an additional rating session. At the visual assessment all patients with logopenic PPA demonstrated predominant brain atrophy in the left hemisphere which primarily affected parietal and temporal regions. In particular, all patients with logopenic PPA but two had severe, predominant and relatively isolated atrophy of the left temporal-parietal junction. Some patients with logopenic PPA had also atrophy in left superior parietal regions (severe 20%, slight 60%), in the left temporal pole (severe 0%, slight 33%), in the left medial temporal region (severe 20%, slight 40%) and in the frontal lobe involving the left dorsolateral (severe 13%, slight 33%) and the left inferior frontal region (severe 7%, slight 13%). Rare regions of slight atrophy were identified in the right hemisphere (temporal and parietal areas). No differences were found between logopenic PPA+ and logopenic PPA- patients. Concerning the three other groups, non-fluent/agrammatic PPA patients had predominant atrophy in left inferior and dorsolateral frontal regions, patients with semantic PPA were mostly affected in the left temporal pole, and posterior cortical atrophy patients mainly had bilateral damage in superior and inferior parietal and occipital regions. To calculate the sensitivity and specificity of the assessment we posited the imaging criteria for logopenic PPA diagnosis as an atrophy pattern affecting predominantly and most severely the left temporal-parietal junction while relatively sparing regions affected in semantic PPA (anterior temporal cortex), non-fluent/agrammatic PPA (left inferior and dorsolateral frontal cortex) and posterior cortical atrophy (bilateral parietal-occipital regions). We found sensitivity and a specificity of 60.0% and 71.8%, respectively, for detecting patients with logopenic PPA within this large population of PPA and posterior cortical atrophy.

**Cortical perfusion on single-photon emission computed tomography**

At the visual assessment all patients with logopenic PPA had severe brain hypoperfusion of the left temporal-parietal junction. Five group contrasts were analysed and the results are illustrated in Fig. 3 and Table 5. The contrast of the whole logopenic PPA group versus healthy controls yielded a large area of severe hypoperfusion in left parietal-temporal cortices (FWE P < 0.05) with a peak of significance in the superior temporal gyrus (Brodman area (BA) 42). This pattern also involved the left precuneus. Smaller and less significant areas of hypoperfusion were also found in the left frontal lobe encompassing the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (BA8, BA9, BA46) and the premotor cortex (BA6). The hippocampus was spared bilaterally (FWE P < 0.05). No areas of hypoperfusion were found in the right hemisphere (FWE P < 0.05).
Analysing logopenic PPA subgroups showed that the ‘logopenic PPA − versus healthy controls’ contrast yielded a pattern of bilateral but asymmetric hypoperfusion in the occipito-temporoparietal junction centred on left inferior parietal areas (FWE P < 0.05). Smaller and less severe areas of hypoperfusion were also found within the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (BA8) (FWE P < 0.05). The hippocampus was spared bilaterally (FWE P < 0.05). Conversely, the ‘logopenic PPA+ versus healthy controls’ contrast showed severe hypoperfusion in the left parietal cortex mainly involving the angular gyrus (BA39) and extending to the posterior temporal cortex (FWE P < 0.05). This hypoperfusion of the temporal-parietal junction was more extensive throughout the inferior parietal, the posterior-superior and the middle temporal cortex than in the logopenic PPA− group. Furthermore, analyses showed hypoperfusion of the left precuneus (FWE < 0.05).

Concerning comparisons with the amnesic Alzheimer group, the ‘Alzheimer versus healthy controls’ contrast provided a typical Alzheimer’s disease pattern showing bilateral and symmetrical hypoperfusion throughout the posterior cortex including the precuneus and extending to hippocampal regions and the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (FWE P < 0.05). Furthermore, the ‘logopenic PPA+ versus amnesic Alzheimer’ contrast showed that the left superior temporal gyrus (BA22) was more severely hypoperfused in patients with logopenic PPA+ as compared with patients with typical amnesic Alzheimer’s disease (P < 0.001, uncorrected). Conversely, hypoperfusion of the left hippocampus region was only found in the amnesic Alzheimer group. No regions of hypoperfusion were found in the hippocampal areas in logopenic PPA+.

### Table 4 Comparison between logopenic PPA due and not due to Alzheimer’s disease on CSF biomarkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSF biomarkers</th>
<th>LPA+ (n = 8)</th>
<th>LPA− (n = 5)</th>
<th>LPA+ versus LPA−</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ab42</td>
<td>256 pg/ml ± 127</td>
<td>452 pg/ml ± 195</td>
<td>F(1,11) = 4.93, P = 0.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau</td>
<td>745 pg/ml ± 392</td>
<td>271 pg/ml ± 46</td>
<td>F(1,11) = 7.02, P = 0.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-tau</td>
<td>103 pg/ml ± 43</td>
<td>46 pg/ml ± 12</td>
<td>F(1,11) = 7.79, P = 0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATI</td>
<td>0.23 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.82 ± 0.40</td>
<td>F(1,11) = 17.40, P = 0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau / Ab42</td>
<td>2.88 ± 1.12</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.27</td>
<td>F(1,11) = 17.89, P = 0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-tau / Ab42</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.05</td>
<td>F(1,11) = 14.59, P = 0.003*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General cognitive assessment**

- MMSE: 21.3 ± 4.1 vs. 22.6 ± 4.2, F < 1
- MDRS: 117.1 ± 12.7 vs. 122.6 ± 8.4, F < 1
- FAB: 11.0 ± 2.4 vs. 11.4 ± 3.4, F < 1
- Verbal span (standard note): 4.5 ± 2.6 vs. 4.0 ± 3.0, F < 1
- Ideomotor apraxia: 87.5 ± 35.4a vs. 20.0 ± 44.7a, R(1,11) = 9.21, P = 0.011*

**Language assessment**

- Severity rating scale BDAE: 3.3 ± 0.9 vs. 3.4 ± 0.5, F < 1
- Sentence repetition BDAE: 9.1 ± 2.9 vs. 10.0 ± 3.4, F < 1
- Sentence comprehension BDAE: 7.4 ± 2.8 vs. 6.4 ± 1.5, F < 1
- Single-word comprehension BDAE: global5: 61.9 ± 12.2 vs. global5: 69.5 ± 2.9 ± 2.6, F(1,11) = 1.83, P = 0.204
- Category fluency (‘fruits’ per 2 min): 5.6 ± 4.1 vs. 14.2 ± 4.7, F(1,11) = 12.04, P = 0.005*
- Phonemic fluency (‘P’ per 2 min): 7.6 ± 4.5 vs. 11.6 ± 4.9, F(1,11) = 2.22, P = 0.164
- DO80 (LFI): 21.3 ± 8.3 vs. 22.8 ± 10.6, F < 1
- DO80 (HFI): 57.1 ± 18.3 vs. 71.0 ± 10.3, F(1,11) = 2.36, P = 0.153
- Number of semantic paraphasias (HFI): 4.0 ± 5.0 vs. 2.8 ± 1.3, F < 1
- Number of phonemic paraphasias (HFI): 0.5 ± 1.1 vs. 0.8 ± 1.3, F < 1
- Number of non-responses (HFI): 13.0 ± 13.3 vs. 5.4 ± 8.3, F(1,11) = 1.29, P = 0.280
- Syntactic disorders: 25.0 ± 46.3a vs. 40.0 ± 54.8a, F < 1
- Disorders of phoneme sequencing: 62.5 ± 51.8a vs. 0 ± 0a, F(1,11) = 7.05, P = 0.022*

**Discussion**

This study explored a large cohort of 19 stringently diagnosed patients with logopenic PPA and provided a three-level characterization including cognitive/linguistic features, brain localization and biological aspects. It also allowed for revealing the important prevalence of logopenic PPA within the PPA spectrum accounting for about 31% of all patients with PPA. Thus, logopenic PPA appears to be the second most frequent PPA variant behind semantic PPA (39%) and before the non-fluent/agrammatic variant (18%). Our demographic data furthermore indicated that logopenic
PPA is an early-onset disease corresponding to a mean onset age of ~63 years.

Our language/cognitive findings showed that, according to the diagnostic criteria of Gorno-Tempini et al. (2011), all patients with logopenic PPA had picture naming and sentence repetition difficulties which were qualitatively the most severe disorders. The second most impaired faculties were phonemic and category fluency, followed by sentence comprehension, syntactic production, phoneme sequencing and single-word comprehension. Correlation analyses showed that naming difficulties patterned with scores of phonemic fluency suggesting that the underlying language disorder in logopenic PPA is linked to impaired access to lexical representations or to genuine damage of the output lexicon. Such naming errors did not correlate with proxy markers of semantics and were primarily related to non-responses thus arguing against a top-down mechanism tied to semantic damage. In contrast, the input lexicon seems to be relatively preserved in logopenic PPA given that single-word comprehension was only moderately hampered. Furthermore, single-word comprehension patterned with category fluency which rather suggests a concomitant yet slight damage of semantic representations. In line with these results the overall severity of aphasia correlated with the intensity of lexical disorders as well as with the concomitant impairment of semantic representations. Lexical dysfunction in logopenic PPA also impacts on standard neuropsychological tests such as the Mini-Mental State Examination, the Frontal Assessment Battery or the Mattis Dementia Rating Scale, the poor outcome of which significantly correlated with naming scores. Beyond lexical impairment, the second main disorder in logopenic PPA is the reduction of verbal working memory which is corroborated by the fact that both verbal span and sentence repetition yielded poor test scores which furthermore correlated one with another. Our results also

Figure 3  Brain hypoperfusion patterns in patients with logopenic PPA (LPA) using Statistical Parametric Mapping: comparison with healthy controls and patients with typical Alzheimer’s disease (AD). T-score hypoperfusion maps of (A) the entire logopenic PPA group compared with healthy age-matched controls; (B) logopenic PPA patients classified according to their CSF biomarkers profiles. The ‘logopenic PPA – versus controls’ (red to white tints) and the ‘logopenic PPA+ versus controls’ contrast (purple to violet tints) showed hypoperfusion of the left temporal-parietal junction with a more extensive defect in the latter group contrast affecting larger portions of the temporal cortex. The ‘logopenic PPA+ versus typical amnesic Alzheimer’s disease’ contrast (blue to green tints) showed that the left superior temporal gyrus was more specifically affected in logopenic PPA+ as compared to typical Alzheimer’s disease. T-maps are projected onto a surface rendering and onto axial views of the customized MNI template. The axial slices are shown in accordance with neurological convention (right is right).
Table 5  Quantitative statistical parametric mapping results: logopenic PPA and comparisons with healthy control subjects and typical Alzheimer’s disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region (Brodmann area)</th>
<th>Coordinates (x, y, z)</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Cluster size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All patients with logopenic PPA &lt; controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left superior temporal gyrus (42)</td>
<td>-64, -36, 18</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
<td>16,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left angular gyrus (39)</td>
<td>-50, -62, 28</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left inferior parietal gyrus (40)</td>
<td>-50, -42, 48</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left superior parietal gyrus (6)</td>
<td>-30, 2, 68</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
<td>3,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left middle frontal gyrus (9,8)</td>
<td>-40, 26, 38</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left middle frontal gyrus (9,8)</td>
<td>-36, 20, 46</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peculiar hypoperfused areas in logopenic PPA+ and logopenic PPA–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logopenic PPA+ &lt; controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right angular gyrus (39)</td>
<td>46, -68, 32</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right inferior parietal gyrus (40)</td>
<td>50, -54, 52</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right inferior parietal gyrus (40)</td>
<td>56, -58, 30</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left inferior parietal gyrus (40)</td>
<td>-64, -40, 24</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
<td>3,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left inferior parietal gyrus (40)</td>
<td>-54, -44, 48</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left angular gyrus (39)</td>
<td>-56, -62, 24</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left superior parietal gyrus (8)</td>
<td>-20, 22, 54</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left middle frontal gyrus (8)</td>
<td>-34, 8, 44</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logopenic PPA+ &lt; controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left angular gyrus (39)</td>
<td>-44, -64, 28</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>9,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left inferior parietal gyrus (40)</td>
<td>-54, -44, 44</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left middle temporal gyrus (21)</td>
<td>-40, -50, 8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left precuneus (31)</td>
<td>-8, -68, 28</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left precuneus (31)</td>
<td>-1, -54, 42</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logopenic PPA+ &lt; typical Alzheimer’s disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left superior temporal gyrus (22)</td>
<td>-62, -30, 2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left superior temporal gyrus (22)</td>
<td>-58, -48, 20</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordinates are in millimetres relative to the anterior commissure, corresponding to the MNI space. Statistical maps were thresholded for significance at P < 0.05 FWE-corrected except for the comparison between logopenic PPA+ and typical Alzheimer’s disease (P < 0.001 uncorrected). Cluster extent was set at 300 voxels. Bold characters indicate areas with the most severe hypoperfusion for a given group contrast.

demonstrate that cognitive disorders in logopenic PPA extend even deeper into the language system as well as beyond it, affecting syntactic processing and phoneme sequencing, causing the above mentioned degradation of semantic representations and leading to ideomotor apraxia.

With respect to biological aspects, CSF biomarkers which were used as a surrogate of underlying neuropathology showed that 61.5% of the patients with logopenic PPA had probable Alzheimer’s disease (logopenic PPA+) whereas in 38.5% the profile was not indicative of Alzheimer’s disease (logopenic PPA–). Multiple comparisons showed that both subgroups were matched on age, number of years of education, symptom duration and standard neuropsychological tests but that patients with logopenic PPA+ demonstrate significantly poorer performance in the domains of phonology, semantics and ideomotor praxis. Pathological test scores in these domains had a relatively high sensitivity and specificity in detecting logopenic PPA related to Alzheimer’s disease, which reached 100% sensitivity for impaired category fluency scores and 100% specificity for phoneme sequencing disorders.

Regarding neuroimaging, our results highlight that patients with logopenic PPA demonstrate a typical lesion pattern, namely damage of the left temporal-parietal junction. Visual MRI analysis showed that 87% of the patients with logopenic PPA had atrophy of the left temporal-parietal junction but it also reveals that such an assessment has a relatively poor sensitivity (60%) and specificity (72%) for detecting logopenic PPA among the different PPA variants and posterior cortical atrophy. Analysing brain perfusion on SPECT revealed that 100% of the patients with logopenic PPA had hypoperfusion of the left temporal-parietal junction. Comparing the logopenic PPA group as a whole with healthy age-matched controls further allowed for quantifying the temporal-parietal junction disorder which corresponded to the most prominent and significant hypoperfusion cluster. This finding replicates previous imaging results on logopenic PPA including both PET and voxel-based morphometry studies (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2004; Josephs et al., 2010; Rohrer et al., 2010b) while emphasizing the imaging-supported logopenic PPA diagnosis of our patients (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011). Moreover, the comparison with typical amnestic Alzheimer’s disease strengthened the distinctive imaging pattern of logopenic PPA which specifically involves the left superior-posterior temporal gyrus in patients with logopenic PPA having biomarkers indicative of Alzheimer pathology. In addition, unlike in typical Alzheimer’s disease, hippocampal regions were spared in logopenic PPA+. However, the partial overlap of
impaired regions including posterior temporal-parietal regions and
the precuneus suggests the existence of a shared ‘core network’
the alteration of which may be characteristic of Alzheimer’s dis-
ease (Warren et al., 2012). Finally, SPECT data also indicated that
the cortical perfusion pattern might differentiate logopenic PPA+
from logopenic PPA— by showing that the former subgroup has
more widespread hypoperfusion exceeding the temporal-parietal
junction and affecting larger regions throughout the inferior par-
ietal, the posterior-superior and the middle temporal cortex. In
addition to the temporal-parietal junction, we also found hypoper-
fusion of the precuneus and of the left dorsolateral prefrontal
cortex which is in line with previous atrophy data drawn from
voxel-based morphometry studies on patients with logopenic PPA
with similar time durations (Migliaccio et al., 2009; Rohrer et al.,
2010b). One hypothesis is therefore that neural
degeneration in logopenic PPA directly affects distinct cortical
sites and notably the temporal-parietal junction and the dorsolat-
eral prefrontal cortex. Conversely, it might be hypothesized that
cortical damage primarily affects the left temporal-parietal junction
causing profound disconnection of dorsolateral prefrontal regions
through the alteration of superior components of the superior lon-
gitudinal fasciculus as evidenced by Galantucci et al. (2011).
Disentangling such hypotheses requires further studies tracking
and correlating the time course of damage affecting the prefrontal
cortex and connexions fibres of the superior longitudinal fasciculus.

Finally, with respect to logopenic PPA— it should be noted that
one may ask whether these patients had genuine logopenic PPA
given that 40% had syntactic disorders and because they demon-
strated temporal-parietal junction and frontal hypoperfusion on
SPECT. At first glance such a profile could suggest non-fluent/
agrammatic PPA rather than logopenic PPA. However, in-depth
analyses of the data easily overcome this doubt. First, our parsi-
monious patient selection procedure showed that all five logopenic
PPA— had predominant word finding and sentence repetition dif-
culties whereas syntactic disorders were only mild in two of
them. No patient had ‘frank agrammatism’ but all had frank lexical
and verbal working memory disorders. The same pattern, with
even less syntactic errors, was found on speech recordings realized
1 year before study inclusion. Second, according to imaging-sup-
supported logopenic PPA criteria (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011) our
SPECT results of the logopenic PPA— group showed clearly pre-
dominant hypoperfusion of the left temporal-parietal junction.
Reviewing the individual SPECT data of the two mildly syntax-
impaired patients also evidenced this temporal-parietal junction
pattern (Supplementary Fig. 1). Finally, the hypoperfused area
within the prefrontal cortex (BA8) which was found in the voxel-
based analyses was smaller, less severe and did not affect syntax-
related language areas such as BA45 or BA44, which are typically
involved in agrammatic PPA (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2004).

The language–brain pattern of
logopenic primary progressive aphasia

Our results substantiate that the core feature in logopenic PPA
comprehends hampered access or damage of the output lexicon
and reduced verbal working memory which are associated with
primary dysfunction of the left temporal-parietal junction. These
findings are coherent with previous studies on logopenic PPA
showing predominant impairment of single-word retrieval and
sentence repetition (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2004, 2008; Hu
et al., 2010; Rohrer et al., 2010b; Leyton et al., 2011) and left-
sided temporal-parietal junction atrophy on voxel-based morph-
ometry (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2004; Migliaccio et al., 2009;
Rohrer et al., 2010b). They are also in line with functional imaging
results with healthy adults providing evidence that lexical process-
ing is tied to inferior parietal (Tyler et al., 2005) and posterior
temporal cortices (Kotz et al., 2002), and that phonological
short time memory is linked to the supramarginal gyrus (Paulus,
et al., 1993; Jonides et al., 1998). In addition, our findings provide
novel evidence allowing for refining the linguistic profile of logo-
penic PPA and indicating the neural substrates of its different
components.

Concerning the functional profile, our results show that processing
disorders in logopenic PPA extend deeper into the language
system affecting also semantic representations, syntactic produc-
tion and phonological mechanisms of phoneme encoding. At first
glance this seems surprising because studies on logopenic PPA did
not explicitly report such disorders except the possible existence
of phonological difficulties mentioned in the consensus criteria of
Gorno-Tempini et al. (2011). However, detailed analysis of
language data from studies on logopenic PPA readily suggest
syntactic disorders as reflected by poor scores on sentence com-
prehension tasks (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2004, 2008; Rohrer et al.,
2010b). As such comprehension tasks draw not only on syntax but
also on verbal working memory, poor performance was commonly
attributed to a sentence length effect rather than to syntactic
complexity per se. In contrast, the present study assessed sentence
processing in the production modality, which is independent from
verbal input working memory, unveiling various grammatical
errors that confirm syntactic dysfunction in logopenic PPA.
Similarly, semantic deficits have been mostly overlooked although
detailed inspection of the data of Gorno-Tempini et al. (2008)
shows that two of six patients with logopenic PPA had semantic
difficulties, one of whom demonstrated 10% errors on single-word
comprehension. This difficulty of single-word comprehension be-
comes even more salient during disease evolution as substantiated
in a recent study reporting clinical follow-up of 13 patients with
logopenic PPA (Leyton et al., 2013). Thus, the total range of
language impairments is more widespread than usually acknowl-
ledged comprehending additional disorders that might increase
over time and ultimately expose patients with logopenic PPA to
potential misdiagnosis within the PPA spectrum. SPECT imaging,
however, should contribute to a correct logopenic PPA diagnosis
by showing predominant hypoperfusion of the left temporal-
parietal junction at least for the first 3 years of evolution.

Although we did not conduct lesion–function correlations the
present SPECT results provide some hints with respect to the
brain substrates underpinning the three additional language dis-
orders. More specifically, the hypoperfusion pattern suggests that
these disorders presumably are not related to cortical dysfunction
of regions which are classically dedicated to semantic, syntactic
or phonological processing. In particular, the temporal pole which is a
key region for semantic knowledge (Patterson et al., 2007), the
posterior-inferior frontal cortex that is crucial to phonological encoding (Papoutsi et al., 2009) and posterior-inferior frontal and antero-superior temporal cortices that are core areas for syntactic processing (Friederici et al., 2003; Pallier et al., 2011) were largely spared in our logopenic PPA population. One plausible hypothesis is therefore that such additional language disorders are related to previously reported damage of the white matter underneath the temporal-parietal junction region (Rohrer et al., 2010b; Migliaccio et al., 2012) which encompasses fibre bundles running from superior temporal/inferior parietal cortices to posterior frontal areas (Catani et al., 2005) and possibly to the temporal pole (Acosta-Cabronero et al., 2011). Such damage might therefore lead to functional disconnections between lexical representations in the left temporal-parietal junction cortex and remote cortical areas which underpin phonological spell-out of words, syntactic concatenation and semantic processing. In particular, progression disconnection of the temporal pole presumably leads to deficits in semantic processing tasks whereas progressive disconnection of the posterior-inferior frontal cortex causes deficits in syntactic and phonological encoding. This view is substantiated by recent DTI tractography data showing that brain damage in logopenic PPA affects several components of the superior longitudinal fasciculus including the arcuate (Galantucci et al., 2011) which projects to the posterior-inferior frontal cortex (Catani et al., 2005; Rilling et al., 2008). Likewise, several authors (Galantucci et al., 2011; Mahoney et al., 2013) have reported abnormal diffusivity values in the anterior and posterior portion of the inferior longitudinal fasciculus of patients with logopenic PPA suggesting damage of this pathway, which has been shown to project onto the temporal pole (Catani et al., 2003). Finally, damage of the temporal-parietal portion of the arcuate as evidenced by Galantucci et al. (2011) might affect fibre contingents within this tract which, according to Acosta-Cabronero et al. (2011), might connect the temporal-parietal junction and the temporal pole. However, it should be noted that, in addition to the probable disconnection of the temporal pole, damage of the temporal-parietal junction cortex as such might also contribute to semantic processing disorders in logopenic PPA. Accordingly, several functional imaging studies with healthy adults have reported that the temporal-parietal junction was involved when participants performed lexical-semantic tasks (Binder et al., 2003; Spitsyna et al., 2006). It should also be noted that progressive disconnection of white matter pathways directly hampers the transmission of linguistic information to the connected cortical sites but that it does not necessarily cause cortical damage on SPECT or PET (Metter et al., 1988). In the same vein, Josephs et al. (2012) have shown that a PPA-related syndrome (primary progressive apraxia of speech) comprehends damage of the left premotor cortex and of the underlying superior longitudinal fasciculus, yet without any cortical dysfunction of the parietal/temporal endpoints of this fibre bundle on PET. Finally, using functional MRI Sonty et al. (2003) have explored patients with PPA with single word-finding problems and atrophy of the left temporal-parietal junction region, showing that these patients had impaired performance on phonological processing despite normal activation of the posterior-inferior frontal cortex. To sum up, logopenic PPA seems to be characterized by a left-lateralized network-level dysfunction including primarily the temporal-parietal junction cortex but affecting also major white matter pathways of language processing. This proposal is in line with findings of Rohrer et al. (2010b) who posited that logopenic PPA is a network-based syndrome that implicates distributed dominant hemisphere cortices and white matter connections. Clinical, PET and DTI follow-up studies are now needed to explore whether the ongoing neural degeneration progressively disconnects and ultimately alters the function of key areas of the language cortex thus transforming logopenic PPA insidiously into a global aphasia disease.

Variants of logopenic primary progressive aphasia

Our findings also highlight that the unique language-brain entity of logopenic PPA should be considered as a clinical and topographic syndrome without presuming its underlying pathology, especially at the individual level. Our CSF data suggested, however, that the temporal-parietal junction region appears to be more vulnerable to Alzheimer’s disease (61.5% of the patients) than to non-Alzheimer’s disease (38.5%). This result tightly fits the findings of the largest neuropathological logopenic PPA cohort (n = 11) which has revealed an Alzheimer’s disease proportion of 64% whereas one-third of the cases were related to lesions characteristic of frontal-temporal lobar degeneration such as ubiquitine-positive (27%) or tau-positive pathology (9%) (Mesulam et al., 2008). The same tendency has been shown by previous studies using surrogate markers such as PET-PIB and CSF biomarkers indicating that 58% (Hu et al., 2010) to 92% of logopenic PPA cases (Leyton et al., 2011) are related to underlying Alzheimer’s disease. Finally, two case studies have suggested that logopenic PPA might be linked to a fourth neurodegenerative mechanism, namely Lewy body disease (Caselli et al., 2002; Teichmann et al., 2013). This multiplicity of causative mechanisms thus warrants caution when considering a given patient with logopenic PPA and invites re-discussion of the proposal that logopenic PPA represents an atypical form of Alzheimer’s disease (Migliaccio et al., 2009). In clinical practice, several language/cognitive parameters may contribute to disentangle logopenic PPA related to probable Alzheimer’s disease from such non-Alzheimer subvariants. More specifically, given a symptom duration of ~3 years, we showed that significant difficulties with phonological encoding, semantic processing and ideomotor praxis strongly suggest underlying Alzheimer disease. Such supplementary disorders also indicate that logopenic PPA+ is an aggressive and rapidly expanding disease whereas logopenic PPA– seems to demonstrate a more circumscribed evolution. Our SPECT data are in accordance with this view showing that, compared with logopenic PPA+, logopenic PPA+ affects a larger cortical region extending beyond the temporal-parietal junction. In this vein, deficits with ideomotor praxis are presumably related to damage affecting additional regions of the left parietal cortex whereas semantic and phonological disorders might reflect the above mentioned disruption of connection fibres projecting to remote cortices involved in semantics and phonology. Altogether, we propose that logopenic PPA might be subdivided into an expansive variant due to Alzheimer’s
disease and a more localized variant not linked to Alzheimer pathology. Some caution is, however, warranted given that the present SPECT exploration included a relatively small sample of patients with logopenic PPA. Nonetheless our proposal is coherent with previous findings showing that early-onset Alzheimer’s disease, as opposed to the typical late-onset form, is an aggressive disease characterized by a high lesion burden leading to spreading atrophy and causing more extensive and rapid cognitive decline (Jacobs et al., 1994; Rogaeva, 2002; Frisoni et al., 2007). In addition, one should note that expansive structural damage and supplementary linguistic disorders including syntax and semantics have also been reported in patients with logopenic PPA with mutations of the progranulin gene (Rohrer et al., 2010a, b). Four of our five logopenic PPA—patients had plasma measures of progranulin which were not indicative of gene mutations thus suggesting possible lesions of non-progranulin-related frontal-temporal lobar degeneration, which might lead to a more limited damage pattern. Longitudinal studies confronting clinical data with amyloid biomarkers, such as PET-PIB, and genetic data should further contribute to disentangle the distinct logopenic PPA subvariants while unveiling their respective damage dynamics. At a clinical level, such studies may also validate the non-invasive cognitive/linguistic markers which should contribute to sub-classify logopenic PPA variants.

Logopenic and non-classifiable primary progressive aphasia

From a pragmatic point of view, our findings are also relevant for the clinical necessity to correctly classify patients with PPA. They provide answers to the doubt about the existence of logopenic PPA which was formulated by Sajjadi et al. (2012) and they may clarify why some authors report a relatively high proportion of non-classifiable or mixed variants within the PPA spectrum (Grossman and Ash, 2004; Deramecourt et al., 2010; Leyton et al., 2011; Sajjadi et al., 2012). Questioning the mere existence of logopenic PPA, Sajjadi et al. (2012) have reported that within PPA, typical logopenic PPA is scarce (4% of their patients) whereas mixed or non-classifiable PPA is a frequent finding accounting for 41% of the patients. In striking contrast to this view, our results have revealed that predominant word-finding and sentence repetition disorders that positively define the logopenic PPA phenotype frequently co-occur in PPA (31% of our patients with PPA). Moreover, in all these patients SPECT has shown hypoperfusion of the same cortical region, namely the left temporal-parietal junction. Interestingly, when analysing in detail the data of Sajjadi et al. (2012) the seeming discrepancies almost fade away. Eighteen of their 19 mixed-labelled patients with PPA demonstrated naming and sentence repetition disorders. In addition, they also had syntactic, semantic or phonological difficulties, which is coherent with our data showing that mainly logopenic PPA+ patients have rather widespread language disorders including semantic and phonological impairments. Unfortunately, the authors did not provide imaging data and it remains unknown whether their mixed-labelled patients had predominant damage of the temporal-parietal junction, which would be coherent with the findings of the present study. Generally speaking, a certain proportion of so-called mixed or non-classifiable PPA could reflect the natural evolution of the expansive variant of logopenic PPA due to Alzheimer pathology. In addition, some mixed phenotypes might also arise from gene mutations as reported by Rohrer et al. (2010a, b) who described the association of naming, sentence repetition, semantic and grammatical disorders in patients with PPA with mutations of the progranulin gene. Follow-up studies are needed to further substantiate that logopenic PPA due to Alzheimer’s disease might evolve to particular forms of ‘mixed’ or ‘non-classifiable’ PPA and that other atypical phenotypes should motivate clinicians to actively research non-degenerative or genetic causes.

Limitations

As mentioned above, the proposed interpretation of our data has several limitations that need to be considered. First, even if the whole patient set of this study is one of the most important logopenic PPA samples, the subgroups that were contrasted in the SPECT and CSF analyses were relatively small. Thus, the distinctive imaging and cognitive/linguistic patterns of logopenic PPA due to probable Alzheimer’s disease and of logopenic PPA—require further substantiation through larger-scale multi-centre studies. In the same vein, CSF biomarker results and subsequent analyses of subgroups need to be confirmed by replicating our results with other markers comprehending amyloid imaging like PET-PIB and ultimately neuropathological data as gold standard. Concerning the disease severity of logopenic PPA+, longitudinal investigations using size-equalized comparator groups should reinforce our proposal by providing a dynamic picture of the multifaceted logopenic PPA spectrum while distinguishing aggressive from less aggressive disease variants. Finally, the links between brain and language damage in logopenic PPA were inferred upon neurolinguistic findings on language implementation but need further support from correlation analyses linking language data to precise cortical and subcortical structures through for example, voxel-based morphometry and fibre-tracking. Nonetheless our results represent a first step towards the refining of knowledge about the language and imaging profile in logopenic PPA while unveiling that it unfolds into at least two variants due, or not, to probable Alzheimer pathology. The distinction of such entities with respect to cognitive patterns, anatomical profiles and disease severity has important implications for patient management as well as for potential future therapies.
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