

Main title

A modified Camel and Cactus Test detects presymptomatic semantic impairment in genetic frontotemporal dementia within the GENFI cohort

Running title

Modified Camel and Cactus Test

Authors

Katrina Moore BSc¹, Rhian Convery MSc¹, Martina Bocchetta PhD¹, Mollie Neason MSc¹, David M. Cash PhD¹, Caroline Greaves BSc¹, Lucy L Russell BSc¹, Mica TM Clarke MSc¹, Georgia Peakman BSc¹, John van Swieten MD², Lize Jiskoot PhD², Fermin Moreno MD³, Myriam Barandiaran PhD³, Raquel Sanchez-Valle MD⁴, Barbara Borroni MD⁵, Robert Laforce Jr MD PhD⁶, Marie-Claire Doré PhD⁶, Mario Masellis MD PhD⁷, Maria Carmela Tartaglia MD⁸, Caroline Graff MD⁹, Daniela Galimberti PhD^{10,11}, James B Rowe FRCP PhD¹², Elizabeth Finger MD¹³, Matthis Synofzik MD^{14,15}, Hans-Otto Karnath MD PhD¹⁶, Rik Vandenberghe MD¹⁷, Alexandre de Mendonça MD¹⁸, Carolina Maruta MPsy PhD¹⁹, Fabrizio Tagliavini MD²⁰, Isabel Santana MD²¹, Simon Ducharme MD²², Chris Butler FRCP PhD²³, Alex Gerhard FRCP PhD²⁴, Johannes Levin MD²⁵, Adrian Danek MD²⁵, Markus Otto MD²⁶, Jason D Warren FRACP PhD¹, Jonathan D Rohrer FRCP PhD¹, on behalf of the Genetic FTD Initiative, GENFI.*

Affiliations

¹Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, ²Department of Neurology, Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam, Netherlands. ³Cognitive Disorders Unit, Department of Neurology, Donostia University Hospital, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain. ⁴Alzheimer's disease and Other Cognitive Disorders Unit, Neurology Service, Hospital Clínic, Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi I Sunyer, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain. ⁵Centre for Neurodegenerative Disorders, Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Brescia, Italy. ⁶Clinique Interdisciplinaire de Mémoire, Département des Sciences Neurologiques, Université Laval, Québec, Canada. ⁷Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Sunnybrook Research Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. ⁸Tanz Centre for Research in Neurodegenerative Diseases, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. ⁹Department of Geriatric Medicine, Karolinska University Hospital-Huddinge, Stockholm, Sweden. ¹⁰University of Milan, Centro Dino Ferrari, Milan, Italy. ¹¹Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Policlinico, Neurodegenerative Diseases Unit, Milan, IT. ¹²Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom. ¹³Department of Clinical Neurological Sciences, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario Canada. ¹⁴Department of Neurodegenerative Diseases, Hertie-Institute for Clinical Brain Research and Center of Neurology, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany. ¹⁵German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Tübingen, Germany. ¹⁶Division of Neuropsychology, Hertie-Institute for Clinical Brain Research and Center of Neurology, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany. ¹⁷Laboratory for Cognitive Neurology, Department of Neurosciences, KU Leuven,

Leuven, Belgium. ¹⁸Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal. ¹⁹Laboratory of Language Research, Centro de Estudos Egas Moniz, Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal. ²⁰Fondazione Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico Istituto Neurologica Carlo Besta, Milano, Italy. ²¹Faculty of Medicine, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. ²²Department of Psychiatry, McGill University Health Centre, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada. ²³Department of Clinical Neurology, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom. ²⁴Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences, Institute of Brain, Behaviour and Mental Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK. ²⁵Department of Neurology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich, Germany. ²⁶Department of Neurology, University of Ulm, Ulm

Corresponding author

Dr Jonathan Rohrer, Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen Square, London, WC1N 3BG, j.rohrer@ucl.ac.uk

*List of consortium authors below

Keywords: frontotemporal dementia, semantic knowledge, genetics, MAPT, C9orf72, progranulin

Word count article: 2171. *Number of figures:* 1. *Number of tables:* 5. *Appendix:* 1

List of GENFI consortium authors:

Martin N. Rossor MD FRCP¹, Nick C. Fox MD FRCP¹, Ione O.C. Woollacott MRCP¹, Rachele Shafei MRCP¹, Carolin Heller BSc^{1,2}, Rita Guerreiro PhD², Jose Bras PhD², David L. Thomas PhD³, Jennifer Nicholas PhD⁴, Simon Mead PhD⁵, Lieke Meeter MD⁶, Jessica Panman MSc⁶, Janne Pappa PhD⁶, Rick van Minkelen PhD⁷, Yolande Pijnenburg PhD⁸, Begoña Indakoetxea MD^{9,10}, Alazne Gabilondo MD¹⁰, Mikel Tainta MD¹⁰, Maria de Arriba BSc¹⁰, Ana Gorostidi PhD¹⁰, Miren Zulaica BSc¹⁰, Jorge Villanua MD PhD¹¹, Zigor Diaz¹², Sergi Borrego-Ecija MD¹³, Jaume Olives MSc¹³, Albert Lladó PhD¹³, Mircea Balasa PhD¹³, Anna Antonell PhD¹³, Nuria Bargallo PhD¹⁴, Enrico Premi MD¹⁵, Maura Cosseddu MPsych¹⁵, Stefano Gazzina MD¹⁵, Alessandro Padovani MD PhD¹⁵, Roberto Gasparotti MD¹⁶, Silvana Archetti MBiolSci¹⁷, Sandra Black MD¹⁸, Sara Mitchell MD¹⁸, Ekaterina Rogaeva PhD¹⁹, Morris Freedman MD²⁰, Ron Keren MD²¹, David Tang-Wai MD²², Linn Öijersted MD²³, Christin Andersson PhD²⁴, Vesna Jelic MD²⁵, Hakan Thonberg MD²⁶, Andrea Arighi MD^{27,28}, Chiara Fenoglio PhD^{27,28}, Elio Scarpini MD^{27,28}, Giorgio Fumagalli MD^{27,28,29}, Thomas Cope MRCP³⁰, Carolyn Timberlake BSc³⁰, Timothy Rittman MRCP³⁰, Christen Shoemith MD³¹, Robart Bartha PhD^{32,33}, Rosa Rademakers PhD³⁴, Carlo Wilke MD^{35,36}, Benjamin Bender MD³⁷, Rose Bruffaerts MD PhD³⁸, Philip Van Damme MD PhD³⁹, Mathieu Vandenbulcke MD PhD^{40,41}, Catarina B. Ferreira MSc⁴², Gabriel Miltenberger PhD⁴³, Ana Verdelho MD PhD⁴⁴, Sónia Afonso BSc⁴⁵, Ricardo Taipa MD PhD⁴⁶, Paola Caroppo MD PhD⁴⁷, Giuseppe Di Fede MD PhD⁴⁷, Giorgio Giaccone MD⁴⁷, Sara Prioni PsyD⁴⁷, Veronica Redaelli MD⁴⁷, Giacomina Rossi MSc⁴⁷, Pietro Tiraboschi MD⁴⁷, Diana Duro NPsych⁴⁸, Maria Rosario Almeida PhD⁴⁸, Miguel Castelo-Branco MD PhD⁴⁸, Maria João Leitão BSc⁴⁹, Miguel Tabuas-Pereira MD⁵⁰, Beatriz Santiago MD⁵⁰, Serge Gauthier MD⁵¹, Pedro Rosa-Neto MD PhD⁵², Michele Veldsman PhD⁵³, Toby Flanagan BSc⁵⁴, Catharina PRIX MD⁵⁵, Tobias Hoegen MD⁵⁵, Elisabeth Wlasich Mag. rer. nat.⁵⁵, Sandra Loosli MD⁵⁵, Sonja Schonecker MD⁵⁵, Elisa Semler Dr.hum.biol Dipl. Psych⁵⁶, Sarah Anderl-Straub Dr.hum.biol Dipl. Psych⁵⁶

Affiliations

¹Dementia Research Centre, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen Square, London, UK; ²Dementia Research Institute, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen Square,

London, UK; ³Neuroimaging Analysis Centre, Department of Brain Repair and Rehabilitation, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen Square, London, UK; ⁴Department of Medical Statistics, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK; ⁵MRC Prion Unit, Department of Neurodegenerative Disease, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen Square, London, UK; ⁶Department of Neurology, Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam, Netherlands; ⁷Department of Clinical Genetics, Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam, Netherlands; ⁸Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Amsterdam VUmc, Amsterdam, Netherlands; ⁹Cognitive Disorders Unit, Department of Neurology, Donostia University Hospital, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain; ¹⁰Neuroscience Area, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain; ¹¹OSATEK, University of Donostia, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain; ¹²CITA Alzheimer, San Sebastian, Gipuzkoa, Spain; ¹³Alzheimer's disease and Other Cognitive Disorders Unit, Neurology Service, Hospital Clínic, Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi I Sunyer, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; ¹⁴Imaging Diagnostic Center, Hospital Clínic, Barcelona, Spain; ¹⁵Centre for Neurodegenerative Disorders, Neurology Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Brescia, Italy; ¹⁶Neuroradiology Unit, University of Brescia, Brescia, Italy; ¹⁷Biotechnology Laboratory, Department of Diagnostics, Spedali Civili Hospital, Brescia, Italy; ¹⁸Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Sunnybrook Research Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada; ¹⁹Tanz Centre for Research in Neurodegenerative Diseases, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada; ²⁰Baycrest Health Sciences, Rotman Research Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada; ²¹The University Health Network, Toronto Rehabilitation Institute, Toronto, Canada; ²²The University Health Network, Krembil Research Institute, Toronto, Canada; ²³Department of Geriatric Medicine, Karolinska University Hospital-Huddinge, Stockholm, Sweden; ²⁴Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; ²⁵Division of Clinical Geriatrics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; ²⁶Center for Alzheimer Research, Division of Neurogeriatrics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; ²⁷Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Neurodegenerative Diseases Unit, Milan, Italy; ²⁸University of Milan, Centro Dino Ferrari, Milan, Italy; ²⁹Department of Neurosciences, Psychology, Drug Research and Child Health (NEUROFARBA), University of Florence, Florence, Italy; ³⁰Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; ³¹Department of Clinical Neurological Sciences, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada; ³²Department of Medical Biophysics, The University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada; ³³Centre for Functional and Metabolic Mapping, Robarts Research Institute, The University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada; ³⁴Department of Neuroscience, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida, USA; ³⁵Department of Neurodegenerative Diseases, Hertie-Institute for Clinical Brain Research and Center of Neurology, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany; ³⁶Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Tübingen, Germany; ³⁷Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany; ³⁸Laboratory for Cognitive Neurology, Department of Neurosciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; ³⁹Neurology Service, University Hospitals Leuven, Belgium, Laboratory for Neurobiology, VIB-KU Leuven Centre for Brain Research, Leuven, Belgium; ⁴⁰Geriatric Psychiatry Service, University Hospitals Leuven, Belgium; ⁴¹Neuropsychiatry, Department of Neurosciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; ⁴²Laboratory of Neurosciences, Institute of Molecular Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; ⁴³Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; ⁴⁴Department of Neurosciences and Mental Health, Centro Hospitalar Lisboa Norte - Hospital de Santa Maria & Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; ⁴⁵Instituto Ciências Nucleares Aplicadas a Saude, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal; ⁴⁶Neuropathology Unit and Department of Neurology, Centro Hospitalar do Porto - Hospital de Santo António, Oporto, Portugal; ⁴⁷Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, Milano, Italy; ⁴⁸Faculty of Medicine, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal; ⁴⁹Centre of Neurosciences and Cell biology, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal; ⁵⁰Neurology Department, Centro Hospitalar e Universitario de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal; ⁵¹Alzheimer Disease Research Unit, McGill Centre for Studies in Aging, Department of Neurology & Neurosurgery, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada; ⁵²Translational Neuroimaging Laboratory, McGill Centre for Studies in Aging, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada; ⁵³Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Medical Sciences Division, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK; ⁵⁴Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, Division of Neuroscience and Experimental Psychology, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK; ⁵⁵Neurologische Klinik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, Germany; ⁵⁶Department of Neurology, University of Ulm, Ulm.

Abstract

Impaired semantic knowledge is a characteristic feature of some forms of frontotemporal dementia (FTD), particularly the sporadic disorder semantic dementia. Less is known about semantic cognition in the genetic forms of FTD caused by mutations in the genes *MAPT*, *C9orf72* and *GRN*. We developed a modified version of the Camel and Cactus Test (mCCT) to investigate the presence of semantic difficulties in a large genetic FTD cohort from the Genetic FTD Initiative (GENFI) study. 644 participants were tested with the mCCT including 67 *MAPT* mutation carriers (15 symptomatic, and 52 in the presymptomatic period), 165 *GRN* mutation carriers (33 symptomatic, 132 presymptomatic), and 164 *C9orf72* mutation carriers (56 symptomatic, 108 presymptomatic) and 248 mutation-negative members of FTD families who acted as a control group. The presymptomatic mutation carriers were further split into those early and late in the presymptomatic period (more than vs. within ten years of expected symptom onset). Groups were compared using a linear regression model, adjusting for age and education, with bootstrapping. Performance on the mCCT had a weak negative correlation with age ($\rho = -0.20$) and a weak positive correlation with education ($\rho = 0.13$), with an overall abnormal score (below the 5th percentile of the control population) being below 27 out of a total of 32. All three of the symptomatic mutation groups scored significantly lower than controls: *MAPT* mean 22.3 (standard deviation 8.0), *GRN* 24.4 (7.2), *C9orf72* 23.6 (6.5) and controls 30.2 (1.6). However in the presymptomatic groups, only the late *MAPT* and late *C9orf72* mutation groups scored lower than controls (28.8 (2.2) and 28.9 (2.5) respectively). Performance on the mCCT correlated strongly with temporal lobe volume in the symptomatic *MAPT* mutation group ($\rho > 0.80$). In the *C9orf72* group, mCCT score correlated with both bilateral temporal lobe volume ($\rho > 0.31$) and bilateral frontal lobe volume ($\rho > 0.29$), whilst in the *GRN* group mCCT score correlated only with left frontal lobe volume ($\rho = 0.48$). This study provides evidence for presymptomatic impaired semantic knowledge in genetic FTD. The different neuroanatomical associations of the mCCT score may represent distinct cognitive processes causing deficits in different groups: loss of core semantic knowledge associated with temporal lobe atrophy (particularly in the *MAPT* group), and impaired executive control of semantic information associated with frontal lobe atrophy. Further studies will be helpful to address the longitudinal change in mCCT performance and the exact time at which presymptomatic impairment occurs.

The Camel and Cactus Test (CCT) was designed as a way to assess semantic knowledge (Bozeat et al, 2000). The task involves asking people to match a picture (or word) with a matching picture (or word) from a choice of four by their semantic association e.g. matching 'camel' with 'cactus' rather than 'tree', 'sunflower' or 'rose'. It was an extension of the Pyramids and Palm Trees Test (Howard et al, 1992) in which people were asked to choose from only two pictures (or words); the CCT, with 64 items in total, was therefore expected to be more sensitive than its predecessor.

The CCT has been tested in a number of cohorts, but particularly in those with semantic dementia (SD, also known as semantic variant primary progressive aphasia), a subtype of frontotemporal dementia (FTD) (Bozeat et al, 2000; Jefferies et al, 2006; Garrard et al, 2006; Adlam et al, 2010). Loss of semantic knowledge is the fundamental cognitive difficulty in these patients, and the CCT has been shown to sensitively and accurately identify the extent of the deficit. However, semantic impairment is not unique to SD in the FTD spectrum – it is seen in those with behavioural variant FTD (bvFTD) (Hardy et al, 2016), and in those with other forms of primary progressive aphasia (Rohrer et al, 2010c), albeit as a secondary cognitive deficit. Amongst these FTD variants, the group in which semantic deficits seem particularly prominent (often appearing in conjunction with, or shortly after behavioural impairment) is genetic FTD due to *MAPT* mutations (Snowden et al, 2015; Hardy et al, 2016), although this has not been studied in detail.

The Genetic FTD Initiative (GENFI) is an international genetic FTD cohort study aimed at developing novel markers of disease onset and progression (Rohrer et al, 2015). The difficulties of using the CCT in its original form in the GENFI study include firstly, the multiple languages (and cultures) that the study needs to be performed in, and secondly, the length that the test takes to administer, being ~20-30 minutes, is too time-consuming to be included in a battery of tests in which study participants are assessed in multiple cognitive domains as well as undertaking clinical, imaging and biofluid data collection.

We therefore developed a modified version of the CCT, usable across the different GENFI languages and short enough to be incorporated into a comprehensive neuropsychological battery. This new version of the CCT was subsequently tested in the GENFI cohort of presymptomatic and symptomatic carriers of mutations in the progranulin (*GRN*), chromosome 9 open reading frame 72 (*C9orf72*), and microtubule-associated protein tau (*MAPT*) genes, as well as a control dataset of non-mutation carriers from the same families.

Methods

Development of the modified Camel and Cactus Test (mCCT)

The development of the test was performed by the first author (KM) in conjunction with the GENFI Investigator Group. In order to ensure the same test was able to be used across multiple languages, the picture-picture matching version of the CCT was chosen, to avoid multiple translations of the words. The first modification that was made was to reduce the size of the test to 32 items: each of the original 64 test items were reviewed for the level of difficulty, confusability (whether any items could have potentially more than one answer that would be readily confused), and cultural appropriateness of individual items (whether participants in each country would recognise the stimuli adequately); we then chose 32 items that were of a spectrum of difficulty (in particular, removing easier items in an attempt to get more control participants off a ceiling score), and felt to be applicable within each of the countries of the GENFI study. The original version of the CCT used a combination of photographs and line drawings, and so the second modification the group decided to make was to develop a more modern photographic version of the test making use of available (labelled for reuse) images from Google Images, each of which was reviewed by the Investigator Group to ensure it was culturally appropriate. The full final version of the mCCT is included as an Appendix.

Participants

Participants were recruited from the 4th data freeze of the GENFI study including sites in the UK, Canada, Sweden, Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Germany. Of the 680 participants in the data freeze, 644 undertook the mCCT: 248 mutation-negative controls, 67 *MAPT* mutation carriers, 165 *GRN* mutation carriers, and 164 *C9orf72* mutation carriers (Table 1). Mutation carriers were either presymptomatic or symptomatic, with the latter group including the following diagnoses: *MAPT* mutation carriers, all bvFTD; *GRN* mutation carriers, 15 bvFTD, 17 PPA, 1 dementia-not otherwise specified; and *C9orf72* mutation carriers, 40 bvFTD, 10 FTD with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, 2 PPA, 1 progressive supranuclear palsy, 3 dementia-not otherwise specified. We split the presymptomatic mutation carriers based on their estimated age at onset, a measure calculated by the difference between the current age and the mean age at onset of symptoms within the family (Rohrer et al, 2015): those further than ten years from estimated onset were called 'early' presymptomatic mutation carriers, and those within ten years of estimated onset were called 'late' presymptomatic mutation carriers.

Imaging

The majority of mutation carriers had magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) on a 3T scanner as part of their assessment: 30/33 early presymptomatic, 17/19 late presymptomatic, 12/15 symptomatic *MAPT* mutation carriers; 76/79 early presymptomatic, 48/53 late presymptomatic, 31/33 symptomatic *GRN* mutation carriers; and 66/68 early presymptomatic, 35/40 late presymptomatic, 50/56 symptomatic *C9orf72* mutation carriers. Volumetric T1 MRI brain scans were parcellated using the geodesic information flow (GIF) algorithm, which is based on atlas propagation and label fusion, with parcellations combined to create volumetric measures of frontal, temporal, parietal and occipital grey matter in both hemispheres (Rohrer et al, 2015).

Statistical analysis

In the control group we explored the relationship of the mCCT score to age (Spearman rank correlation), sex (Mann-Whitney U test) and education (years in education – Spearman rank correlation).

Scores on the mCCT were compared between groups using a linear regression model in STATA (v.14; Texas, USA) adjusting for age, with 95% bias-corrected bootstrapped CIs with 1000s repetitions.

Spearman rank correlation coefficients were calculated between mCCT scores and imaging measures in STATA.

Results

Healthy controls

Stratifying by decade, mean mCCT score was similar (29.5-30.5) in each age group within the controls (Table 2a); however overall there was a weak but significant correlation of mCCT score with age ($\rho = -0.20$, $p = 0.001$), i.e. lower mCCT scores with higher age.

145 participants in the control group were female (58%) and 103 were male (42%). No significant differences in mCCT score were seen between the groups ($p=0.441$), with a mean (standard deviation) mCCT score of 30.2 (1.6) in females and 30.1 (1.6) in males.

Similar to age, when stratifying by education level, mean CCT score was similar (29.8-30.5) in each group within the controls (Table 2b); however overall there was also a very weak but significant correlation of mCCT score with years of education ($\rho = 0.13$, $p = 0.037$), i.e. lower mCCT scores with fewer years of education.

Overall, controls scored between 25 and 32 out of a total possible score of 32 (mean score 30.2, standard deviation 1.6), with cumulative frequency shown in Table 3. In standard neuropsychological assessments a score below the 5th percentile is commonly considered to be abnormal: for the mCCT a score of below 27 would therefore be considered outside the normal range. A score of 27 would be considered a borderline abnormal result.

Mutation carriers

All of the three symptomatic mutation carrier groups showed a significantly lower score than controls (Tables 1 and 4, Figure 1), with no significant difference between the different genetic groups: *MAPT* mean 22.3 (standard deviation 8.0), *GRN* 24.4 (7.2), and *C9orf72* 23.6 (6.5). Within each genetic group, scores were significantly lower in the symptomatic group compared with both the early and late presymptomatic groups (Tables 1 and 4, Figure 1).

No significant differences were seen between the early presymptomatic mutation carriers and controls. However a significantly lower score was seen in the late presymptomatic group compared with controls (and in the late compared with the early presymptomatic group) in both the *MAPT* and *C9orf72* genetic groups but not the *GRN* group (Table 4, Figure 1): *MAPT* late presymptomatic 28.8 (2.2), early presymptomatic 30.9 (0.9); *C9orf72* late presymptomatic 28.9 (2.5), early presymptomatic 30.4 (1.5); *GRN* late presymptomatic 29.8 (1.9), early presymptomatic 30.5 (1.3).

Imaging analyses revealed differences between the genetic groups in terms of the anatomical regions that were most significantly correlated with the mCCT score (Table 5). In the symptomatic *MAPT* group the score was very strongly associated with bilateral temporal lobe atrophy ($\rho > 0.80$ for both temporal lobes), with a borderline association with left temporal lobe atrophy in the late presymptomatic group ($\rho = 0.48$). In the symptomatic *C9orf72* group the score was also associated with bilateral temporal lobe atrophy ($\rho = 0.40$ for right, and 0.31 for left), but also with bilateral frontal lobe atrophy ($\rho =$

0.30 for right, and 0.29 for left). In the late presymptomatic *C9orf72* group, the only significant correlation was with left frontal lobe volume ($\rho = 0.33$). In the symptomatic *GRN* group the mCCT score was significantly correlated with left frontal lobe atrophy ($\rho = 0.48$), but with quite widespread volume loss in the late presymptomatic group. No significant correlations were found with any of the regional volumes in the early presymptomatic groups.

Discussion

In this study we have shown that a modified version of the Camel and Cactus Test is able to detect deficits within both symptomatic genetic FTD, and for *MAPT* and *C9orf72* mutation carriers, the late presymptomatic period within ten years of expected onset. Scores on the mCCT were correlated with atrophy in temporal regions for the symptomatic *MAPT* carriers, temporal and frontal areas for *C9orf72* carriers, and frontal grey matter for *GRN* mutation carriers, suggesting different areas of a semantic association network are predominantly affected in the different groups.

By investigating a large control population consisting of mutation-negative members of genetic FTD families, we were able to explore performance of the CCT in a much larger healthy group than previously. This allows determination of a percentile score and therefore an 'abnormal' lower boundary. By making the test freely available, we hope that such healthy control data can be expanded and further validated, particularly in older populations, where there were limited numbers in this study.

Impairment of semantic knowledge has been described previously in people with *MAPT* mutations (Pickering-Brown et al, 2002; Pickering-Brown et al, 2008) including very early in the illness: a single case report described a patient with only mild behavioural change who had evidence of semantic impairment on testing at that stage (including scoring only 35 out of 64 on the original visual version of the CCT: Garrard et al, 2005). People with *MAPT* mutations commonly have focal atrophy of both

temporal lobes in a pattern not dissimilar within each hemisphere as that seen in SD i.e. an anterior and inferior predominance of volume loss (Whitwell et al, 2009; Rohrer et al, 2010). In SD it is felt that semantic impairment is caused by the breakdown of an anatomical network focused on the temporal pole with loss of connectivity to other temporal lobe structures in both hemispheres (Fletcher et al, 2011). It is therefore unsurprising that people with *MAPT* mutations also develop semantic impairment given the pattern of atrophy, and this is supported here by the strong association of performance on the mCCT with reduced bilateral temporal lobe volume. Such loss has been shown to occur presymptomatically (Rohrer et al, 2015; Cash et al, 2018), consistent with the finding in this study of semantic impairment before symptom onset.

Impairment on tasks of semantic knowledge has been investigated less in those with *C9orf72* and *GRN* mutations. Whilst there are some case reports of patients with prominent early semantic deficits in these two groups (Rohrer et al, 2010; Cerami et al, 2013; Abbate et al, 2014; Jiskoot et al, 2018), in one retrospective neuropsychological study comparing individuals with mutations in all three genes, impaired word comprehension was present at time of initial referral in only 24% of the *C9orf72* group and 19% of the *GRN* group (compared with 86% in the *MAPT* group), and impaired object knowledge was only found in 16% of the *C9orf72* group and 7% of the *GRN* group (compared with 80% in the *MAPT* group) (Snowden et al, 2015). One other explanation for poor performance on the mCCT might be the role of executive dysfunction, a common cognitive deficit in genetic FTD (found in 92% of *MAPT*, 93% of *GRN* and 84% of *C9orf72* patients at initial referral in the same study discussed above: Snowden et al, 2015), and also known to be impaired presymptomatically (Rohrer et al, 2015; Jiskoot et al, 2018). The role of executive function in semantic tasks has been well-described (Jefferies et al, 2006; Hoffman et al, 2010): it has been proposed that semantic cognition relies not just on a temporal lobe-based hub of semantic knowledge, but a second process of executive control required for computation and manipulation of semantic information (Jefferies et al, 2006; Whitney et al, 2012), located in the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (Hoffman et al, 2010; Whitney et al, 2012). This would be consistent in

this study with the association of performance on the mCCT with the frontal lobe in both symptomatic *GRN* and *C9orf72* carriers. Interestingly, performance in symptomatic *C9orf72* carriers showed an association with both frontal and temporal lobe atrophy, suggestive that both systems may be impaired in this group.

In summary, the mCCT appears to be a useful test of semantic knowledge, able to detect impairment of semantic cognition in both the symptomatic and late presymptomatic periods of genetic FTD. In comparison with the original CCT it is shorter and contains only visual stimuli, making it practical for use in international trials. Future longitudinal studies will be important to investigate the rate of change over time, and to understand further the time period before symptom onset when such changes can be detected.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the support of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Queen Square Dementia Biomedical Research Unit and the University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre; the Leonard Wolfson Experimental Neurology Centre; the MRC Dementias Platform UK and the UK Dementia Research Institute. The Dementia Research Centre is an Alzheimer's Research UK coordinating centre and is supported by Alzheimer's Research UK, the Brain Research Trust and the Wolfson Foundation. JDR is an MRC Clinician Scientist (MR/M008525/1) and has received funding from the NIHR Rare Diseases Translational Research Collaboration (BRC149/NS/MH), the Bluefield Project and the Association for Frontotemporal Degeneration. JDW receives grant support from the Alzheimer's Society and Alzheimer's Research UK. RSV has received funding from Fundació Marató de TV3 (grant no. 20143810).

References

1. Abbate C, Arosio B, Galimberti D, Nicolini P, Chiara LR, Rossi PD, Ferri E, Gussago C, Deriz M, Fenoglio C, Serpente M, Scarpini E, Mari D. Phenotypic variability associated with the C9ORF72 hexanucleotide repeat expansion: a sporadic case of frontotemporal lobar degeneration with prodromal hyposmia and predominant semantic deficits. *J Alzheimers Dis.* 2014;40(4):849-55.
2. Adlam AL, Patterson K, Bozeat S, Hodges JR. The Cambridge Semantic Memory Test Battery: detection of semantic deficits in semantic dementia and Alzheimer's disease. *Neurocase.* 2010 Jun;16(3):193-207.
3. Bozeat S, Lambon Ralph MA, Patterson K, Garrard P, Hodges JR. Non-verbal semantic impairment in semantic dementia. *Neuropsychologia.* 2000;38(9):1207-15.
4. Cash DM, Bocchetta M, Thomas DL, Dick KM, van Swieten JC, Borroni B, Galimberti D, Masellis M, Tartaglia MC, Rowe JB, Graff C, Tagliavini F, Frisoni GB, Laforce R Jr, Finger E, de Mendonça A, Sorbi S, Rossor MN, Ourselin S, Rohrer JD; Genetic FTD Initiative, GENFI. Patterns of gray matter atrophy in genetic frontotemporal dementia: results from the GENFI study. *Neurobiol Aging.* 2018 Feb;62:191-196.
5. Cerami C, Marccone A, Galimberti D, Zamboni M, Fenoglio C, Serpente M, Scarpini E, Cappa SF. Novel evidence of phenotypical variability in the hexanucleotide repeat expansion in chromosome 9. *J Alzheimers Dis.* 2013;35(3):455-62.
6. Fletcher PD, Warren JD. Semantic dementia: a specific network-opathy. *J Mol Neurosci.* 2011 Nov;45(3):629-36.
7. Garrard P, Carroll E. Presymptomatic semantic impairment in a case of fronto-temporal lobar degeneration associated with the +16 mutation in MAPT. *Neurocase.* 2005 Oct;11(5):371-83.
8. Garrard P, Carroll E. Lost in semantic space: a multi-modal, non-verbal assessment of feature knowledge in semantic dementia. *Brain.* 2006 May;129(Pt 5):1152-63.

9. Hardy CJ, Buckley AH, Downey LE, Lehmann M, Zimmerer VC, Varley RA, Crutch SJ, Rohrer JD, Warrington EK, Warren JD. The Language Profile of Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia. *J Alzheimers Dis.* 2016;50(2):359-71.
10. Hoffman P, Jefferies E, Lambon Ralph MA. Ventrolateral prefrontal cortex plays an executive regulation role in comprehension of abstract words: convergent neuropsychological and repetitive TMS evidence. *J Neurosci.* 2010 Nov 17;30(46):15450-6.
11. Howard D, Patterson K. The Pyramids and Palm Trees Test. A test of semantic access from words and pictures, 1992. Bury St. Edmunds, UK: Thames Valley Company.
12. Jefferies E, Lambon Ralph MA. Semantic impairment in stroke aphasia versus semantic dementia: a case-series comparison. *Brain.* 2006 Aug;129(Pt 8):2132-47.
13. Jiskoot LC, Panman JL, van Asseldonk L, Franzen S, Meeter LHH, Donker Kaat L, van der Ende EL, Doppert EGP, Timman R, van Minkelen R, van Swieten JC, van den Berg E, Pappa JM. Longitudinal cognitive biomarkers predicting symptom onset in presymptomatic frontotemporal dementia. *J Neurol.* 2018 Jun;265(6):1381-1392.
14. Pickering-Brown SM, Richardson AM, Snowden JS, McDonagh AM, Burns A, Braude W, Baker M, Liu WK, Yen SH, Hardy J, Hutton M, Davies Y, Allsop D, Craufurd D, Neary D, Mann DM. Inherited frontotemporal dementia in nine British families associated with intronic mutations in the tau gene. *Brain.* 2002 Apr;125(Pt 4):732-51.
15. Pickering-Brown SM, Rollinson S, Du Plessis D, Morrison KE, Varma A, Richardson AM, Neary D, Snowden JS, Mann DM. Frequency and clinical characteristics of progranulin mutation carriers in the Manchester frontotemporal lobar degeneration cohort: comparison with patients with MAPT and no known mutations. *Brain.* 2008 Mar;131(Pt 3):721-31.
16. Rohrer JD, Crutch SJ, Warrington EK, Warren JD. Progranulin-associated primary progressive aphasia: a distinct phenotype? *Neuropsychologia.* 2010a Jan;48(1):288-97.

17. Rohrer JD, Ridgway GR, Modat M, Ourselin S, Mead S, Fox NC, Rossor MN, Warren JD. Distinct profiles of brain atrophy in frontotemporal lobar degeneration caused by progranulin and tau mutations. *Neuroimage*. 2010b Nov 15;53(3):1070-6.
18. Rohrer JD, Rossor MN, Warren JD. Syndromes of nonfluent primary progressive aphasia: a clinical and neurolinguistic analysis. *Neurology*. 2010c Aug 17;75(7):603-10.
19. Rohrer JD, Nicholas JM, Cash DM, van Swieten J, Dopper E, Jiskoot L, van Minkelen R, Rombouts SA, Cardoso MJ, Clegg S, Espak M, Mead S, Thomas DL, De Vita E, Masellis M, Black SE, Freedman M, Keren R, MacIntosh BJ, Rogaeva E, Tang-Wai D, Tartaglia MC, Laforce R Jr, Tagliavini F, Tiraboschi P, Redaelli V, Prioni S, Grisoli M, Borroni B, Padovani A, Galimberti D, Scarpini E, Arighi A, Fumagalli G, Rowe JB, Coyle-Gilchrist I, Graff C, Fallström M, Jelic V, Ståhlbom AK, Andersson C, Thonberg H, Lilius L, Frisoni GB, Pievani M, Bocchetta M, Benussi L, Ghidoni R, Finger E, Sorbi S, Nacmias B, Lombardi G, Polito C, Warren JD, Ourselin S, Fox NC, Rossor MN, Binetti G. Presymptomatic cognitive and neuroanatomical changes in genetic frontotemporal dementia in the Genetic Frontotemporal dementia Initiative (GENFI) study: a cross-sectional analysis. *Lancet Neurol*. 2015 Mar;14(3):253-62.
20. Snowden JS, Adams J, Harris J, Thompson JC, Rollinson S, Richardson A, Jones M, Neary D, Mann DM, Pickering-Brown S. Distinct clinical and pathological phenotypes in frontotemporal dementia associated with MAPT, PGRN and C9orf72 mutations. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener*. 2015;16(7-8):497-505.
21. Whitney C, Kirk M, O'Sullivan J, Lambon Ralph MA, Jefferies E. Executive semantic processing is underpinned by a large-scale neural network: revealing the contribution of left prefrontal, posterior temporal, and parietal cortex to controlled retrieval and selection using TMS. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2012 Jan;24(1):133-47.
22. Whitwell JL, Jack CR Jr, Boeve BF, Senjem ML, Baker M, Rademakers R, Ivnik RJ, Knopman DS, Wszolek ZK, Petersen RC, Josephs KA. Voxel-based morphometry patterns of atrophy in FTLD with mutations in MAPT or PGRN. *Neurology*. 2009 Mar 3;72(9):813-20.

Appendix

Stimuli for the modified Camel and Cactus Test

Table 1

Demographics and modified Camel and Cactus Test scores in the GENFI cohort

		Number of participants	Age in years [mean(SD)]	Sex (% male)	Years of education [mean(SD)]	FTLD-CDR [mean(SD)]	Modified Camel and Cactus Test [mean(SD)]
Controls		248	46.5 (13.0)	42	14.2 (3.5)	0.2 (0.6)	30.2 (1.6)
MAPT	Early presymptomatic	33	34.7 (7.0)	36	14.7 (2.6)	0.2 (0.5)	30.9 (0.9)
	Late presymptomatic	19	50.0 (9.3)	42	14.0 (3.7)	0.8 (1.9)	28.8 (2.2)
	Symptomatic	15	59.7 (6.0)	53	14.9 (3.8)	9.0 (5.8)	22.3 (8.0)
GRN	Early presymptomatic	79	39.2 (8.2)	32	15.0 (3.7)	0.1 (0.2)	30.5 (1.3)
	Late presymptomatic	53	58.4 (7.8)	49	14.2 (3.4)	0.3 (0.7)	29.8 (1.9)
	Symptomatic	33	63.9 (8.4)	52	11.3 (3.3)	8.3 (5.5)	24.4 (7.2)
C9orf72	Early presymptomatic	68	39.9 (9.7)	43	14.4 (2.4)	0.2 (0.5)	30.4 (1.5)
	Late presymptomatic	40	53.7 (8.9)	33	14.4 (3.7)	0.4 (0.9)	28.9 (2.5)
	Symptomatic	56	62.2 (7.8)	66	13.0 (3.9)	9.6 (5.8)	23.6 (6.5)

Table 2a

Modified Camel and Cactus Test scores in controls by age

Age group (years)	Number of participants	Modified Camel and Cactus Test [mean(SD)]
18.1-29.9	28	30.0 (1.9)
30.0-39.9	58	30.5 (1.6)
40.0-49.9	66	30.5 (1.4)
50.0-59.9	48	30.1 (1.4)
60.0-69.9	40	29.5 (1.7)
70.0-85.0	8	29.5 (1.6)

Table 2b

Modified Camel and Cactus Test scores in controls by education

Education group (years)	Number of participants	Modified Camel and Cactus Test [mean(SD)]
0-9	25	29.8 (1.7)
10-12	47	30.1 (1.8)
13-16	122	30.1 (1.6)
≥17	54	30.5 (1.4)

Table 3

Modified Camel and Cactus Test score in controls – cumulative frequency

Modified Camel and Cactus Test score	Number of participants	Cumulative frequency (%)
25	3	1.2
26	5	3.2
27	8	6.5
28	24	16.1
29	27	27.0
30	57	50.0
31	67	77.0
32	57	100.0

Table 5

Spearman's rank correlation coefficients (ρ) of modified Camel and Cactus Test score with regional brain volumes in early and late presymptomatic (presymp) and symptomatic genetic groups (p value in parentheses, significant in bold)

	<i>MAPT</i> early presymp	<i>MAPT</i> late presymp	<i>MAPT</i> symp	<i>GRN</i> early presymp	<i>GRN</i> late presymp	<i>GRN</i> symp	<i>C9orf72</i> early presymp	<i>C9orf72</i> late presymp	<i>C9orf72</i> symp
Right frontal	-0.03 (0.872)	0.11 (0.681)	0.46 (0.135)	0.16 (0.158)	0.38 (0.008)	0.23 (0.210)	-0.17 0.177	0.27 (0.123)	0.30 (0.031)
Left frontal	-0.08 (0.660)	0.33 (0.192)	0.38 (0.217)	0.14 (0.231)	0.38 (0.008)	0.48 (0.007)	-0.13 (0.296)	0.33 (0.049)	0.29 (0.040)
Right temporal	-0.06 (0.744)	0.05 (0.846)	0.80 (0.002)	0.13 (0.248)	0.37 (0.009)	-0.10 (0.581)	-0.11 (0.379)	0.09 (0.604)	0.40 (0.004)
Left temporal	0.115 (0.547)	0.48 (0.051)	0.82 (0.001)	0.11 (0.339)	0.20 (0.183)	0.30 (0.102)	-0.24 0.058	0.22 (0.199)	0.31 (0.031)
Right parietal	0.14 (0.454)	0.11 (0.677)	0.46 (0.135)	0.11 (0.327)	0.51 (0.001)	0.00 (0.998)	0.07 (0.573)	0.25 (0.140)	0.20 (0.163)
Left parietal	-0.01 (0.968)	0.36 (0.156)	0.11 (0.744)	0.11 (0.342)	0.32 (0.028)	0.28 (0.121)	-0.05 (0.709)	0.15 (0.374)	0.19 (0.186)
Right occipital	-0.07 (0.698)	0.07 (0.793)	0.06 (0.862)	0.05 (0.642)	0.44 (0.002)	0.19 (0.317)	0.14 (0.264)	0.18 (0.299)	0.19 (0.193)
Left occipital	-0.20 (0.296)	-0.14 (0.594)	0.29 (0.356)	0.12 (0.322)	0.36 (0.011)	0.35 (0.054)	-0.06 (0.645)	0.09 (0.626)	0.04 (0.771)

Figure 1

Modified Camel and Cactus Test scores in each group – significant differences from controls and within each genetic group are starred

