Neuroanatomical and neuropsychological features of elderly euthymic depressed patients with early- and late-onset
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ABSTRACT

Background: Whether or not cognitive impairment and brain structure changes are trait characteristics of late-life depression is still disputed. Previous studies led to conflicting data possibly because of the difference in the age of depression onset. In fact, several lines of evidence suggest that late-onset depression (LOD) is more frequently associated with neuropsychological deficits and brain pathology than early-onset depression (EOD). To date, no study explored concomitantly the cognitive profile and brain magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) patterns in euthymic EOD and LOD patients.

Method: Using a cross-sectional design, 41 remitted outpatients (30 with EOD and 11 with LOD) were compared to 30 healthy controls. Neuropsychological evaluation concerned working memory, episodic memory, processing speed, naming capacity and executive functions. Volumetric estimates of the amygdala, hippocampus, entorhinal and anterior cingulate cortex were obtained using both voxel-based and region of interest morphometric methods. White matter hyperintensities were assessed semiquantitively.

Results: Both cognitive performance and brain volumes were preserved in euthymic EOD patients whereas LOD patients showed a significant reduction of episodic memory capacity and a higher rate of periventricular hyperintensities compared to both controls and EOD patients.

Conclusion: Our results support the dissociation between EOD thought to be mainly related to psychosocial factors and LOD that is characterized by increasing vascular burden and episodic memory decline.

© 2010 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Amongst patients who suffer from late-life depression, 30% to 50% display deficits across a wide range of cognitive domains [1]. Even more than in younger cohorts [2], some cognitive deficits in old age may represent trait characteristics of depression that persist despite the amendment of symptoms [3]. However, this viewpoint has been challenged by prospective studies showing that depression at baseline is not necessarily associated with an increased risk of subsequent cognitive decline [4]. These discrepancies might be partly explained by age differences relative to the onset of depression among elderly patients. Recent studies suggest that the patterns of both neuropsychological deficits and structural imaging changes vary substantially between late-onset depression (LOD) and early-onset depression (EOD) [1,5,6]. LOD has been traditionally associated with more frequent and rapid cognitive decline as well as more severe structural brain abnormalities compared to age-matched controls and EOD patients [1,6]. In particular, literature reported executive dysfunction to be a characteristic of LOD whereas episodic memory dysfunction is present both in LOD and EOD [1]. Consistent with the presence of dysexecutive impairment in LOD, neuroimaging studies [7] revealed a frontostriatal disruption caused by subcortical, white matter and periventricular hyperintensities. In contrast, EOD cases display selective hippocampal volume loss [8] underlying the episodic memory impairment.
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There are two main methodological limitations of these studies. Most of them explored separately structural changes and neuropsychological performances. Most importantly, they included acutely depressed patients and did not provide further insight into their persistent abnormalities. To address these issues, we performed a prospective group study (EOD, LOD and controls) including a detailed neuropsychological assessment and MRI investigation.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Thirty EOD patients (depression onset before 60), eleven LOD patients (depression onset after 60), and thirty healthy controls were included. The diagnosis of depression or the absence of a psychiatric condition was established using the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview. Euthymia was defined according to DSM-IV criteria, namely the absence of depressive symptoms for at least two months. In addition, all participants had to obtain a score below 5 on the 15 item Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) at inclusion. Exclusion criteria for all groups were: 1) history of major neurological disorders, 2) the presence of a current or a past DSM-IV psychiatric diagnosis (other than depression), 3) the presence of dementia, and 4) current systemic medical disease requiring inpatient treatment. Physical health status was examined with the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI). Following the formal acceptance of the research protocol by the local ethics committee, written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

2.2. Cognitive measures

2.2.1. Processing speed

(I) In a simple reaction time test, participants had to press a key as quickly as possible when the visual signal stimulus appeared. The score of interest was the mean latency of the 120 test trials. (II) In the Stroop color, participants had to complete two subtests. The first subtask displayed solid color patches in one of four colors. The second subtask contained color words printed in an incongruous ink color. In each subtask, participants had to name the ink color of the stimuli as quickly and accurately as possible. Completion time for each subtask was the dependent measure. The score of interest was the flexibility cost [(part B − part A)/part A].

2.2.4. Episodic memory

(I) In the Cued recall 48 items test (CR 48), participants had to learn 48 different words, belonging to 12 different semantic categories, with the help of semantic cues. A cued recall task, using semantic categories as a cue, was performed. The score of interest was the number of words correctly recalled; (II) In the CERAD Word List Memory test, participants had to memorize a list of ten words that was presented over three trials. The total number of words recalled correctly across the three trials was the dependant measure.

2.3. MRI procedures

MRI imaging was performed at 3 T. Coronal slices were obtained from 3-dimensional MPRAGE sequence with the following parameters: TR 2500 ms, TE 2.94 ms, TI 1100 ms, flip angle 9°, isotropic resolution of 0.9 mm^{3}, acquisition time 520 s. In addition, 3-dimensional T2 weighted imaging was obtained with the following parameters: TE = 383 ms, TR = 3200 ms, FOV = 230 mm, acceleration factor (parallel imaging) 2, matrix size 256 × 256 × 240.

2.4. Assessment of WMH

Assessment of white matter lesions was performed in T2-weighted sequences with the Scheltens semiquantitative scale [9].

2.5. ROI analysis

Anterior cingular and entorhinal cortices, as well as hippocampal and amygdala perimeters were traced manually on each contiguous coronal slice using a ROI procedure of ANALYZE software (version 8, Mayo Foundation). Neuroanatomic boundaries of the hippocampus and amygdala were based on those of Watson et al. [10]. Anatomic guidelines for outlining the entorhinal and anterior cingular cortices were those described by Bernasconi et al. [11] and Sassi et al. [12] respectively. Normalized volumes for brain regions of interest were determined by using the following formula: [absolute volume in mm^{3}/intracranial volume (ICV) in mm^{3}] × 1.000.

2.6. Voxel-based morphometry

Standard processing, using SPM5 software, was employed to analyze MRI for voxel-based morphometry (VBM) [13]. Images were segmented using the standard T1 template and a priori gray matter, white matter and CSF atlases provided by SPM. Spatially normalized (1 × 1 × 1 mm^{3}) data were modulated to account for local volume changes due to non linear co-registration. Gray matter images were smoothed with a 8-mm Gaussian kernel.

2.7. Statistical analysis

Comparisons between groups for continuous variables were performed using a one-way independent analysis of variance. To respect assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance data were modified prior to analysis by means of logarithmic or power 2 transformations. In the absence of normalisation, non-parametric tests were used. Comparisons of categorical variables were performed with a Pearson’s Chi-Square. Linear regression models were also built with cognitive parameters or vascular lesions as the dependent variables and diagnostic group and age as the independent variables.
3. Results

3.1. Demographics and clinical characteristics

The demographic and clinical characteristics of the series are summarized in Table 1. Among the three groups there were no significant differences in gender, education and somatic comorbidity as assessed by the CCI. EOD patients were significantly younger than controls \((U = 205.50, p < 0.001)\) and LOD patients \((U = 22.00, p < 0.001)\). Patients were already under treatment at inclusion. We did not interfere with their medication as the treatment was prescribed naturally. 73% of LOD patients and 50% of EOD patients received regular antidepressant medication (selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors). This treatment was associated in 10% of the EOD cases and 27% of the LOD cases with benzodiazepines and in 3% of the EOD cases and 18% of the LOD cases with atypical antipsychotics. Only one LOD case received concomitantly antidepressants, antipsychotics, and benzodiazepines.

3.2. MRI data

Table 2 summarizes the mean rating score of WMH according to the Scheltens semiquantitative scale. Periventricular hyperintensities score differed among our three groups \(H(2) = 13.00, p < 0.01\) and were significantly higher in LOD patients compared to controls \((U = 58.50, p < 0.001, r = 0.51)\) and EOD patients \((U = 57.00, p < 0.001, r = 0.52)\). The severity of deep white matter and basal ganglia hyperintensities was comparable between the three groups. Except 2 LOD cases, there were no hyperintensities in infratentorial area in the present series.

The mean normalized volumes of each brain ROI by group of participants are reported in Table 2. There were no significant differences in entorhinal cortex and amygdala volume between our three groups. There was a trend for reduced hippocampal \((F(2, 68) = 2.64, p = 0.06)\) and anterior cingulate \((F(2, 68) = 3.03, p = 0.05)\) volume in LOD patients. However, this trend did not persist after adjustment for age in linear regression models. The VBM analysis confirmed the absence of statically significant difference in gray matter volumes between our three groups.

3.3. Cognitive test performance

Performances on cognitive tests are provided in Table 3. With respect to processing speed, the simple reaction time test and the part A of the color trail making test revealed no significant differences among our three groups. This was also the case for working memory assessed by the mean number of words correctly recalled in the reading span task and the score of the sequence-letter sequence test. Performances on episodic memory tasks were significantly different compared to controls. For episodic memory, a significant group difference was observed for the cued recall score of the CR 48 items test \((F(2, 68) = 4.16, p = 0.05)\) as well as for the total recall score of the CERAD word list memory test \((F(2, 68) = 8.26, p < 0.01)\). Post-hoc analyses using the Bonferroni post hoc criterion for significance indicated that LOD patients \((M = 17.73, 95\% CI [14.72, 20.73])\) obtained a significantly lower total recall score on the CERAD word list memory test compared to controls \((M = 22.17, 95\% CI [20.77, 23.56], p < 0.01, r = 0.46)\) and EOD patients \((M = 22.70, 95\% CI [21.59, 23.81], p < 0.01, r = 0.55)\). Similarly, LOD patients \((M = 23.55, 95\% CI [18.44, 28.65])\) obtained a significantly lower cued recall score on the CR 48 items test compared to controls \((M = 29.07, 95\% CI [26.96, 31.18], p < 0.05, r = 0.37)\) and EOD patients \((M = 29.10, 95\% CI [26.78, 29.67], p < 0.05, r = 0.39)\). Importantly, linear regression analysis revealed that these differences were still present after adjustment for age. Among EOD patients, duration of illness had no impact on ROI volumes, WMH scores and cognition after control for age.

### Table 1
Demographic and clinical characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Controls (N=30)</th>
<th>EOD (N=30)</th>
<th>LOD (N=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>70.83 (6.78)</td>
<td>65.00 (4.24)</td>
<td>75.82 (6.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education⁴</td>
<td>13.50 (3.68)</td>
<td>14.43 (3.31)</td>
<td>12.64 (4.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score GDS (max 15)⁵</td>
<td>1.97 (1.52)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.63)</td>
<td>2.36 (1.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score CCI (max 18)⁶</td>
<td>0.63 (0.85)</td>
<td>0.63 (0.85)</td>
<td>0.55 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at depression onset (years)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35.67 (14.51)</td>
<td>74.09 (7.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of depressive illness (years)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>29.33 (14.72)</td>
<td>1.73 (1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (% women)</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Number of years of education completed.
⁵ Geriatric Depression Scale.
⁶ Charlson Comorbidity Index.

### Table 2
White matter hyperintensity scores for EOD patients, LOD patients and controls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Controls (N=30)</th>
<th>EOD (N=30)</th>
<th>LOD (N=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltens' scale scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periventricular hyperintensities</td>
<td>0.83 (1.05)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.96)</td>
<td>2.45 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMH in deep white matter</td>
<td>2.87 (4.99)</td>
<td>3.23 (4.13)</td>
<td>6.45 (6.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal ganglia</td>
<td>0.40 (1.10)</td>
<td>0.13 (0.43)</td>
<td>0.73 (1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infratentorial</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.73 (1.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean normalized volumes of the brain region of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampal Total</td>
<td>3.65 (0.53)</td>
<td>3.61 (0.43)</td>
<td>3.26 (0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entorhinal cortex Total</td>
<td>1.17 (0.20)</td>
<td>1.09 (0.23)</td>
<td>1.04 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior cingulate cortex Total</td>
<td>2.64 (0.49)</td>
<td>2.73 (0.64)</td>
<td>2.26 (0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amygdalar Total</td>
<td>1.70 (0.26)</td>
<td>1.69 (0.25)</td>
<td>1.63 (0.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive functions were also preserved in EOD and LOD patients. The relative ratios measuring interference cost induced by the Stroop effect and switching cost evaluated by the color trail making test were not significantly different compared to controls. For episodic memory, a significant group difference was observed for the cued recall score of the CR 48 items test \((F(2, 68) = 4.16, p = 0.05)\) as well as for the total recall score of the CERAD word list memory test \((F(2, 68) = 8.26, p < 0.01)\). Post-hoc analyses using the Bonferroni post hoc criterion for significance indicated that LOD patients \((M = 17.73, 95\% CI [14.72, 20.73])\) obtained a significantly lower total recall score on the CERAD word list memory test compared to controls \((M = 22.17, 95\% CI [20.77, 23.56], p < 0.01, r = 0.46)\) and EOD patients \((M = 22.70, 95\% CI [21.59, 23.81], p < 0.01, r = 0.55)\). Similarly, LOD patients \((M = 23.55, 95\% CI [18.44, 28.65])\) obtained a significantly lower cued recall score on the CR 48 items test compared to controls \((M = 29.07, 95\% CI [26.96, 31.18], p < 0.05, r = 0.37)\) and EOD patients \((M = 29.10, 95\% CI [26.78, 29.67], p < 0.05, r = 0.39)\).

4. Conclusion

The preservation of both cognition and brain structures in euthymic EOD patients, in particular episodic memory capacity and hippocampal volume, as well as the absence of deleterious effect of the duration of illness does not support the hypothesis of a progressive neurotoxic effect of depression [8]. Our results parallel several lines of evidence supporting the preservation of cognitive abilities in elderly patients with EOD after remission [4,6]. In particular, Brodaty et al. [4] found no evidence for long-term cognitive deficits following depressive episodes even after 25 years of follow-up. It is worth mentioning that in the present study we carefully excluded all lifetime psychiatric comorbidities such as substance abuse, known to influence neuropsychological performances and hippocampal volumes [14]. This might explain the difference between our findings and those of certain previous studies in this field [3,8].

Unlike EOD, LOD patients showed decreased performances limited to episodic memory tasks. Although one could argue that this finding may be primarily due to confounding factors such as medication, this is an unlikely scenario since we indexed episodic memory capacity by...
using the RI-48 item test that controls for cognitive processing during encoding. In contrast to free recall tests, this procedure involves cued recall and minimises the effect of impaired attention, inefficient strategies or reduced processing capacity that could result from these factors [15]. Moreover, the episodic memory impairment cannot be attributed to the co-existence of dementia since we carefully excluded all of these cases. In line with our results, two recent studies found a reduction of episodic memory capacity in LOD patients compared to controls and EOD patients [2,16]. Moreover, Thomas et al. [2] observed that none of their LOD patients developed dementia during a four-year follow-up suggesting that incipient Alzheimer’s disease is not the explanation of the larger verbal memory impairment identified in LOD group. The significant increase of periventricular hyperintensities in our LOD group may partly explain the observed cognitive deficits. In fact, recent contributions pointed to a possible vascular origin of episodic memory impairment both in population-based samples and LOD cohorts [5,17].

To our knowledge, this is the only study that compared concomitantly the cognitive profile and the brain structural characteristics of elderly patients who recovered from EOD or LOD. Additional strengths of the present study include the careful exclusion of lifetime psychiatric comorbidities as well as physical burden, control for demographic variables and duration of depression, detailed assessment of cognitive performances, volumetric analyses as well as assessment of WMH. Two limitations should also be taken into account. First, we cannot exclude that the lack of significant between-group differences on some measures may be due to an insufficient sample size. Second, the effect of additional clinical parameters such as the number of previous episodes and history of psychotic symptoms was not addressed.

In conclusion, our observations support the distinction between the aetiological mechanisms implicated in the pathogenesis of LOD and EOD [1]. While LOD may be more driven by acquired pathology such as vascular burden, genetic background and personality dimensions may be the most important determinants of EOD.
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Table 3

Neuropsychological performances in EOD patients, LOD patients and controls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive function</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Controls (N=30)</th>
<th>EOD (N=30)</th>
<th>LOD (N=11)</th>
<th>H/F a</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing speed</td>
<td>Simple reaction time b</td>
<td>336.92 (74.77)</td>
<td>299.72 (48.48)</td>
<td>312.00 (34.22)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latencies in ms CTM part 1 c</td>
<td>59.03 (19.45)</td>
<td>52.80 (16.45)</td>
<td>60.55 (19.95)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latencies in sec. CTM part 1 c</td>
<td>5.93 (2.72)</td>
<td>9.00 (1.83)</td>
<td>8.55 (2.16)</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working memory</td>
<td>Reading span: Score</td>
<td>2.27 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.40 (0.59)</td>
<td>2.04 (0.38)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter-number sequence Score</td>
<td>10.40 (2.72)</td>
<td>9.00 (1.83)</td>
<td>8.55 (2.16)</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive function</td>
<td>Stroop color Relative ratio CTM c</td>
<td>2.00 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.45 (0.59)</td>
<td>2.10 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative ratio CTM c</td>
<td>1.04 (0.59)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.55)</td>
<td>1.33 (0.66)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic memory</td>
<td>Cued recall 48 Score</td>
<td>29.07 (5.65)</td>
<td>29.10 (5.34)</td>
<td>23.55 (7.59)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total recall score</td>
<td>22.17 (3.74)</td>
<td>22.70 (2.98)</td>
<td>17.73 (4.47)</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Statistical comparisons were made using Kruskal–Wallis test/Analysis of variance (ANOVA).
b Data were transformed prior to analyses (logarithmic or power 2 transformation).
c CTM = Color Trail Making Test.


