



# Towards timely Alzheimer’s diagnosis: a clinical data-driven approach to biomarker discovery

Smita Sahay, Ali Sajid Imami, Abdul-Rizaq Hamoud, Robert Erne McCullumsmith , Sinead Marie O’Donovan

Department of Neurosciences, The University of Toledo College of Medicine and Life Sciences, Toledo, OH, USA

## INTRODUCTION

Alzheimer’s Disease (AD) is a neurodegenerative disorder characterized by a progressive decline in cognitive function and memory [1]. The prevalence of dementia, mostly attributed to AD, is increasing in the United States and globally.

Early symptoms are often non-specific and go unnoticed. Traditional diagnosis relies on clinical and cognitive assessments, which are both subjective and often imprecise [2].

Currently, no objective and reliable biomarkers exist for the detection of AD in its early stages. Our study fills this gap in the field and proposes lab-based biomarkers that may be used to diagnose AD by analyzing retrospectively collected critical care medical data from the MIMIC-IV database [3].

The detection of AD in its early stages will allow for early clinical intervention and the possibility of more effective and robust management of this complex disorder prior to its progression.

## METHODS

We utilized the MIMIC-IV database that includes critical care data from 40,000 racially and ethnically diverse patients admitted to intensive care units at the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. For each lab (n=1600+), MIMIC-IV was filtered for patients with a primary diagnosis of AD and age- and sex-matched non-psychiatrically ill control (CTL) patients.

Each case was matched to four CTLs. The means and standard deviations for each lab of interest was calculated. Welch’s two sample t-test was used to compare means and standard deviations in AD vs. CTL groups. Effect sizes (ES) were also calculated to further assess the practical significance of our results.

## RESULTS

|                             | AD vs. CTL | Females AD vs. CTL | Males AD vs. CTL |
|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Total Labs                  | 477        | 227                | 210              |
| Significant Labs (p<0.05)   | 51         | 22                 | 22               |
| Labs with Moderate-Large ES | 22         | 6                  | 9                |
| Moderate-Large ES Range     | 0.27-1.16  | 0.35-0.48          | 0.26-0.49        |

| AD vs. CTL                                   |      |
|----------------------------------------------|------|
| Lab   Fluid   Units                          | ES   |
| Acetaminophen   Blood   ug/mL                | 0.84 |
| Albumin   Urine   mg/dL                      | 0.47 |
| Albumin/Creatinine   Urine   mg/g            | 0.61 |
| CA-125   Blood   U/mL                        | 0.51 |
| Calculated TBG   Blood   Ratio               | 1.16 |
| Chloride   Blood   mEq/L                     | 0.32 |
| Chloride   Urine   mEq/L                     | 0.29 |
| Cholesterol, LDL, Calculated   Blood   mg/dL | 0.27 |
| Cholesterol, Total   Blood   mg/dL           | 0.34 |
| Fibrinogen, Functional   Blood   mg/dL       | 0.47 |
| Glucose   Urine   mg/dL                      | 0.32 |
| Haptoglobin   Blood   mg/dL                  | 0.47 |
| Osmolality   Urine   mOsm/kg                 | 0.44 |
| Other Cells   Blood   %                      | 0.33 |
| Parathyroid Hormone   Blood   pg/mL          | 0.32 |
| Phenytoin, Percent Free   Blood   %          | 1.01 |
| Sedimentation Rate   Blood   mm/hr           | 0.45 |
| Sodium   Blood   mEq/L                       | 0.35 |
| Sodium   Urine   mEq/L                       | 0.33 |
| Uptake Ratio   Blood   Ratio                 | 1.14 |
| Urea Nitrogen   Urine   mg/dL                | 0.35 |
| Valproic Acid   Blood   ug/mL                | 0.60 |

| ES Ranges Utilized in the Study |             |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| 0.0-0.25                        | Small ES    |
| 0.26-0.75                       | Moderate ES |
| >0.76                           | Large ES    |

| Females AD vs. CTL                     |      |
|----------------------------------------|------|
| Lab   Fluid   Units                    | ES   |
| Chloride   Blood   mEq/L               | 0.37 |
| Fibrinogen, Functional   Blood   mg/dL | 0.48 |
| Haptoglobin   Blood   mg/dL            | 0.46 |
| Osmolality   Urine   mOsm/kg           | 0.46 |
| Sodium   Blood   mEq/L                 | 0.35 |
| Sodium   Urine   mEq/L                 | 0.35 |

| Males AD vs. CTL                       |      |
|----------------------------------------|------|
| Lab   Fluid   Units                    | ES   |
| Fibrinogen, Functional   Blood   mg/dL | 0.46 |
| Haptoglobin   Blood   mg/dL            | 0.49 |
| Hematocrit   Blood   %                 | 0.26 |
| Hemoglobin   Blood   g/dL              | 0.27 |
| Osmolality   Urine   mOsm/kg           | 0.41 |
| Red Blood Cells   Blood   m/uL         | 0.26 |
| Sodium   Blood   mEq/L                 | 0.35 |
| Sodium   Urine   mEq/L                 | 0.30 |
| Urea Nitrogen   Blood   mg/dL          | 0.28 |

## DISCUSSION

- Potential lab-based biomarkers for AD were fell in three major diagnostic categories: kidney function (urea nitrogen), cardiovascular (cholesterol), and electrolyte/metabolic balance (chloride, glucose)
- Among the three comparison groups, the AD vs. CTL group had the most significant labs with moderate to large ESs (n=22) as well as the broadest ES range (0.27-1.16).
- Five labs were common across all comparison groups: functional fibrinogen (blood), haptoglobin (blood), urine osmolality, blood sodium, and urine sodium.
- An assessment of significant labs between females and males showed overlap; however, males were distinguished by the broader diagnostic category of hematology, indicating the importance of considering sex in biomarker analysis for AD.

## REFERENCES

[1] P. Scheltens *et al.*, "Alzheimer's disease," (in eng), *Lancet*, vol. 397, no. 10284, pp. 1577-1590, Apr 24 2021, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32205-4.

[2] A. Atri, "The Alzheimer's Disease Clinical Spectrum: Diagnosis and Management," (in eng), *Med Clin North Am*, vol. 103, no. 2, pp. 263-293, Mar 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.mcna.2018.10.009.

[3] A. E. W. Johnson *et al.*, "Author Correction: MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset," (in eng), *Sci Data*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 219, Apr 18 2023, doi: 10.1038/s41597-023-02136-9.