

WAB-R Profiles in Progressive Speech and Language Disorders: Longitudinal Findings

Heather Clark, Rene Utianski, Joseph Duffy, Edythe Strand, Jennifer Whitwell and Keith A. Josephs

EasyChair preprints are intended for rapid dissemination of research results and are integrated with the rest of EasyChair.

August 26, 2021

WAB-R Profiles in Progressive Speech and Language Disorders: Longitudinal Findings

Heather M Clark^{1*}, Rene L Utianski¹, Joseph R Duffy¹, Edythe A Strand¹, Jennifer L Whitwell² and Keith A Josephs¹

¹ Department of Neurology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN USA ² Department of Radiology Research, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN USA

*corresponding author, clark.heather1@mayo.edu

Introduction

In previous work, we demonstrated that whereas traditional WAB-R (Kertesz, 2007) aphasia type classification did not distinguish among primary progressive aphasia (PPA) and apraxia of speech (AOS) classifications, relative performance across WAB-R composite scores had good agreement with consensus diagnosis of the semantic (svPPA) and agrammatic variants of PPA (with or without AOS; agPPA), and primary progressive AOS (PPAOS)(Clark et al., 2019). Other variants, such as logopenic (IvPPA), had no characteristic profile. The current study examined the performance of these metrics longitudinally.

Methods

Participants included 69 adults (35 female) diagnosed with svPPA, agPPA or PPAOS. All participants underwent comprehensive clinical evaluation between two and seven visits at approximately one-year intervals.

The WAB-R was one component of the assessment battery. In addition to traditional scoring, performance ratios were calculated between: the auditory comprehension and naming and word-finding composite scores (Comprehension:Naming ratio); the auditory comprehension composite score and fluency rating (Comprehension:Fluency ratio); and the rating of information communicated during the spontaneous speech tasks relative to the naming composite score (Information Content:Naming ratio).

As described by Clark et al (2019), the relative size of these three ratios yields a profile that is either flat (all ratios are roughly equivalent), has a "dip" (the Comprehension: Fluency ratio is smaller than the other two ratios), or has a "peak" (the Comprehension: Fluency ratio is larger than the other two ratios). For the current study, meaningfully different was defined as a difference of 0.20 or greater between both Comprehension:Naming and Information Content:Naming ratios (in the same direction) and the Comprehension:Fluency ratio (Figure 1). Ratio profile agreement between first and final visits was assessed, relative to diagnosis.

Results

Table 1 illustrates maintenance of the dip and peak profiles between timepoints, with only one profile evolving into an unclassifiable profile. In contrast, fewer than half of flat profiles remained flat at the final visit.

Conclusions

The findings suggest that the "dip" and "peak" profiles had good specificity for the semantic and agrammatic variants, respectively. The flat profile had excellent sensitivity for PPAOS, but also overidentified svPPA at initial visit. The flat profile also overidentified agPPA, although a proportion of participants indeed evolved from PPAOS (flat profile) to agPPA (peak profile) over time. However, this does not account for those with agPPA who continued to display a flat profile at their final visit. This observation affirms what has been argued by many groups, that a single aphasia instrument such as the WAB-R, in the absence of other measures, is not well-suited for distinguishing among the variants of PPA (Botha et al., 2015; Leyton et al., 2011; Mesulam et al., 2009; Vandenberghe et al., 2005), nor for tracking disease progression over time, as shown in this study. Nonetheless, these ratio profiles add value beyond the AQ and often reflect, when present, the proportionate deficits seen in PPA. Future studies will explore agreement of profiles at interval visits" and/or "the predictive value of profiles and relative difference of ratios for estimating disease trajectory.

References

- Botha, H., Duffy, J. R., Whitwell, J. L., Strand, E. A., Machulda, M. M., Schwarz, C. G., Reid, R. I., Spychalla, A. J., Senjem, M. L., Jones, D. T., Lowe, V., Jack, C. R., & Josephs, K. A. (2015). Classification and clinicoradiologic features of primary progressive aphasia (PPA) and apraxia of speech. *Cortex*, *69*, 220-236. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.05.013</u>
- Clark, H. M., Utianski, R. L., Duffy, J. R., Strand, E. A., Botha, H., Josephs, K. A., & Whitwell, J. L. (2019). Western Aphasia Battery-Revised Profiles in Primary Progressive Aphasia and Primary Progressive Apraxia of Speech. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019 AJSLP-CAC48-18-0217

Kertesz, A. (2007). Western Aphasia Battery - Revised. The Psychological Corporation.

- Leyton, C. E., Villemagne, V. L., Savage, S., Pike, K. E., Ballard, K. J., Piguet, O., Burrell, J. R., Rowe, C. C., & Hodges, J. R. (2011). Subtypes of progressive aphasia: application of the International Consensus Criteria and validation using beta-amyloid imaging. *Brain*, 134(Pt 10), 3030-3043. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr216</u>
- Mesulam, M., Wieneke, C., Rogalski, E., Cobia, D., Thompson, C., & Weintraub, S. (2009). Quantitative template for subtyping primary progressive aphasia. *Arch Neurol*, 66(12), 1545-1551. <u>https://doi.org/10.1001/archneurol.2009.288</u>
- Vandenberghe, R., Vandenbulcke, M., Weintraub, S., Johnson, N., Porke, K., Thompson, C. K., & Mesulam, M. M. (2005). Paradoxical features of word finding difficulty in primary progressive aphasia. *Ann Neurol*, 57(2), 204-209. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.20362</u>

Acknowledgments

The study was funded by National Institutes of Health Grants R01 DC010367 (PI: K. A. Josephs) and R01 DC12519 (PI: J. L. Whitwell). The authors acknowledge the patients who participated in this study and their family members who made their participation possible.



Figure 1. Idealized WAB-R Ratio Profiles. Blue: Comprehension:Naming; Red: Comprehension:Fluency; Green: Information Content:Naming

Table 1. Agreement between first and final visit WAB profiles. Listed diagnosis indicates the consensus diagnosis at the final visit. Shaded cells are those with agreement between first and final visit. Underlined designations indicate that the WAB-R profile agreed with the consensus diagnosis.

	Dip at Final Visit	Flat at Final Visit	Peak at Final Visit	Unclassified Profile
				at Final Visit
Dip at 1 st Visit	<u>svPPA</u>			
	6 <u>svPPA</u>			1 svPPA
Flat		agPPA		
at 1st Visit		agPPA		
		<u>PPAOS</u> agPPA	<u>agPPA agPPA</u>	
		<u>PPAOS</u> agPPA	<u>agPPA agPPA</u>	
		<u>PPAOS</u> agPPA	<u>agPPA agPPA</u>	
		<u>PPAOS</u> agPPA	<u>agPPA agPPA</u>	
		<u>PPAOS</u> agPPA	agPPA agPPA	
		<u>PPAOS</u> agPPA	agPPA agPPA	
		<u>PPAOS</u> agPPA	agPPA agPPA	
	<u>svPPA</u>	PPAOS agPPA	agPPA agPPA	
	<u>svPPA</u>	PPAOS agPPA	agPPA agPPA	
	3 <u>svPPA</u>	22 <u>PPAOS</u> agPPA	20 <u>agPPA agPPA</u>	1 agPPA
Peak			<u>agPPA</u>	
at 1st Visit			<u>agPPA agPPA</u>	
			agPPA agPPA	
			agPPA agPPA	
			agPPA agPPA	
			<u>agPPA agPPA</u>	
			13 <u>agPPA agPPA</u>	
Unclassified				
Profile				
at 1st Visit			1 <u>agPPA</u>	2 svPPA agPPA

svPPA: Semantic variant; PPAOS: Primary Progressive Apraxia of Speech; agPPA: Agrammatic Variant with or without Apraxia of Speech;